

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Planning & Development Center
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor
4700 Elmore Road**

**May 2, 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)*

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Brad Coy (Chair)	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Brian Lindamood	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Ben White	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Anchorage Field Office
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning Department
Steve Ribuffo	MOA/Port of Alaska
Russ Oswald	MOA/Project Management & Engineering Department (PM&E)
Taylor Keegan	MOA/Parks & Recreation Department
Bart Rudolph	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Matt Stichick	MOA/Health Department

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Jon Cecil	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Mook Puttong	AMATS
Chelsea Ward-Waller	AMATS
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Colin Singleton	CRW Engineering
Chuck Homan	AMATS Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
Zakary Hartman	MOA/Traffic Engineering Dept.
Anna Bosin	DOT&PF
William Still	
John McLeary	
Evan Sharp	
Cathy Gleason	Turnagain Community Council President
Mary Dean	
Noah King	DOT&PF
Lindsey Hajduk	Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Stephen Stone	
Nancy Pease	AMATS CAC
Patrick Swalling	DOT&PF

Roxanne Risse DOT&PF
Katherine Keith DOT&PF Deputy Commissioner
Sarah Riopelle DOT&PF

**Policy Committee Member*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Bart Rudolph represented the MOA Public Transportation Department on behalf of Jamie Acton. Russ Oswald represented the MOA Project Management & Engineering Department on behalf of Melinda Kohlhaas. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory 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

MR. LYON moved to approve the agenda. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – April 4, 2024

MR. ALIMI moved to approve the minutes. MR. LINDMOOD seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Narrative Update

MR. JONGENELEN noted that an update of the 2023-2026 TIP Narrative is needed to help address Corrective Action #1 from the 2023 TMA (Transportation Management Area) Certification Review.

23 CFR 450.326(c) and (d) Development and Content of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP):

The TIP must include a description of the effect of the projects on achieving the federal performance targets. This includes analysis and clarification of how the TPM (Transportation Performance Management) was administered through project selection and/or prioritization and how projects in the TIP will support the TPM targets. The TIP must include a description that demonstrates how projects contribute toward achieving the selected performance targets identified in the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) and link investment priorities to those performance targets.

The updated narrative includes the following:

1. AMATS performance measures as adopted in the 2050 MTP, Table 2.1.
2. Section 2.6.1: A description of the TIP criteria categories and what performance measures are associated with those categories or criteria.
3. Table 2.2 lists all projects in the 2023-2026 TIP and which performance measures or targets they help to achieve.

There were no comments.

MR. LYON moved to recommend the TIP Narrative to the Policy Committee for approval.

MR. ALIMI seconded.

MR. LYON referred to page 3, Narrative 2.1 Purpose, that speaks to the membership of the TAC but does not reflect that AMATS no longer has an MOA Energy and Sustainability manager. He suggested changing that to the Parks & Recreation manager. He also pointed out in the graph that it should reflect the Community Advisory Committee, not the Citizens Advisory Committee.

MR. LYON moved to amend to reflect the change on page 3 by adding the Parks & Recreation representative. MR. ALIMI seconded.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

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

b. AMATS Public Participation Plan (PPP) Update

MR. JONGENELEN noted that an update of the PPP is needed to help address Corrective Action #2 from the 2023 TMA (Transportation Management Area) Certification Review.

23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vi): Interested parties, participation, and consultation:

The PPP must include information about the disposition of public comments and how or where the public can gain access to the disposition of public comments as part of the final MTP and TIP documents.

The updated PPP includes the following language shown on pages 39 and 40:

1. MTP: “The MTP public comment periods include a comment response summary where all comments received are provided a response.”
2. TIP: “The TIP public comment periods include a comment response summary in which all comments received are provided a response.”

MR. LYON clarified that this is a quick fix addressing Corrective Action #2 and a more extensive update will begin soon.

In response to Chair Coy’s question as to when the PPP update will come before the TAC, MR. JONGENELEN replied that it will be within the next year.

There were no public comments.

MR. LYON moved to recommend this update to the PPP to the Policy Committee. MR. WHITE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

c. 2024-001 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Resolution on People Mover Bus Route R

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the AMATS CAC held a special meeting on February 27, 2024, to discuss People Mover Route R, as outlined in the 2020 Transit on the Move Plan shown on page 69. The committee listed the needs for Route R in the Chugiak/Eagle River area in Resolution 2024-001 and forwarded it to the TAC for review and recommendation to the Policy Committee.

CHUCK HOMAN provided a brief summary on behalf of the CAC.

The following were committee comments and questions with responses noted in *Italic*.

(AJ) At this time, AMATS staff does not recommend this course of action based on the priorities that have been identified through the Transit on the Move plan. The 2050 MTP update was just completed and is completely programmed for the TIP. Other projects that have already received priority funding would have to be cut. He can compile a package of available options for the Policy Committee to review what is being asked, especially any impacts.

(CL) He shared both Mr. Rudolph and Mr. Jongenelen’s concerns that the Transit on the Move and the MTP documents have gone through an extensive public process. During that process, this did not come close to the top of the list of projects, being at number 16, which is fairly low. As Mr. Rudolph stated, this is not mentioned as a priority in the MTP that just passed, so he could not support it.

(SR) Is there some sort of a trial program that this might fit into?

(A·J) *That is part of what AMATS typically does with CMAQ funding by being able to provide three years' worth of funding over five years' worth of usage, so it is basically a pilot or trial to get it started. The municipality would become involved and continue to fund it after that time period. In order to do that, we would have to have available CMAQ money, but at this time, we are fully programmed out through 2026. It could be looked at for the next TIP update, but again, it is not in the MTP, and it is not the next priority from the Public Transportation Department.*

(BR) *You cannot just do a pilot per se; like the bike pilot project with cones, etcetera. Every bus stop has to be ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant, so you would have to build these bus stops all along this route. Even though they may have previously had bus stops, chances are they are not ADA compliant because they were built in the 1980s. We estimate the cost to be approximately \$5 million just for the infrastructure and additional buses. You would invest \$5 million into this pilot, then have to pay for the operation costs, so it is not that simple. Usually, with a new route, we add it with the intention that it will stick around for a while due to it being a large investment. The \$3.2 million figure is the annual operating cost for operating every half-hour, and the \$1.7 million figure is to operate every hour. There is an additional capital cost of almost \$5 million (shown on page 47). There is also an additional cost to our paratransit, which is AnchorRides. Because this area is not currently served by paratransit, once we establish a route there, we are federally mandated to provide that service, so that is an additional \$350,000 per year to operate as well. The Public Transportation Department currently has a bus operator shortage, and we are looking at a service reduction next year, so even if someone were to give us \$20 million for a new route, there is no way we could implement any new service in the next one to two years.*

(MS) *Is there a way to combine the RideShare service to collect people for the planned Eagle River route that would allow for a test to determine whether there is enough interest in a route through this area?*

(BR) *We do allow RideShare to operate in Eagle River, but it is just for commuters that live and work in the same area. This route is mainly just staying inside Eagle River and Chugiak. However, we do recommend a microtransit zone in Eagle River, which would be a better test or pilot project to fund in the future. The document on page 80 shows that microtransit is basically like an Uber or Lyft but done with a 20-foot bus that can hold up to 13 people. We have this idea of creating a zone in Eagle River just to bring people within Eagle River and drop them off at the Transit Center, which is already an issue for people to get there. The idea with this is that you do not have to build bus stops and could contract out the labor. The downside is that it is all application-based, so you do weed out the population that does not have access to a phone. There are pros and cons of having this looked into within the next 2 to 5 years.*

(MS) *He would recommend to the CAC that they revisit other ways of achieving this same goal with a microtransit option, since it sounds like this resolution, as proposed, is not feasible.*

(BR) The same would apply in that it still goes against the MTP, and if you want to fund it with CMAQ dollars, you still would have to amend the MTP and take a project out of the CMAQ table.

(CL) The CMAQ is fiscally constrained.

(MS) There should be grant funds available for this type of study, so maybe we could table it to allow the CAC to research this.

(BL) The problem with grant funds besides the resources it takes to write the grant is that, typically on the operating side, the match is relatively high, by 40 to 50% in some cases. You are still dealing with the fiscal constraint issue.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

MARY DEAN

MR. RULDOLPH expressed that he is not opposed to the route itself because it is in our plan, just opposed to the fact that it contradicts the current AMATS plan.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that it could be fixed with an amendment to the MTP and would have to be part of the recommendation provided to the Policy Committee.

MR. RUDOLPH suggested sending this back to the CAC to make a recommendation of what they would want to take out of the MTP and how they would amend the MTP and the CMAQ to fund this project and bring it back to the TAC. Otherwise, their recommendation really should go straight to the Assembly and ask for their funding.

MR. RUDOLPH moved to refer this back to the CAC for them to recommend how to incorporate this into the MTP and TIP while recognizing it is fiscally constrained. MR. LYON seconded.

MR. RUDOLPH offered to attend the CAC meeting to help them work on this.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that this is a recommendation to the Policy Committee to refer it back to the CAC. Since we have not received any comments from the CAC on what should be removed, AMATS staff will not be able to put that in a memorandum to the Policy Committee. We would just say that this is what needs to be done.

MR. STICHICK suggested proposing options beyond just swapping out an MTP project, such as microtransit.

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes we could, but the problem is how it is funded. Whoever is going to fund it is what is holding everything up. Regardless, if it is a microtransit or an actual route, it would still require funding. In order for it to come from AMATS, we would have to use CMAQ, which means something that is currently programmed would have to be taken out. Or it could go to the Assembly, asking them to put money towards it to get it started.

MR. STICHICK asked if it could be established as a vanpool. Is there such a thing as an ADA compliant van that could run that route?

MR. RUDOLPH explained that it could not because it would still operate as a deviated fixed route and would still need a bus stop and an ADA-compliant vehicle. The MTP is just one option, and since this is an AMATS committee, AMATS would recommend this project and should fund it with our pot of money, or AMATS could say this is a good idea but use other money resources to fund it.

MR. STICHICK recommended including exploring microtransit with outside funding sources as an option.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

d. 2024-002 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Resolution on Minnesota Drive Wall

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the AMATS CAC held a special meeting on March 12, 2024, to discuss the Minnesota Wall. Their findings are documented in Resolution 2024-002 and have been forwarded to the TAC for review and recommendation to the Policy Committee.

NANCY PEASE provided a brief summary on behalf of the CAC.

The committee discussed crossing approaches, community council comments, and what the Anchorage Assembly would possibly be requesting of DOT&PF in terms of a near-term solution

MR. LYON referred to Line 39 of the resolution that reads, “Address SCC and TCC concerns that the median fence/wall has made non-motorized crossing less safe”, and asked if that study has been or is being done to address those concerns. For him, the crossing is now a lot less stressful because of the fence barring pedestrians from cutting back and forth.

MR. BOWLAND reiterated that the goal of DOT&PF is to improve safety in this area. The fence is trying to prevent mid-block crossings where people are driving at a higher speed creating a higher potential for accidents there. Moving forward, we will be looking at traffic and crash data in order to make any necessary adjustments, but unfortunately, there is a lag with the data.

CHAIR COY expressed the importance of having information that is data-driven, not opinion-based.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

ANNA BOSIN, DOT&PF

LINDSEY HAJDUK, BPAC

CATHY GLEASON, Turnagain Community Council President

MR. JONGENELEN explained that this resolution would be handled slightly differently because it is actually asking AMATS to forward this to the Policy Committee, asking them to look at the four requests made by the CAC. With regard to Number 2, he is cautious about forwarding this to the PC because he has no data supporting it one way or another. The other three requests we could include the discussion that took place amongst us, such as what projects are moving forward to help address some of the CAC's concerns.

MR. LYON has a challenge with the language that reads, "The current median wall/fence does not resolve the community need for safe and convenient non-motorized crossing... and is not a model for safe and balanced roadway access or great public streets." There is no data supporting this, and he did not know if that information was true and could not support it as written. Maybe it could be amended, but he did not want to amend a CAC document.

CHAIR COY suggested the TAC make its own recommendation supporting DOT&PF's study and evaluation of the wall and any future improvements. He referred to Line 37, asking if there is an opportunity for a project in 2024 to happen that quickly that they can engage in. The two projects mentioned were the sidewalk and a corridor study.

MR. BOWLAND noted that the project is wrapping up at this point and closing down. DOT&PF is limited by what they can do under that contract and there would also be discussions with FHWA about eligibility and clear direction on exactly what is being requested.

MR. OSWALD asked if we could just leave it at requesting AMATS to call upon DOT&PF to help implement adopted safety plans and goals. This is May 2024, and realistically, he did not think anything would happen as far as construction on the ground in 2024. That is pretty fast with regard to the construction and design time frame, including the public process as well.

MR. LYON had a suggestion for possible amendment language. As Ms. Hajduk noted in the Teams chat regarding Number 2, where it says, "Addresses those concerns they have that the median fence/wall has made non-motorized crossing less safe," he did not know whether or not it made it less safe, but those are the CAC's concerns. The request is that the powers that be address those concerns, and it does make sense to leave it as written because, again, those are their concerns. His suggestion would be for it to read, "The CAC has concerns that the current median wall/fence "may" not resolve the community need for safe and convenient non-motorized crossing of Minnesota Boulevard at Northern Lights and Benson Boulevards, and "may" not be a model for safe and balanced roadway access or great public streets." He would feel more comfortable with that because, again, he did not know if that was true, but it still lays out the request for a safety project.

MR. LINDAMOOD commented that, from his perspective, there is a pedestrian problem there. If people would use the pedestrian facilities provided, the fence would not be a problem. The fence is ugly, and that is also an issue. Some of the anecdotes about people walking down the road in the middle of the night in the snow happen everywhere, and the facilities with the snow, etcetera, did not help. There is an issue with pedestrians in that entire area that probably did not get solved by this. Pedestrians are good at ignoring what

they are supposed to do by doing the most expedient thing at the time, which is probably running back and forth. DOT&PF tried to solve this by preventing them from being able to cross, but it did not make the existing facilities any more attractive to use. If we are going to recommend anything, it would be to zoom out a little bit and look at the pedestrian issues on that entire block, and through that process, maybe find a better answer than the fence that everyone takes issue with. Everyone is focused on the fence, but the fence is a symptom, not the problem. The problem is the pedestrian traffic in that entire area. It clearly does not have what it needs for people to want to use it. We are not going to be able to come up with the right solution in this meeting; what needs to happen is that DOT&PF needs to reengage with the community, look at the area with their own traffic safety staff, and come up with a solution that would work for everyone. We can suggest taking down the fence/wall, but people are still going to get hit while running back and forth. The problem is tertiary at those intersections, people do not want to cross there for some reason. Maybe it is because to get from one side of the street to the other that pedestrians have to go all the way around through three different signal light crossings.

MR. JONGENELEN reminded the committee that the TAC is not editing the resolution from the CAC. It will go forward as is, since it has already been approved. If the committee does have recommended language changes, those would just come forward as a recommendation from the TAC.

MR. RIBUFFO commented that if the TAC does something that is considered a corrective action, then it enables bad behavior. It was mentioned earlier that both the intersections at Benson and Northern Lights have three crosswalks, when there could possibly be four crosswalks. That is close enough to where people would want to cross the street and would also be a low-cost solution.

MS. KEEGAN moved to encourage DOT&PF to coordinate with the community about the needs in this area and to update the TAC as needed. MR. LINDAMOOD seconded.

MR. LINDAMOOD offered a friendly amendment to take a more holistic look at what the problem is in the area and try to come up with a solution. The biggest problem is that people still want to cross mid-block. DOT&PF needs to zoom out, look at that entire area, and determine why pedestrians are not using them. Then come back with some solutions - not just have a yellow fence instead of a gray fence, a fence with bigger holes in it, or a bigger or shorter fence. The fence is not the problem.

MR. JONGENELEN restated that the friendly amendment is to take a more holistic look at the problem in the area and come back with some solutions.

MS. KEEGAN accepted the friendly amendment.

MR. BOWLAND added that the urgency of community engagement will lead to what can be done now, which will be an ongoing discussion.

MR. STICHICK asked for clarification that cooperation between the CAC and DOT&PF in reviewing the situation also proposed having a solution brought back to the TAC was part of the motion.

MR. JONGENELEN restated that the motion from the TAC reads, “Encourage DOT&PF to coordinate with the communities in this area, update the TAC as needed, take a more holistic look at the problems in the area, and come back with some solutions.”

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. Protected Bike Lane Pilot Project Presentation

COLIN SINGLETON with CRW Engineering, ZAKARY HARTMAN with the MOA Traffic Engineering Department, and ANNA BOSIN with DOT&PF provided a PowerPoint presentation.

MR. RIBUFFO asked if there was something more concise than this presentation that he could use to pass onto the Port users and trucking companies, making sure they are fully aware of a temporary lane closure on 6th Avenue.

MR. SINGLETON replied that they have already reached out to a number of trucking companies, specifically and more broadly, and are also putting together a drivers’ notice showing those planned lane closures and turn paths to the Alaska Trucking Association.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

WILLIAM STILL

b. Pavement Replacement Project Discussion

MR. JONGENELEN presented the project update and asked the committee for suggestions regarding what staff should be looking for as they move into the next TIP development cycle.

The following were comments and suggestions from the committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

(MS) He recommended that staff try to create a threshold or visibility when a project becomes sufficiently large and will influence that pot. For example, a \$5 million threshold or even lower. At that point, send it to the engineering department to propose a design for that segment to be rehabilitated and pull it out of the pavement replacement pot as a separate project. Try to give yourself some advance warning by setting a lower threshold at which it becomes designed as a separate project. If we are finding that so many projects are hitting that threshold late in the process, then maybe we need to lower the threshold and try to carve that out a little bit sooner.

(BL) He asked if the concern was about how expensive these projects are becoming or about the transparency with the public being able to see where their street is on the list.

- (A.J) *Both. It is a recognition that the cost is going up. Going forward, when developing the TIP cycles, they need to recognize that because there are thresholds currently in AMATS' Policy and Procedures for how much is going toward pavement replacement. Fewer projects are being done in a four-year time period due to the expense increase and because we are adding so much more to these projects to get them done.*
- (BC) With regard to the idea of safety audits, what safety enhancements are needed? For example, a lane that does not have a crossing, if that is something the project can do. Can we reallocate some of the roadway space? Does a pavement preservation project allow for safety improvements? To do a project to the extent possible and then have to repave without doing any of the known safety improvements feels like a lost opportunity and creates issues. It adds costs to the project, which might be the reason why it gets triggered and goes from being a quick, easy "shave and pave" to a more extensive project that catches us off guard.
- (BL) Would consider one being a pavement maintenance repair while the other is more of a rehabilitation or refresh along the corridor.
- (LB) That is the problem we are seeing right now. The pavement preservation pots are usually fast-moving projects where we are just repairing the surface. If you have a culvert that is failing, you do not want to come back a couple of years later and have to rip that up and patch it with brand new pavement, so you might as well do it right now. DOT&PF will be addressing safety concerns when in an area because we do not know when we will be back. That scope creep that starts adding on can drive up utility agreements and right-of-way needs. It is a challenge that Mr. Jongenelen is trying to deal with right now because there should be a place within our funding where we can take care of pavement needs as they pop up. Or these projects make great fillers if a big project slips and moves to the next year. There have to be some guidelines and some bumpers on how much we can add to a pavement preservation project because a corridor may not be revisited for another 10 or 20 years.
- (BL) There are two different things here. Those for which an assessment can be made that do not involve other issues other than the pavement. He sees that as one pot of money versus a road that was last touched 35 years ago and has had the asphalt replaced six times in those 35 years; the utilities are bad, the curb and gutters are bad, and this is more of a complete refresh. Is there a way to divide those two pots? The ones that are just straight "shave and pave" without any additional issues would go a lot faster.
- (LB) A lot of times they start a project with the idea that it is easy, and then we are presented with a ton of suggestions or when we do the detailed analysis, a lot of issues begin to surface. When does it stop being a pavement preservation project?
- (CL) We used to have one or two pavement replacement projects in the lifecycle of a TIP. Approximately 15 years ago, DOT&PF said they had \$70 million worth of back needs in pavement replacement only, so AMATS created a pot in the TIP just for pavement replacement. As mentioned, scope creep occurs, and what looked to be a \$2 million "shave and pave" is now a \$7 million project. Those

projects should come out and become their own projects, but we have outlived the usefulness of having a separate table for just pavement replacement because none of them seem to be just that anymore.

- (AJ) *It may be that we do away with the pot and just put in those pavement projects with their specific amount per year, so everyone can see them and treat them the same as everything else. It would make it easier for staff, the public, and committee members to follow along with what is happening and what is moving forward. What he is struggling with right now is that the process is not as transparent as it should be.*
- (BC) Do we have a sense of what roads are going to need pavement replacement soon? If we had projects that need to be designed with the recognition that they were our kind of go-to shovels that already incorporated safety into them, and moving from a lot earlier with that design element.
- (LB) Pavement replacement is always an ongoing discussion with the STIP funding we use for the PM work on our side. Again, the question is: when does it cross from pavement replacement into the larger project? What does that look like? Is that the discussion here at AMATS? Is it just scoring it, and is it done through a TIP amendment?
- (AJ) *That is kind of the direction he needs to go because if we were going to pull them out as individual projects, we would score and rank them like everything else. Do we have separate scoring and ranking for pavement-only projects? He would assume so because they are typically doing different things.*
- (BL) During discussion earlier, it sounds like Transit already has a list because the Eagle River project is number 16. If we have a list of all the pavement projects, they could probably be listed. You can run into the problem of having \$4 million, but some items might be buried further down on the list that are \$9 million. How you would jump that project forward is something we could handle.
- (AJ) *Table 6 already lists the pavement projects for motorized users and the pavement projects for active transportation users. We are finding that the active transportation user list is becoming a lot more expensive than typical projects that go into that pot. The question then is: how do we move forward with these projects?*
- (BL) If he looks at a lot of the facilities that were designed for active transportation, even 20 years ago, which are now coming due, versus what the expectation is for us to deliver today; they almost do not look the same.
- (AJ) *He is going to take what he heard today and put it in a memorandum to the Policy Committee for discussion only. He is not looking for any action, even though the PC could take action on this, but he is just seeking some guidance of what to be looking for and what to bring forward to the committees as we move into the next TIP update. We may need to move away from our typical pavement preservation pot of funding and have them be individually called-out projects. He would need to*

flush out what that would look like and what it would take for staff to be able to do. There is a benefit to having the pavement projects in a pot, but recognizing that we are moving in a new direction where these projects are no longer just a quick move on and we have a lot more needs to be addressed on a regular basis, we need to go forward with that.

- (BC) There are plans and studies in the works, such as the roadway management snow and ice study, which will look at where to put snow. One of the thoughts would be if we could narrow lanes, do we need to repave a 5-lane section when we could get away with a 3-lane section and turn the outer lane into snow storage cutting down on maintenance and pavement replacement? Having projects laid out so that things could be figured out ahead of time is viable.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None

Mr. Lyon and Mr. Oswald left the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

KATHERINE KEITH, DOT&PF Deputy Commissioner, provided an update on their Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). They met with FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) to discuss what they hoped to accomplish with their policies and procedures as they move forward with resolving the Tier II findings and getting their next STIP amendment out for public comment by June 1. She would be happy to provide that information during the process. DOT&PF is working hard to get AMATS' TIP amendment that has been approved by AMATS into FHWA. For awareness purposes, staff is in full STIP mode in order to make that possible.

MR. JONGENELEN informed the committee that due to AMATS being short-staffed, the subcommittees (CAC, BPAC, and FAC) will have to be put on hold for the near future, but a CAC meeting will still be scheduled when necessary to meet federal requirements.

MR. STICHICK referred to the discussion regarding the pot of money for pavement replacement, noting that with regard to the COVID-related PPP stimulus money, a significant amount of money was expiring all at once. It was convenient having that funding category in pavement replacement to drop that in temporarily until other projects could be spun up. He would not want to lose the pavement replacement category entirely, as it is useful to have a place where expiring money can quickly go.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.