

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

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

**December 16, 2021
1:30 PM**

Due to the expected absence of Chair Junge, Luke Bowland acted as Chair.

With Mr. Lyon's recent acceptance as MOA Planning Director, Mr. Jongenelen acted as AMATS Coordinator

Policy Committee Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Luke Bowland*	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Adam Trombley	Director, MOA Community Development
Emma Pokon	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Meg Zaletel	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning Department
Christine Schuette	MOA/Planning Department
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Jim Amundsen	DOT&PF
Kathryn Wenger	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Jamie Acton*	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Bart Rudolph	PTD
Laurie Cummings	HDR Alaska
Adam Moser	DOT&PF
Brad Coy*	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department

**AMATS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Member*

***Designated Assembly Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

ACTING CHAIR BOWLAND called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Adam Trombley, Community Development Director represented Mayor Bronson. Assembly Member Weddleton was excused. 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. As a result of the virtual meetings, the public has been asked to submit an email request providing their name, phone number, and agenda item to AMATS by 6:30 p.m. the day prior to the meeting but can also participate via Teams and provide testimony when the item is opened to the public for comments.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: October 28, 2021 and November 18, 2021

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

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. ACTION ITEMS

a. 2022-23 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2022 Budget

BACKGROUND:

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is required by federal law under Title 23, amended 23 USC 134 as interpreted by FHWA in 23 CFR 450.308, when federal funds are used for transportation planning. The Draft 2022-23 UPWP defines the transportation planning activities and products to be developed by AMATS and other transportation planning agencies during the fiscal year (January 1 – December 31). It is the basis for allocating federal, state, and local funds for short- and long-range transportation planning activities within the AMATS area. The 2022 UPWP budget outlines staff time that will be spent on the tasks identified in the UPWP narrative. The narrative is updated on a 2-year cycle and the budget is updated annually.

UPWP tasks are grouped into 'Work Elements' in the following categories:

- 100 Element: Plans and Programs*
- 200 Element: Subarea and Special Studies*
- 300 Element: Air Quality*
- 400 Element: Data and Modeling*
- 500 Element: Program Administration and Public Involvement*

- *600 Element: Public Transportation*

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the Committee on the above-noted UPWP explaining that the narrative was released for a 30-day public comment period and did not receive any comments. The budget is not required to be released for public comment period but does come before this Committee prior to forwarding it to FHWA and FTA for approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL noted that this looks to be a continuation budget and asked if this is a fair assessment.

MR. JONGENELEN replied, no, that the budget is a two-year program with an annual budget. This is a brand-new budget because we are starting a new two-year period. Many of the tasks are the same from year-to-year as they are requirements we must fulfill, however, there are some new tasks in this UPWP, most notably, the TDM (Transportation Demand Management) Study, the TSMO (Transportation System Management & Operation) Plan, and the Safety Plan.

MR. LYON added that the planning funds come from FHWA, but AMATS and FMATS (Fairbanks) receive allocations through the State of Alaska. The dollar figure changes slightly from year-to-year but is usually the same. We make the budget fit for what we need as opposed to figuring out what we are going to do and then figure the cost. After being informed as to how much we will receive, we then figure what the tasks are going to be and, should there be any extra funding, we will sometimes put that into very small contracts, such as the modeling support contract. It is kind of a continuation budget because it is very similar to last year, but it is \$60,000 - \$70,000 more than what we received last year, which is not much of an increase.

There were no public comments.

MR. JONGENELEN noted that he received an email from FHWA this morning about additional language we need to add to the UPWP regarding our match. Since the UPWP is federally funded, we do have a match requirement. AMATS meets that match with in-kind match support services provided by the MOA Traffic Engineering Department. We do list that in the budget itself in the "MOA Operating In-Kind Match" column. It is spelled out in the budget but is not as clear in the narrative about it being an in-kind match, so we were asked by FHWA to add a statement that discusses how the in-kind match is derived, where it comes from, how it is calculated, what type of work and when that work is occurring during the period of the UPWP; and that the MOA work is not being completed using other federal funds. These are many of the requirements we have to meet for in-kind match because when paying for something with federal funds, you cannot use that as a way to match these federal funds. He recommended adding another paragraph that meets the requirements requested by FHWA.

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

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL moved to amend to add the paragraph. MR. TROMBLEY seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed, as amended.

**b. 2023-2026 Proposed Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Criteria
 2023-2026 TIP Criteria Public Comments
 2023-2026 TIP Comment/Response Summary**

BACKGROUND:

The TIP criteria are periodically updated to reflect the current goals of the MPO, the Federal requirements, the State of Alaska goals, the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) goals, and the nationwide changes that happen regarding transportation. The 2021 TIP Criteria update incorporated where possible, the MOA 2040 Land Use Plan update, the AMATS Non-motorized Plan update, the AMATS Spenard Corridor Plan, the AMATS Complete Streets Policy, and the Anchorage Climate Action Plan. AMATS staff would like to request approval to proceed with incorporating the public comments for the proposed 2023-2026 TIP Criteria. The criteria were released for a 60-day public review and comment period from July 23 through September 20, 2021. Comments were categorized by criteria type consisting of the following:

Category	Comment Type	# Received
1	Safety	21
2	Mobility	29
3	Economic	26
4	Environment	28
5	Preservation	11
	General Comments	24
Total Comments Received		139

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Committee has viewed the criteria previously as staff has been working on it for approximately one year. He explained what the TIP criteria is, and the next steps involved, and that it had been released for a 60-day public comment period with 139 comments received. The Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the comments and recommended approval of all with the four suggested changes shown below.

Category 1 – Safety

PAGE 1

Comment #14 – Safe Routes to School:

MR. LYON explained that this comment is about designated safe school zones. AMATS made available during the same time period, a TIP Criteria Handbook to help the public understand the criteria. The TAC suggested adding language in that handbook relating to Safe Routes to School to help the public understand the acronyms and language used in transportation planning.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL pointed out that there are multiple comments about Safe Routes to School but just wanted to stress, as the Committee considers these criteria, how we can be integrating school transportation safety incidents and criteria. She understood it is covered under the safety category but there are considerable community concerns in multiple areas across town. It is really an important issue and took up a good portion of the

last joint Assembly and school board meeting as well, and they are looking for ways they can better partner and advocate to ensure student safety getting to school. There have been several incidents lately, so she just wanted to highlight that. The comments are relevant and important, but do not reflect the larger community conversation that continues to raise considerable safety concerns, particularly on Tudor Road and, she thinks, also on Rabbit Creek or Huffman area (these might be the same location). Is there any impetus by staff, or otherwise consider that input beyond just referencing that it is in the Safety category?

MR. LYON replied that the idea behind the criteria would be that people are doing the work right now to track where there are incidences or above average instances of crashes involving pedestrians, bicyclists, etcetera, which would include people walking to and from schools. We believe the criteria we have in place right now will capture incidences occurring in school zones. The reason for the discussion regarding that particular comment is that it referred to places where there were no designated school zones. The only places in Anchorage without designated school zones, where there is a school, is a school that is not a neighborhood school, such as Charter schools. There are no designated walking zones for these schools because the students come from all over the city. In terms of capturing any issues that might come up regarding students walking to school, those should already be captured by the crash data or anything similar to that that occurs around a school because the city and the state are already capturing that information. AMATS will use that information when ranking and scoring projects used in this "improves pedestrian safety category". That is the reason for recommending no changes from what we already have.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL hoped that gets evaluated in potential projects moving forward because the issue seems to be that, even where there is already a designated Safe Routes to School zone, there continue to be collisions and, sometimes, pedestrian fatalities.

MR. LYON reiterated that the criteria, as written, is going to capture that information. If there is an above average crash rate in an area near a school, it is going to trigger the highest points you can receive.

MR. JONGENELEN added that what we are trying to do with our criteria is to be more inclusive, so we did not leave out areas like the safety of the school zones around particular schools. If we only focus on the school safety areas, we are going to be missing some of those areas that need additional help. He agreed with Mr. Lyon that our criteria already helped us get to the point of addressing those areas that are both school zones and non-school zones and have areas of concern.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL expressed that relying on crash data is one way to do this, but it is not terribly proactive. She understood that often we cannot be as proactive as we would like to be, but she will continue to have conversations about how this intersects with the concerns by the school board and the Assembly.

MR. LYON mentioned that staff had never included this information previously but did add it in the criteria and came to this conclusion following a conversation with Scott Thomas, DOT&PF, giving an extra two points if the project site has no crash data, but the MOA Traffic and Safety Engineer and/or the DOT&PF Traffic Engineer must concur that the project is expected to prevent crashes or serious injuries. If you have a location that does

not have any data right now, but the experts in the room can look at it and determine something could be done to solve this issue, even though there is no data point, you will get some points for that area by relying on the expertise of the safety engineers. We are working towards capturing that information.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked if someone could highlight that particular information for her, as she did not catch it and it would be helpful information to take back to the community.

MR. LYON stated that it is the third criteria under "Improves Pedestrian Safety" located under the Safety Category.

Category 2 – Mobility

PAGE 2

Comment #23 - Goals

MR. LYON noted the change was to add some language in the criteria relating to aspirational goals as opposed to the performance measures that FHWA require us to track.

MR. JONGENELEN recommended adding what we have in the MTP because those are our Goals and Objectives that AMATS is trying to meet. He asked if we are adding the 2040 MTP Goals and Objectives or the draft 2050 MTP Goals and Objectives.

MR. COY, TAC Chairperson, recalled that there was a desire to include in the TIP criteria a list of more specific measures in the Safety Handbook, which we do not currently have the tools to measure.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that that would be done as part of the MTP because it is related to Performance Measures and Targets. He did not recommend doing that as part of the TIP criteria because we need to wait until we do that as part of the MTP, which is going to take place in two months.

MR. LYON referred to the comment that reads, "None of the proposed scoring criteria award points for mode shift from single-occupancy vehicle travel." He added that might be a great idea but, as Mr. Coy asked, how do we actually measure that? That is more of an aspirational goal to take people away from single-occupancy vehicle travel. Again, it would be great but very challenging to measure. He did not know how AMATS would measure that but thought the idea would be to add language that some of these are aspirational goals.

MR. COY reiterated that the discussion during the TAC meeting was that it would be added in the back of the Handbook, not as TIP criteria, but just as a note stating the next time there are updates it could be something that was captured.

MR. TROMBLEY referred to Comment #21 regarding Safety and Emergency Response and commented that one of the issues with the Hillside (also found in Chugiak-Eagle River) is that fire has been a big proponent of fire sprinklers on single-access roads. He asked how

AMATS ties into that because we do see there is a safety category, but Hillside has service areas. Can AMATS use money in service areas for secondary access or egress? There are several areas he would like to see secondary access to prevent having fire sprinklers for larger developments.

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes, we can and a good example of that is Mountain Air Drive, which was added to the TIP as a secondary egress out of that area in Hillside. One of the issues we ran into was meeting the match for that because, at the time, the municipality did not have a mechanism to provide the match for that project. However, he believed the Assembly worked with the Administration to get something in place to allow the use of bond funding as match, even in the LRSA (Limited Road Service Area).

In response to Mr. Trombley's question that LRSAs cannot be matches, MR. LYON explained that they do not usually have the ability to come up with enough, which is millions of dollars. He was here during the time when there was still a State Capital Budget, so a lot of the match could come from that to cover local matches, but that does not exist any longer and consisted only of bond funds. We had a bridge over Eklutna River that sat there for a long time while CBERSSA (Chugiak/Birchwood/Eagle River Rural Road Service Area) tried to come up with the funds but could not. You do not want to put a hole in the TIP by adding something where there is no ability to come up with a match. The Assembly passed it with the attrition that you can bond for things that have emergency access or egress routes. If Mr. Trombley were to identify federal funds in the TIP, then the municipality would have to issue a bond for the match.

MR. TROMBLEY asked for clarification that there is an allocation percentage of the dollar amount we receive annually under the safety category.

MR. JONGENELEN replied, no, not for safety specifically. AMATS receives a general allocation, and the Policy Committee sets forth how much they want put towards certain modes, so Roadway gets a percentage, Pavement gets a percentage, Non-motorized, etcetera. He pointed out that we do have criteria in this for emergency access routes because it was identified during the last TIP as being an area that needed some improvements. Not just Anchorage, but Chugiak-Eagle River also did a significant amount of work years ago to identify egress routes relating to this discussion. We need to do something similar for the Anchorage Bowl, the Hillside, and other areas to come up with a way to identify those and they can be nominated as part of the TIP nomination project to rank and score.

Category 4 – Environment

PAGE 6

Comment #104 – Environmental Impacts:

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the TAC had asked for additional clarity on this particular comment. Staff's response to the comment was that the items listed in this comment are a little too prescriptive for what we do at this point in the TIP nomination process. The commenter was asking for no increase in impermeable surface; maximal use of vegetated,

low-heat absorption materials; drainage; no loss of wetlands; and staying with the existing developed right-of-way. He pointed out that this is all design work that needs to be done later in project development. We already had items in our environmental criteria that help address this.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked how the environmental criterion at the TIP scoring level addresses some of the specifics raised. She did understand they were quite prescriptive, but this will allow us to go back and have further conversations about how this particular comment has, somewhat, already been addressed.

MR. JONGENELEN expressed that some of the items may not be addressed. We do not do anything in our criteria about wildlife movement, so he cannot speak to that, but we do have a section in Environmental criteria under "Environmental Impacts/Project Deliverability" that reads, "Project is expected to have limited or no impact of right-of-way, wetlands, historic property, or other environmentally sensitive areas." That is our attempt to take a higher-level planning look at these projects when they are nominated and scored as to what kind of impact they will have in the area. It is somewhat addressing what this individual is asking for but is not getting to that level of possibly having right-of-way impacts. We are not going to have any right-of-way impacts and include that in the description with the project. We need to be flexible in our approach to these projects, so he thinks the comment is too prescriptive, whereas what we do have in the criteria is allowing that flexibility needed in the development of the project.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked, when looking for potential impacts at the TIP level, if those impacts are identified through other plans, such as the Comprehensive Land Use Plan or Wetlands Mitigation. Is there somewhere we can turn to look if a proposed project might have those impacts?

MR. JONGENELEN replied, yes, there is. For example, we can look at historic property information to see what kind of impact this project will create in the area of historic properties that have already been identified. We do work with the MOA and DOT&PF to review these projects for cost estimating purposes and they provide us with some of the information about what kind of impacts are going to be occurring as part of the project. Granted, that is a very high-level analysis of the project.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL thinks the extent that we can tie it toward other opportunities where some of these impacts can be identified if they are natural features and are existing in other plans to inform this provides a lot more predictability of what might be or not be allowed.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that one good thing helpful to us is the GIS system that MOA and DOT&PF worked very hard on to provide a lot of this information in a format that is easier for us to see with our limited view at this point.

MR. LYON added that we provide a quick description of how the process works when ranking and scoring projects. We put out the Call for Nominations and then look at the existing plans, such as the MTP, the Non-motorized Plan, etcetera, and have staff from

DOT&PF, Long-Range Planning with Wetlands expertise, Transportation Planning, Project Management & Engineering present. While we are reviewing a project, we have experts in the room that can provide any impact data. The GIS system has so many different capabilities with helping us see what we are actually looking at when reviewing a project to determine what kind of points they would get in a certain category, whether it be wetlands, historic property, or other impacts. A lot of the projects have already been ranked and scored since they have been around for a while, but we do get new ones.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL stated that the community is probably one of the most heavily involved in the district plans or the Comprehensive Land Use Plan from a municipal side to the extent that it anticipates where impacts to sensitive areas can be. They are going to be looking if a project impacts something they are aware of. As she thinks through the process, it is a way to not get latent community concern because it was already either identified as an area, or it was not identified as an area and those plats were either updated or developed.

CHAIR COY clarified that the last comment was to change staff's response that reads, "The proposed recommendations are too prescriptive" to "These items are looked at when the project goes to its design in a more thorough and complete fashion". Trying to do that as part of the TIP criteria is a lot of work for every single project, which is why the TIP criteria was a little more general in having some expert qualitative, instead of getting too quantitative too quickly for everything."

MR. LYON reiterated that we want to make sure we are not suggesting projects be put in the TIP that are non-starters. If we know there is a huge elevation challenge in the area, we do not want to put that in the TIP knowing it will not be able to go forward. Those are the big items we try to catch early, but when it starts through the NEPA process, all of this must be looked at before it can move any further forward.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL referred to the TIP scoring criteria, using mobility as an example, and noted that it feels a little counterintuitive. She saw the asterisk on the bonus point for a project located within an EJ (Environmental Justice) area of the sixtieth or greater percentile and the penalty with the same language "and will negatively impact population" and asked what those negative impacts are. There are examples of transit being supported when seeing the first asterisk, but she is having a hard time tying this together.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that we do have an asterisk under "mobility" that talks about what negative impacts the EJ populations are and lists examples that include, putting up barriers to mobility making it harder for people to access and/or utilize the transportation system; negative economic impacts (aesthetics and visual); relocation, displacement; and negative impacts to land use.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL suggested using different symbols for each area making it easier to track them. Overall, the TIP Scoring Criteria Update is a good one and is quite responsive to a lot of what was heard throughout the 2040 comments. It is really trying to capture some of the priorities that have been stated and it will be interesting to see how

these all work in application because some of these things feel very subjective. Again, it will be very interesting how these terms are ultimately defined when applied to a project. This is a wonderful job on taking the feedback and this scoring criteria better reflects the community's goals.

MR. TROMBLEY referred to Comment #132 asking for a little more information regarding staff's response. He agreed that the Chugiak-Eagle River Plan needs to be updated. How would you address, specifically, the comment at the very end that mentions Hillside, Chugiak and Eagle River are out of contention based on TIP projects and scoring?

MR. LYON suggested when looking at the projects in the current TIP to notice that most of them are currently on the Hillside and have several Abbott and O'Malley Roads projects. He did not think it could be said that we leave Hillside out. In previous TIPs, we funded different projects in Chugiak-Eagle River and continue to do so. For the last 18 years, every time he had done the exercise, which is the proportioning of funding over a four-year life cycle in the TIP, it usually seemed to be comparable to the actual population in that area. He did not think anything was in this that would penalize Chugiak-Eagle River as that is not the intention. He is not looking at projects just designed to help Downtown or Midtown. We spread it out, and Ms. Ossiander was a favorite on the Policy Committee for several years and always did her homework. In the past, projects in Chugiak-Eagle River were funded regularly. As for the Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan (which he believes is what she is referring to in her comment), it is outdated but does not have anything to do with AMATS.

There were no public comments.

MR. TROMBLEY moved to approve the criteria with staff's changes. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

c. Major Amendment to 2021-AMATS Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Budget

BACKGROUND:

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is required by federal law under Title 23, amended 23 USC 134 as interpreted by FHWA in 23 CFR 450.308, when federal funds are used for transportation planning. Annually, the MOA Public Transportation Department (PTD) receives Federal Transit Administration (FTA) section 5303 funds for Transit Planning through the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF). In March 2021, the MOA received notification from DOT &PF that the allocation was in process. However, after multiple meetings and lengthy correspondence it was discovered that the 2021 funds had not been disbursed due to a disagreement between DOT&PF and FTA related to ICAP (Indirect Cost Allocation Plan) funds being taken from those funds. FTA is not allowing DOT&PF to assess ICAP to the 5303 funds. As a result, PTD has been providing the funds for those tasks using local funds. AMATS has underspent their Planning (PL) funds and has the ability to cover those funds with federal

transportation planning dollars. This amendment will move funds from the 100-500 elements in the AMATS work program into the 600 element (PTD).

The following is a summary of the changes that will be forwarded to DOT&PF for approval.

▪ **100 Element - AMATS Plans & Programs**

Task 110 -- Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP): Remove \$90,225 from this task, transfer to Task 610

Task 120 -- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Remove \$30,075 from this task, transfer to Task 610

Task 130 -- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP): Remove \$24,060 from this task, transfer \$12,030 to task 620 and \$6,015 to task 640.

Task 160 -- Title VI/ LEP Plan: Remove \$15,000 from this task, transfer to Task 610

▪ **200 Element - Special Studies & Local Planning [0 \$ change within 200-Element]**

No changes necessary.

▪ **300 Element - Air Quality Plans, Programs, and Studies**

Task 310 -- Air Quality Monitoring: Remove \$20,451 from this task, transfer to Task 620.

Task 340 -- Eval of Trans Air Pollution Controls: Remove \$13,233 from this task, transfer to Task 620.

▪ **400 Element - Data Collection / Analysis & Modeling [0 \$ change within 400-Element]**

No changes necessary.

▪ **500 Element - Program Admin / Public Involvement**

Task 510 -- Program Administration: Remove \$84,210 from this task, transfer to task 620.

Task 520 -- Staff Development/Training: Remove \$28,872 from this task, transfer to task 620.

Task 534 -- Website/Social Media: Remove \$9,624 from this task, transfer to task 620.

▪ **600 Element - Transit**

Task 610 -- Transit Planning Program Support: Augment funding by \$24,060, from Tasks 110, 120 and 160.

Task 620 -- Transit General Development & Comprehensive Planning: Augment funding by \$186,450, from Tasks 130, 310, 340, 519, 520, and 534.

Task 640 -- Transit Long Range Project Level Planning: Augment funding by \$6,015, from Task 130.

MR. LYON clarified that the Committee just approved the 2022 UPWP budget but this is an amendment to the 2021 UPWP budget. The following were due to the pandemic:

1. An AMATS staff member was asked to work the Emergency Operation Center for approximately half the year. In addition, this staff member is active in the AMEA (Anchorage Municipal Employees Association) Union and does apply a certain amount of weekly time to union matters. As a result, there was a significant amount of staff time not charged to AMATS resulting in a significant amount of AMATS funds not being spent this year.
2. The planning funds usually come through DOT&PF to AMATS to spend. In this case, the State of Alaska, Department of Administration wanted to charge ICAP on AMATS planning funds. FHWA originally said that cannot be done, but then agreed a cut could be taken from it. It is overhead that would go to the State of Alaska to administer these funds and will happen in 2022 with AMATS funds.
3. The State of Alaska, Department of Administration wanted to apply that same process with the FTA funds for transit planning that go to the MOA Public Transportation Department. In this case, the FTA said it could not be done. PTD was expecting that the State of Alaska would let it go for this year and transit would receive their allocation of 5303 transit planning funds, but those funds are not being released leaving PTD with having to cover those transit planning funds (approximately \$300,000) out of their own funding from property tax funds, not federal funds. PTD was planning on using those property tax funds for other purposes but have had to cover this due to having staff perform transit planning duties as required by federal law, but, again, do not have those federal funds.

AMATS has always had the 600 element (Transit) which is inside the work program but consisted of 5303 funds. With AMATS not using approximately \$300,000 of its funds and with Transit having this need, we are asking to move some of the regular AMATS allocation into the PTD federal transit planning funds.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL asked if this is expected to be a one-time situation or does AMATS think this will occur again in the future.

MR. LYON replied that AMATS has been told that the federal government, from here on out, is to do a consolidated planning grant, so that AMATS would get both the Transit funds and the AMATS PL in one block. All would come to AMATS through FHWA and FHWA would automatically take the ICAP off, then AMATS would distribute the portion of Transit's funds belonging to them. For the future, this will not be an issue because AMATS will be getting all the funds and will allocate Transit's portion to them.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL thanked staff for finding a way to cover this. She was a bit hesitant if we could find a solution to something that becomes a way of not having someone else take care of it in the future, but this is just a one-time situation. Great job making sure this required transit planning is covered and acknowledging the unique circumstances that allow it to happen.

MR. LYON added that staff was not provided this information until last week, so the TAC did not get the opportunity to hear this. It does say in the work program that these types of amendments do not require a public comment period, and are approved by the Policy Committee and DOT&PF, then sent on to the federal overseers for their approval. The total amount being sent to Transit is \$216,525.

ACTING CHAIR BOWLAND asked for public comments.

ADAM MOSER with DOT&PF noted that information was received this afternoon that the grant funds from FTA have been approved and the State of Alaska did put forth a waiver on that ICAP, and that is an issue we are still working on with FHWA and FTA about a long-term resolution. However, it does look like the Anchorage Transit agency should be able to access those funds, potentially, sometime in the coming weeks.

MR. LYON asked for clarification that the 2021 funds would be available to PTD.

MR. MOSER replied, yes, these were applied for at the end of FY2021 and have been approved by FTA and are being released to the State, and should be ready to be billed against sometime in the coming weeks. He could not provide a specific date.

MS. ACTON noted that PTD has been acting in good faith for over a year waiting on these funds but did get notification from the DOT Transit Office today that the application had been approved. However, there are many steps still to come for us to be able to bill against this funding and it will not likely be in time for us to bill our 2021 expenses. This is still something we need to have happen to be able to close out the year and to be able to make sure we are in good standing, ensure the expenses we have paid out are appropriate, and will cover the program as we have intended. AMATS will still need to go forward with this amendment.

MR. TROMBLEY moved to approve the major amendment to the 2021 Unified Planning Work Program Budget. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES - None

7. GENERAL INFORMATION - None

8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ZALETEL provided feedback regarding the ability to provide comments on the MTP 2050 Goals and Objectives. Rogers Park Community Council took this up at their December meeting and illustrated that it is very hard for a community council to deal with comments on something complex, even the MTP Goals and Objectives as proposed, in one meeting. They do intend to comment, but those comments will not come until after their meeting in January. She told them she would raise the issue that their comments would still be considered. The council delayed taking quick action because they did want their comments to be thoughtful. While some members of the council put together a comment chart, others did not get an opportunity to go through this and are probably not as familiar with the MTP process. She knew the MTP is always a time crunch to process,

but she wanted to raise this particular situation so that staff is aware of it and consider it as we continue to refine the process.

MR. JONGENELEN noted the following:

1. A joint TAC/PC work session will be held late January to start the Performance Measures Targeting Criteria Development for the MTP. We will take any Goals and Objectives comments, even those submitted after the deadline will be considered, although we do encourage the public to submit their comments during the formal comment period. This will be an intensive work session because Performance Measures and Targets tend to be significant.
2. He informed the Committee that Mr. Lyon had spent a good number of years as leader of AMATS guiding us all through the processes. Mr. Lyon has been greatly appreciated and is wished the best in his next endeavors.

9. Public Comments

MS. ACTON and MR. RUDOLPH expressed their appreciation and congratulated Mr. Lyon on his new position as Planning Director.

10. ADJOURNMENT

MR. TROMBLEY moved to adjourn. MS. POKON seconded.

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.