

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

**March 10, 2022  
2:30 PM**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Brad Coy (Chair)	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Brian Lindamood	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Todd Vanhove	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region Planning
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Matt Stichick	MOA/Anchorage Health Department (AHD)
Craig Lyon	MOA/Planning Department
Jamie Acton	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Shaina Kilcoyne	MOA/Energy and Sustainability
Melinda Tsu	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)

Also in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Aaron Jongenelen	MOA/Planning
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
Bart Rudolph	PTD
Kathryn Wenger	Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Dan Smith	DOT&PF
Katherine Hensley	DOT&PF

*\*Policy Committee Member*

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Adeyemi Alimi represented ADEC on behalf of Cindy Heil. Melinda Tsu represented PM&E on behalf of Kent Kohlhasse. Steve Ribuffo 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.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

*Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.*

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – February 10, 2022**

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

*Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.*

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**a. Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Resolution of Support for  
Hiland Merge Lane Improvements**

**BACKGROUND:**

*The AMATS Community Advisory Committee (CAC) is the resident's forum for transportation issues affecting the AMATS area. This group serves to review projects and plans, share information with the public and bring forth recommendations about transportation planning issues to the AMATS Policy Committee (PC) through the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).*

*The CAC has spent several meetings discussing congestion and safety concerns at the Hiland Road & Glenn Highway Interchange. Recognizing the Hiland Interchange Reconstruction project is listed in the Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) Study, Phase 1 - Chapter 4 Strategies, as a high priority, the committee is requesting that the Policy Committee send a letter to the Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (AKDOT&PF) indicating that AMATS supports merge lane improvement southbound on Hiland Road onto the southbound Glenn Highway, such that the merge lanes would not be conflicting with possible future partial cloverleaf renovations to the Hiland/Glenn Interchange.*

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the Committee on the above-noted Resolution of Support.

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

(MS) Are there different proposals for an interchange, one of which would be more compatible with the cloverleaf than another option? What about construction of the on-ramp upgrade that would make it incompatible with the future cloverleaf design?

(TV) *There was an intersection study done on that interchange resulting in five alternatives. Everything DOT&PF is currently looking at is in agreement with what the study says. One of the studies was a flyover, one was a cloverleaf, and one was improvements to the existing interchange. We have not decided*

*anything specific yet, but we are trying to get a design project started to do an upgrade assumption to that interchange.*

(MS) Is there anything inherent about an upgrade of an on-ramp as an interim congestion relief that would complicate a future cloverleaf design? Or make that less likely in the future?

(TV) *There are no interim improvements being discussed at this time.*

(MS) Essentially, an on-ramp upgrade would preclude a cloverleaf design. Is it one of the available options?

(TV) *A cloverleaf is one of the options we would be looking at.*

(MS) What he is hearing from the Community Advisory Committee is that they prefer a cloverleaf solution and do not want any alternate relief that might delay that implementation. Is that accurate?

(SB) *DOT&PF is looking at a couple of different things. We have certainly looked at some alternatives to solve some of the issues at the interchange. Basically, the Department has no interest in breaking any of the merging kinds of actions. We are looking at parallel merge actions, potential extensions of merge lanes all the way down to the Weigh Station. One project we are looking at starting right now is the partial cloverleaf (the addition there) and they potentially have to look at any of the merging actions coming off of the existing southbound on-ramp as well to make sure we do not break any of those. Any part of those actions is looking at Level of Service of the merge actions, so that is just another measure to make sure we are continuing to serve the public. The potential partial cloverleaf addition would then reduce, if not eliminate, most of the traffic using the existing southbound off-ramp. The only maneuvers that are not facilitated are the ones coming from the west.*

*Ms. Tsu joined the meeting at 2:38 p.m.*

(BC) Does passing this resolution have any impact on the project either way?

(SB) *The Department supports continuing to work with the community and serving all the needs of all the maneuvers through that interchange. It does not deter us from our actions trying to solve the problems.*

(AJ) *It is a positive to have something come forward stating that AMATS or the CAC recommends supporting improvements in this area making sure that we account for the users. He did not see it precluding anything.*

There were no public comments.

MR. STICHICK moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the Community Advisory Committee’s resolution supporting renovations that are compatible with a future cloverleaf design. MR. LYON seconded.

***Hearing no objections, this motion passed.***

**b. Alaska Railroad 2022 Transit Asset Management (TAM) Performance Targets**

**BACKGROUND:**

*As required by the Transit Asset Management Final Rule and regulation at 49 CFR Part 625, the 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 rolling stock 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 vehicles equipment is the percentage of those vehicles that have either met or exceeded their ULB.*
- c) Facilities. *The performance measure for facilities is the percentage of facilities within an asset class, rated below Condition 3 on the TERM scale.*
- d) Infrastructure - rail fixed guideway, track, signals, and systems. *The performance measure for rail fixed guideway, track, signals, and systems is the percentage of track segments with performance restrictions.*

*As an MPO, AMATS is also required to adopt targets for the Transit Asset Management Final Rule. Below are the targets set by the Alaska Railroad within the AMATS boundary:*

<b>Alaska Railroad Corporation</b>	2022
<b>Rolling Stock</b>	
Passenger Railcars	0%
Locomotives	0%
<b>Equipment</b>	
Truck & Rubber Tired	25%
Steel Wheel Vehicle	38%
Automobile	0%
<b>Facilities</b>	
Admin & Maintenance	9%
Passenger & Parking	0%
<b>Infrastructure</b>	
Track	1.42%

MR. JONGENELEN presented the Transit Asset Management Target recommendations.

There were no comments.

MR. LINDAMOOD moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the Alaska Railroad's TAM Target package. MR. ALIMI seconded.

***Hearing no objections, this motion passed.***

**c. Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) Committee Member Appointment**

**BACKGROUND:**

*The AMATS Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) is the community forum for freight issues affecting the AMATS area. Specific functions of this group are to assist in promoting public and private participation in the freight planning process and to comment on freight planning issues. Members of this committee may serve up to three rotating three-year terms. Committee bylaws limit members to two consecutive terms. Katherine Hensley is being nominated to fill the seat for the ADOT Commercial Vehicle Enforcement representative. Ms. Hensley has previously served as an alternate for Mr. Dan Smith, who manages the ADOT Commercial Vehicle Safety Programs.*

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the Committee on the recommendation of Ms. Hensley to the Freight Advisory Committee.

The Committee expressed their appreciation to Mr. Smith for his service on the FAC.

CHAIR COY asked for public comments.

KATHERINE HENSLEY introduced herself noting that she is excited to be able to take a more active role as a member.

DAN SMITH noted that the FAC is getting a very capable person with Ms. Hensley. He appreciated his time serving what was a fast ten years on the committee.

MR. LYON moved to recommend approval to the Policy Committee. MR. VANHOVE seconded.

***Hearing no objections, this motion passed.***

**6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES**

**a. Survey Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act for Alaska**

MR. JONGENELEN provided a PowerPoint presentation.

MR. VANHOVE noted that this is in support of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and we did receive a significant number of comments on surveys. This is a statewide project and we welcome all the comments we can get.

In response to Chair Coy's questions as to who put this survey together, the process, and if there is a link to the survey available, MR. JONGENELEN explained that this was put together by DOT Headquarters. A good comment to DOT Headquarters would be to provide that information either on the survey or on the page itself. It would be most helpful to have it on the survey because if the public is just given the link, they may not be seeing what this is for and what it helps with. He will search the DOT webpage for a link that may have more information and send it to everyone.

MR. VANHOVE pointed out that anyone that uses transportation can submit comments.

MS. TSU mentioned that it, if not already, would be valuable to share it with the Federation of Community Councils (FCC) and then they can share it on their website.

In response to Chair Coy's question asking if the Assembly Members were aware of this, MR. JONGENELEN noted that he was not sure of all those that were sent this information. He did just locate a link that contained more information and will forward it to everyone.

There were no public comments.

## **7. GENERAL INFORMATION**

### **a. Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Update**

MR. JONGENELEN presented the update.

MR. STICHICK asked if there is a website or a document that summarizes all the opportunities available of Bipartisan Infrastructure Law.

MR. JONGENELEN replied that they do have one that addresses the different programs and provides some general information. In terms of the exact funding amounts, he did not know of a specific website saying here is how much you can expect. Until the notice of funding opportunities goes out it is hard to say exactly, but he can send an email to the TAC and PC Committees containing a guidebook for the Infrastructure Bill that describes each program. He added that Ms. Wenger also provided a link in the Teams chat that explains the process.

MR. VANHOVE noted that there are a number of slide presentations that the Statewide DOT and Regional Planning offices are working on to make information available about the different funding amounts and potential eligibility amounts. We started yesterday working on a statewide presentation making it accessible whenever visiting community councils or any organization to provide them all the same information. In recognition of the grants, one of the big differences in grant funding is that it is typically tied to the same

transportation funding, but this one is adding some extensions as far as eligibility for the length of time to spend some of this money. If you are asking for grants now, there is some additional time being allotted for completing projects.

There were no public comments.

**8. COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

CHAIR COY recalled at the last TAC meeting there was discussion regarding the concept of Urban Safety Corridors. He has been in conversations with DOT&PF, MOA, PM&E, and APD and it sounds like it does have some promise. It is more about how it would be implemented and what it might look like.

**9. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

*Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.*