

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor
632 W. 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska**

**April 18, 2024
1:00 PM**

*This meeting is available for viewing at
[Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings \(muni.org\)](https://www.muni.org/transportation-planning/amats-meetings)*

Policy Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Sean Holland	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Kent Kohlhasse	Municipal Manager, Mayor's Office
Jason Olds	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Daniel Volland	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Meg Zaletel	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Jon Cecil	AMATS
Chelsea Ward-Waller	AMATS
Mook Puttong	AMATS
Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Sarah Riopelle	DOT&PF
Luke Bowland*	DOT&PF
Ben White*	DOT&PF
Wolfgang Junge	
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Brandon Telford	MOA/Project Management & Engineering Dept. (PM&E)
Lindsey Hajduk	Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Adeyemi Alimi*	ADEC
John Linnell	DOT&PF
Anna Bosin	DOT&PF
Kelly Summers	DOT&PF
Patrick Swalling	DOT&PF
Nancy Pease	
Julie Jenkins	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Jamie Acton*	MOA/Public Transportation Dept. (PTD)
Bart Rudolph	PTD
Zakary Hartman	MOA/Traffic Engineering Dept.
Taylor Keegan*	MOA/Parks & Recreation Dept.
Russ Oswald	MOA/Project Management & Engineering Dept. (PM&E)
Joselyn Bilon	DOT&PF
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Mark Littlefield	

**AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Member*

***Designated Assembly Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

CHAIR HOLLAND called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Kent Kohlhase, Municipal Manager, represented Mayor Bronson. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy Committee. He explained staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve the agenda. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – March 21, 2024

MR. KOHLHASE moved to approve the minutes. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. ACTION ITEMS

**a. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2
Air Quality Conformity Demonstration**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the 2023-2026 Air Quality Conformity Demonstration was developed for Amendment #2 as an AMATS requirement. An Interagency consultation meeting was held on October 25, 2023, and the demonstration was released for a 45-day public comment period along with the Amendment #2 TIP tables from January 29 through March 15, 2024. AMATS did not receive any comments on the demonstration. The Air Quality Conformity Demonstration approval is required prior to the final approval of TIP Amendment #2.

There were no comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

b. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2

CHAIR HOLLAND asked Mr. Jongenelen to explain during his presentation the following three topics:

1. Despite the fact that all NHS (National Highway System) projects are being removed from the TIP, they will return with the next STIP amendment because those documents have to align. He would like to have the changes and their process explained because the process will delay several good projects.
2. The majority of the comments received were from Eagle River Hiland, which is being removed from the TIP. DOT&PF will have a design start for the Artillery Interchange in the near future, which will have to fit into the process. Is there a reason or a theme why Eagle River projects do not score well with AMATS scoring criteria? Is it something in the scoring criteria, or is it that not many projects are nominated?
3. Explain what an Illustrative project is and how a project might benefit from that rather than being totally removed from the TIP.

MR. JONGENELEN noted that an amendment to the AMATS 2023-2026 TIP is needed to update Table 2: Roadway, Table 3: Non-motorized, Table 4: Plans and Studies, Table 5: Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, Table 7: HSIP, Table 8: NHS, Table 9: Transit, and Table 10: Other Federal, State, and Local Funded projects within the AMATS area. These changes meet the requirements outlined in the AMATS Operating Agreement, Section 6.6.1., and Policies and Procedures #5. TIP Amendment #2 was released for a 45-day public comment period that also included an Anchorage Assembly public hearing. Fifty comments were received from the public, and the comment response summary includes 33 edits from staff based on those public comments and project status updates. The overall change was to remove all Illustrative projects from the TIP tables and put them in Appendix C to the TIP narrative. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) did recommend approving Amendment #2, with a change to strike the multi-use pathway from Tudor Road to Northern Lights Boulevard and move it to Illustrative.

He explained that when a project is moved from the TIP into Illustrative, it essentially moves it from the TIP tables. AMATS uses these TIP tables as our fiscal analysis to determine what projects will be done in the next four years and what funding is going to those projects. Illustrative projects have no funding and are not part of the TIP tables. This was causing some confusion because people thought that any project in the TIP should be moving forward, even though it is Illustrative. AMATS uses Illustrative projects as a way to show projects that have an immediate need but do not have sufficient funding or staff time to implement the project. Putting a project on the Illustrative list basically says that these are the Policy Committee's next priorities for projects that should be considered if future funding or staff time becomes available. During our certification review, AMATS was informed they had to do a better job defining what is and what is not in our fiscal analysis, which is the reason for Illustrative projects being moved out of the TIP tables into the appendix.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL referred to CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) funding and asked Ms. Acton, by adding the considerable amount of money to the Bus Stop Facility Improvements and to Capital Vehicles, if she was able to do anything with regard to snow with the money that is in Capital Vehicles by adding a plow to a truck or additional equipment for any of those facility improvements. There have been a considerable number of snow-related access issues with regard to bus stops.

MS. ACTON explained that, as it relates to the funding in Table 5, these are dedicated to those actual activities. The plan with Capital Vehicles is for fleet replacement of the 40-foot buses, bringing the total to at least 50% turnover, bringing our useful life down. As it relates to Bus Stop and Facility Improvements, we are looking at how to achieve better shelters, and the Assembly passed a procurement last week for a new shelter purchase. Our amenity guidelines have been recently updated to identify where shelters would be placed and the level of amenities that would go there. Those funds will help support those activities. She referred to Table 9, noting that the money in Table 5 will allow us to free up money in Table 9, which identifies snow removal equipment. There are additional items to be dealt with because our site enhancement team does not have in their position descriptions operating specialized snow removal equipment, so that will be something to address with Human Resources since they currently use snow blowers and hand digs. The snow accumulated outside of the bus pad is work that will have to be addressed with either the state, the unions, etcetera, but they are all consideration items. The funding does allow us to free up additional activities in other tables.

MR. JONGENELEN further explained that, with regard to Chugiak-Eagle River projects and the reason they fall lower in the scoring process, during this TIP cycle, AMATS updated the TIP criteria, which focuses on equity, environmental justice (EJ), and immediate safety concerns identified in VisionZero or the recently approved AMATS Safety Plan. Eagle River does not have the same density of EJ populations. Additionally, the focus was to look at the *2040 Land Use Plan* and to focus projects in areas where density is anticipated to occur. AMATS did try to account for the land use plan that Chugiak-Eagle River has, but that has not been updated for a while. The criteria are just one tool that can be used for project selection, and everything goes to the Policy Committee (PC) for final determination. If projects do not score high enough, it is always within the purview of the PC to place those projects into the TIP regardless of how they score. A good example is Mountain Air Drive; at the time, it was one of the lower-scoring projects, but the PC felt that because of the emergency access needs that project could help address, it should be moved forward quicker.

CHAIR HOLLAND clarified that the selection criteria are set for this 2023-2026 TIP and will be revisited in 2027.

MR. JONGENELEN replied that is correct, and if there is the desire, we have the opportunity and are planning to revisit the criteria. We will be recommending a change in the TIP process because we have always done a Call for Nominations before a TIP is constructed, and it has caused some confusion for the public because we also do nominations for the MTP, the TIP, and projects get nominated for the TIP that are not in the MTP. Moving forward, we recommend pulling projects from the approved MTP and

using those to build our future TIPs because we would be in alignment. We are trying to envision what the criteria would look like regarding that since we have pretty robust criteria for the 2050 MTP.

MS. ACTON added that the site enhancement crew managing the bus stops consists of a team of four but is currently down to one, making it very challenging.

In response to Assembly Member Zaletel's question when additional money is received in Table 5 with an MOA match, if the Transportation Department has the additional match to meet the increased funding, MS. ACTON stated that they do.

CHAIR HOLLAND asked what the consequences would be if this were not approved today. Is there any benefit in waiting until this can be in sync with the STIP because there are other projects being delayed that are critical?

MR. JONGENELEN noted that there are two important corrective actions included in TIP Amendment #2 related to the TIP that were part of the AMATS certification review done in 2023. The first is to show a match for our projects, and the second is that we cannot have projects in our TIP that do not have funding within the four years of the fiscal constraint. In order for these to be addressed, this TIP amendment is moving forward. After the PC approves the TIP, it must be incorporated into the STIP, which is done via an amendment. That cannot happen at this point because of the Tier II corrective actions DOT&PF has to address, and part of those corrections are AMATS' certification corrective actions. Delaying approval of this amendment means we cannot address the Tier II corrections, which will delay everything, including the STIP process. AMATS' TIP amendment process takes four months, with an additional two months for DOT&PF approval, then FHWA approval. FHWA has notified us that AMATS needs to work with DOT&PF to shorten this process.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL pointed out that the Academy Drive/Vanguard Drive project was moved from FY26 Right of Way to funding beyond FY26, noting that it was already misaligned with a highway project. Would this put it further out of alignment, or is the intent to get them aligned if the highway project comes back?

MR. BOWLAND explained that the intent of rescoping the O'Malley to Dimond project is to align it with Academy/Vanguard.

CHAIR HOLLAND opened the floor to public comments.

JAMES STARZEC
MARK LITTLEFIELD

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve the TIP amendment.

MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend to add the following three recommendations presented by the AMATS Coordinator:

1. Change the title of the “AMATS Interim 2050 MTP Update” to “AMATS 2052 MTP Update.” The word “Interim” is a specific federal designation for the MTP when an MPO is unable to get their Air Quality Conformity Determination in time.
2. Update the Sitka Pathway Non-motorized Pavement Preservation project in Table 6 to include the following termini: Orca Street to Lake Otis Parkway.
3. Add to page 12 under Section 2.7.4. the following explanation:
 - ***Illustrative*** is a way to show projects that have an immediate need, but there is not sufficient funding or staff time available to implement the project. Putting a project on the Illustrative list indicates that it is a project that should be considered first when funding or staff time becomes available. Moving a project in the current TIP tables to Illustrative removes it from the TIP and can only be added back again as part of an amendment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

1st Amendment

Hearing no objections, the first amendment passed.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to remove from the TIP in Table 7, Highway Safety Improvement Program, Project HSP0014: 5th Avenue Concrete Street to Karluk Street Pedestrian Improvements. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND explained that it is helpful to have descriptions added to the HSIP projects because pedestrian improvements sounded like a good thing, but from the description, this project does not appear to be an improvement for pedestrians. The project description reads, “Install a pedestrian medium barrier between Concrete Street and the couplet of 5th and 6th Avenues.” A lot of discussion has taken place on a recently added pedestrian barrier on Minnesota without a robust public process and feedback (colloquially referred to as the Minnesota cheese grater). He thought the local policymakers had been clear when it came to safety interventions to make them safer for all users (motorized or non-motorized). However, we also want to support active transportation and have these interventions so that people can get where they are going with whatever their chosen method of travel is. There has been a lot of public pushback with two resolutions from community councils on the Minnesota pedestrian barrier wall, so he did not want to repeat a project similar in nature. He would be happy to do away with that project and revisit the corridor to see what could be a meaningful intervention that actually supports active transportation users.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that the funding looks to be set for FY2025. Does that mean nothing is going to happen until FY2025, or is there a lead-up because there is no money in 2023 or 2024?

MR. JONGENELEN explained that it currently has design funding, so they can still continue with the design efforts. If it is removed from the TIP, they would not be able to move into another phase. It looks as if they have utilities construction listed here, meaning they could not move to utilities construction until this project is added back into the TIP through another amendment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked where it is in the design and of any outreach on the design with the community, having a conversation about what it is intended to look like. Is there still time and availability to get feedback on the intervention?

CHAIR HOLLAND noted that the HSIP is a data-driven program and projects are selected based on measured needs. There is definitely a crash problem in this area that DOT&PF is focusing on. It is in design, but there is still time to make adjustments. This will be the subject of a joint work session between the committees, with a higher level of public participation than what is typically done for HSIP projects. He felt the project should be kept where it is in the TIP, and he is committed to DOT&PF having a higher level of public participation, resulting in a solution that will work better for everyone participating in that work session.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked when is that supposed to come to a conclusion with having a preferred alternative wanting to move to construction, so that we would know when that money in utility construction was going to begin being spent. If it remains in the TIP.

CHAIR HOLLAND replied that if the selection is made at the conclusion of the NEPA (National Environment Protection Act) document, which is a categorical exclusion. DOT&PF has the ability to change the details right up to advertising for construction.

MR. BOWLAND added that there is time to discuss the need for it. DOT&PF will be going out for an RFP (Request for Proposal) in order to conduct a robust public involvement process. We are running into some unique design constraints, similar to the situation that led to the Minnesota cheese grater. This area does have a good amount of crash data, and portions of this area approach into Merrill Field, which compounds the problems. He would like to continue through the design and evaluate how improvements can be made in this area.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND does not intend to support the project moving forward with its current project description, which he feels predetermines an outcome. It says you will be throwing up a wall. Simply saying something is data-driven, so therefore a wall is going to be thrown up that does not allow pedestrians to cross and have the accessibility they need, is diametrically opposed to what policymakers in Anchorage have put on record that they want to support active transportation users. Pedestrians choose to cross where they feel it is safe and convenient for them. It is not just about design, aesthetics, and how it looks and feels; it is about the functionality of non-motorized users being able to get to their destination in a way that is safe and convenient for them. Interventions that do not support those users, he thinks, are not worth our investment via the AMATS process. Going back to Minnesota, not only did the wall get put up so that people cannot cross, but you have to go so far in between crosswalks to cross Minnesota. It divides the neighborhood. This is all within the context of everything we are looking at when it comes to reconnecting parts of our community that were divided by highways. We are saying that not only are we going to allow parts of our community to continue to be divided by highways, but we are also going to make it even more punitive and more hostile to vulnerable road users. To him, that is unacceptable. If this project language were paired with some type of description or language that says, "We are going to put in more crosswalks, an overpass, or an underpass

and do something to support active transportation users,” then he could get behind going through the design process. As the language is proposed now, we should not move forward.

CHAIR HOLLAND expressed that, according to data, the conditions where most pedestrian fatalities occur are at mid-block crossings, not at controlled intersections. The wall addresses that issue. He agreed that, in this case, it is a half-mile between crosswalks, so there may be other solutions to look at. He does not intend to support the amendment because it should be kept in the TIP, and if they decide to change the scope at a later date, that would be the appropriate time to modify the TIP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked if the description could be edited before adopting it. If the description were altered, would it have to go back out for public comment or would it depend on what was proposed?

MR. JONGENELEN replied that the description can be edited prior to approval. To require an additional public comment period, it has to be an unforeseen, significant change to the program. Changing the description in line with the discussion being had as part of the public process.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL preferred to change the description rather than remove it to achieve what Assembly Member Volland is attempting, knowing there is still the opportunity to remove the construction dollars if that design comes back and does what is suggested here and is contrary to municipal policy regarding pedestrian access.

MR. KOHLHASE noted that while looking at Google Earth regarding the distinction between the location of the notorious cheese grater and this location, it is hard to tell from the project description what is exactly intended. There are pedestrian crosswalks crossing the 5th and 6th couplet on both sides of Concrete Street. At Minnesota and West Northern Lights, he did not believe there was a pedestrian crosswalk on the south side of Northern Lights crossing Minnesota. There is a distinction between the existing pedestrian pathways that are recognized by crosswalks at Concrete and Minnesota. We are not arguing in favor of or against the solution that was put there. He thinks the situations are different.

2nd Amendment

Hearing objections, CHAIR HOLLAND called for a roll call vote.

YAY

Assembly Member Volland

NAY

Assembly Member Zaletel

Mr. Kohlhase

Mr. Olds

Chair Holland

The second amendment failed with 1 vote in favor and 4 votes against.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend HSP0014 to have the description read, “Develop and construct a pedestrian safety intervention between Concrete Street and the couplet of 5th and 6th Avenues” and the rest of the language would remain the same.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL thinks that language is flexible enough to center the pedestrian road user in the conversation, instead of saying it is going to be a barrier. She is open to a better word than intervention, but the idea is that we should be able to put all the options on the table and understand how utilization works in that area. Pedestrians do like to take the most convenient and direct route, but how to do so safely. It gives the opportunity through the design process to balance those two significant interests versus just starting with an element of stopping pedestrians from doing this.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND will cautiously support the amendment. He did not have a lot of faith that, even with the description change, a safety intervention does enough to bolster the fact that it needs to be supportive of non-motorized users. This approach to being okay means that we want to prevent crossings by throwing up walls; maybe we should wall off the entirety between the sidewalk and the street at Northern Lights and Benson in Midtown. Would that be functional? Should we just put everyone in a tunnel so they can only cross at intersections? He is not a fan of throwing up walls and barring pedestrians without giving them an easier and safer means to cross. This language is better than nothing.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that if there is better language that captures the discussion here, she is open to that language. The intention here is to put all options on the table to support what Assembly Member Volland is saying in terms of what our municipal policy is for pedestrians while taking into account safety considerations. If this passes, she encourages the design team to think and engage the community, particularly the users of this space, in that conversation because that is where we have had issues. With regard to Minnesota, there was not significant community engagement at the time. She understood there were some changes in staffing at DOT&PF, and it was very different from what she had previously encountered with the HSIP process. She had a close working relationship with a deeply engaged prior coordinator who would be at her community councils discussing what the possible interventions could be. She felt they came from a project that went without the right engagement, so here is another opportunity to reset that, and she hoped that would happen.

MR. KOHLHASE intends to support the amendment. It is well-phrased, and DOT&PF staff stated today that they will take a broader look at the measures they would implement as part of this project.

MR. JONGENELEN added that he had been working with DOT&PF and Anna Bosin, the new Traffic Safety Engineer, to talk about HSIP projects and how AMATS can be more involved. There will also be an opportunity for the committees to be involved. AMATS is looking to schedule a work session with the PC, TAC, and subcommittees to discuss HSIP projects. The description given today can help with that conversation, and the idea is to try and have that meeting soon, especially since there is a desire to move quickly on this before things get too far down the road with the project description.

3rd Amendment

Hearing no objections, the third amendment passed.

Main Motion, As Amended

Hearing no objections, the main motion, as amended, passed.

c. AMATS Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Comments on the Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Planning & Environmental Linkages (PEL).

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the AMATS CAC held a special meeting on March 11, 2024, to discuss comments on the Seward Highway to Glenn Highway PEL, voted, and approved having the comments provided to the project team. The TAC reviewed and recommended the comments be released to the project team with the clarification that the comments are coming from the CAC, not the Policy Committee.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND was curious as to why comments from other AMATS committees were funneled through the TAC before coming to the PC. His understanding is that all the committees are advisory to the PC. He thought that if there was a difference of opinion or facts on the ground, it was up to the PC to sort those things out, not up to the TAC. They could provide their findings or comments to the PC, just like any other committee could. Why was the work of one committee brought to another committee for some sort of sign-off or input before coming to the PC?

MR. JONGENELEN explained that, as part of AMATS' Public Participation Plan, all subcommittees and staff go through the TAC, and it is the role of the TAC to review and provide their technical perspectives and recommendations before going to the PC for final approval. This was a decision made years ago by the PC that everything is to be funneled through the TAC, and if there is a desire to change that process, it is up to the will of the PC.

CHAIR HOLLAND clarified that the TAC did not modify any of the comments, but there would have been track changes made in order to see any modifications.

MR. JONGENELEN further explained that regardless of what the TAC recommends, everything comes before the PC for final approval. If the TAC does not want these comments to go forward, staff would still forward the comments to the PC and include the comments made by the TAC.

There were no public comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve to release the comments from the Community Advisory Committee. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

d. AMATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Comments on the Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Planning & Environmental Linkages (PEL)

MS. WARD-WALLER noted that BPAC committee met on February 27, 2024, with the Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection PEL Study project team and voted on March 11, 2024, to approve having their comments provided. Their overarching support was for the 2050 MTP Alternative as best supporting the project purpose and need, especially balancing livability, community, and connectivity with mobility needs, but they would like more information provided about mapping, scoring, and how the various projects on that list fit together. They would also encourage considering public transit as a way to get people through the area without reducing car traffic and use the railroad for free, and they would like to see more information about the bicycle and pedestrian studies incorporated into the alternatives that were developed. BPAC does support the regional trail agreement and turning Gambell Street back into more of a community-focused street with local needs. The TAC recommended releasing the comments to the project team.

There were no comments.

MR. KOHLHASE moved to release and forward the comments from BPAC to the project team. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

e. Alaska Railroad 2024 Transit Asset Management (TAM) Performance Targets

MR. JONGENELEN noted that, as required by the Transit Asset Management Final Rule and Regulation, 49 CFR, Part 625, the following performance management requirements outlined in 49 CFR 625, Subpart D, are a minimum standard for operators that provide public transportation services and receive funds under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53:

- a) Rolling stock: the performance measure for this is the percentage of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB).
- b) Equipment: non-revenue service vehicles. The performance measure for nonrevenue, support-service, and maintenance vehicle equipment is the percentage of those vehicles that have either met or exceeded their ULB.
- c) Facilities: the performance measure for this is the percentage of facilities within an asset class that are rated below Condition 3 on the TERM scale.
- d) Infrastructure: rail fixed-guideway, track, signals, and systems. The performance measure for these is the percentage of track segments with performance restrictions.

He added that as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), AMATS is required to adopt targets for the Transit Asset Management Final Rule.

There were no comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to approve. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

f. AMATS Letter of Support for DOT&PF Prioritization Process Pilot Program (PPPP) Grant Application

MR. JONGENELEN noted that DOT&PF staff recently made AMATS staff aware of the fact that DOT&PF is planning on submitting an application for the Prioritization Process Pilot Program (PPPP) to develop a more transparent STIP scoring and ranking process. The PPPP Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) was released February 22, 2024, with an application due date of May 1, 2024. DOT&PF Planning staff met with AMATS staff on April 2, 2024, to coordinate this letter of support, discuss what this grant will be used for, and resolve any concerns.

In response to Chair Holland's question as to how much money was requested in the grant application, MR. STARZEC believed the maximum amount available per application is \$2 million and the total dollar amount available for this round is \$60 million.

There were no public comments.

MR. KOHLHASE moved to approve the Letter of Support. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. Q1 Obligation Report

MR. JONGENELEN presented the obligation report.

There were no comments.

b. Q1 Project Status Report

MR. JONGENELEN presented the status report.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked with regard to the Academy/Vanguard area improvements if this takes into account the amendments we just passed or if it needs to be updated. Does it already have a stale shelf life? She would like to share this report with community councils that are tracking projects and suggested adding the date under the first quarter title because councils are probably not tracking the first quarter of the federal fiscal year, even though the report does note FFY2024.

MR. STARZEC explained that this report is reflective of the status of the projects at the end of the first quarter, which would have been December 31, 2023, so as of December 31, this is the project status. We are currently developing the second quarter, which will be as of March 31, 2024. This is not a legal document and can be edited with the best available information. He will also add the date and the suggestions made by the TAC to add non-AMATS-funded projects, such as DOT&PF and HSIP projects, to achieve a more comprehensive report.

There were no public comments.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. ACTON announced that the Public Transportation Department has an open house from April 3 to May 3, 2024, for the Downtown Transit Center Site Selection Study to gather as much feedback as possible.

MR. JONGENELEN informed the committee that Ms. Ward-Waller has accepted a position with PM&E and will be leaving AMATS in two weeks, but she will continue to work closely with AMATS. He expressed sincere appreciation for her challenging the normal concepts of transportation and for pushing AMATS to try more things.

10. ADJOURNMENT

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to adjourn. MR. KOHLHASE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 2:23 p.m.