

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE  
HUNTSVILLE AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION,  
HELD MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2017

The Citizens Advisory Committee of the Huntsville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization met in a regular meeting on Monday, August 28, 2017, at 5 p.m., in the Council Conference Room of the Municipal Building of the City of Huntsville, Alabama, there being present:

Committee Members Present:

Mr. Bob Devlin	Acting Chairman/Secretary, Madison County
Mr. Emo Furfori	City of Madison
Mr. Trent Griffin	City of Huntsville
Mr. Pat Mason	City of Madison
Ms. Jennifer Nelson	City of Huntsville
Mr. John Ofenloch	Chairman-City of Huntsville
(Not present for entire meeting)	
Mr. Todd Slyman	City of Huntsville
(Not present for entire meeting)	
Mr. Tony Smith	City of Huntsville
Mr. Gary T. Whitley, Jr.	City of Huntsville

Staff Members Present:

Mr. Dennis Madsen	MPO Staff
Mr. James Moore	MPO Staff
Ms. Connie Graham	MPO Staff
Mr. James Vandiver	MPO Staff
Mr. John Autry	City of Huntsville Transit Department Staff
Mr. Scott Freeman	City of Huntsville Transit Department Staff
Ms. Kim Smith	City of Huntsville Transit Department Staff
Ms. Kathy Martin	City of Huntsville Director of Engineering
Mr. Houston Matthews	Madison County Engineering

Acting Chairman Devlin called the meeting to order.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the first item on the agenda was Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting held on June 5, 2017.

Mr. Smith moved for approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee held on June 5, 2017.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Griffin.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there were any comments concerning the minutes.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the next item on the agenda was Adoption of the Final Fiscal Year 2018 Unified Planning Work Program.

Acting Chairman Devlin recognized Mr. Moore.

Mr. Moore made a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Moore stated that this was the Final Fiscal Year 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). He stated that the Draft Fiscal Year 2018 UPWP had been presented at the June 2017 meeting and had been approved. He continued that this was the Final, and that not many changes had been made.

Mr. Moore stated that the purpose of the UPWP was basically to outline multimodal transportation planning

activities, within a financially constrained budget, to be conducted in the Huntsville MPO Planning Area.

Mr. Moore stated that the UPWP was updated every year to provide citizens and stakeholders the necessary transparency to see how Federal and State transportation planning dollars were expended by the Huntsville MPO and the Alabama Department of Transportation.

Mr. Moore stated that examples of tasks performed in the UPWP were as follows: Task I, Administration, covering the administrative support activities such as financial management, contract management, public outreach, and the general management of the MPO; Task II, Data Development and Maintenance, covering the collection, maintenance, and analysis of transportation data, including the development of socioeconomic forecasts and travel demand models to determine where future transportation investments would be; Tasks III and IV, Short- and Long-Range Planning, addressing planning for activities taking place within a 3- to 5-year time frame, including the management of the Transportation Improvement Program, the TIP; the Unified Planning Work Program, the UPWP; and covering planning activities for the long term, including the development of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan, air quality planning, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit, and the promotion of sustainable development; and Task V, Special Studies, covering other planning issues and studies, including major corridor studies; planning, freight

planning, congestion management, and safety management, as well as environmental justice and climate change.

Mr. Moore stated that the UPWP was developed by the MPO staff, in consultation with partner agencies and input from local citizens and stakeholders. He stated that the document may be amended to account for changes in funding or project needs.

Mr. Moore stated, concerning the 2017-2018 Budget, that the Huntsville MPO's current UPWP, adopted in September 2016, extended through September 30, 2017. He stated that the Final FY 2017 UPWP total was \$745,816. He continued that as adopted, the 2018 program funded over \$756,000 worth of planning activities and studies for the Huntsville MPO region.

Mr. Moore stated that the Edits from Draft to Final UPWP were as follows: Transit pages edited by Huntsville Public Transit added Request for Proposals (RFP) wording; last transit study "increased ridership over 20 percent;" and Appendix E - Summary of Public Outreach Activities, providing details as to the dissemination of the Draft 2018 UPWP and Final FY 2018 UPWP for two weeks of public review each. He stated that the Appendix included press releases and public notices.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there were any questions for Mr. Moore or any questions about the Plan.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if the last transit study, for the 20 percent increase, was in actual riders or if it was

projected.

Mr. John Autry, Transit Manager, City of Huntsville, stated that the 20 percent was the increase following the study, the implementation of the 2012 study.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if that was the biggest they had ever seen, the 20 percent, noting that that seemed pretty huge.

Mr. Autry stated that there were some major modifications to the system following that study.

Mr. Griffin moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 09-17, adopting the Final Fiscal Year 2018 Unified Planning Work Program.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Smith.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any discussion of the above motion.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the next item on the agenda was Amendment to the FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program.

Acting Chairman Devlin recognized Mr. Dennis Madsen.

Mr. Madsen made a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Madsen stated that this was to add the Dry Creek Greenway project to the TIP. He continued that this was one

they had actually already considered earlier in the year, in terms of adding it. He stated that it was the only TAP grant application received by the MPO in 2017, and that it was for the Dry Creek Greenway. He stated that it would extend from the existing Indian Creek Greenway, alongside a surface street for a short distance, and then drop down into Dry Creek, and that from there, it would pass underneath the bridge at Providence Main, and then along Dry Creek to Providence Square, the green space in Downtown Providence.

Mr. Griffin asked if the cost was \$500,000, with \$400,000 in Federal funds.

Mr. Madsen stated that it was \$500,000, and that \$400,000 was Federally funded, that it was an 80/20 match.

Ms. Nelson inquired as to the length of the link.

Mr. Madsen stated that it was approximately one-half mile. He continued that it was not a particularly long piece, but they had felt it was important because it was connecting the Indian Creek Greenway, which was fairly well traveled, to a public area that was very, very heavily used.

Mr. Whitley stated to Mr. Madsen that people were already under that bridge, walking and biking, and asked what there was to improve.

Mr. Madsen stated that he understood Mr. Whitley was talking about the existing bridge and stated that there was not a formal, or a hard, path down there.

Mr. Whitley asked how persons got down there.

Mr. Madsen stated that there would be a small, graded ramp that would go down.

Mr. Whitley stated that persons got down there at this time by some means.

Mr. Madsen stated that persons did so, but they would like for them not to continue using those means.

Mr. Whitley inquired as to those means. He stated that he had seen persons down there, but he had not been able to figure out how to get down there.

Mr. Madsen stated that he believed it involved either climbing or falling.

Ms. Graham stated that it was not currently ADA compliant.

Ms. Nelson stated that she had a general question as to this link. She asked if they had some kind of prioritization or methodology in place to choose which project to fund, and when. She continued that she would love for all the greenways to be funded and stated that she was sure this was a great link but asked why this piece versus any other in Huntsville.

Mr. Madsen stated that Connie Graham, with the City of Huntsville and the MPO, who was overseeing the Greenway Master Plan, could provide more detail on specific prioritization. He continued that this one in particular was because there was already a very heavily used greenway in the Indian Creek link. He continued that there were actually very few areas in the Greenway network that had immediate proximity to commercial areas. He stated that one saw a lot of greenways in other

cities that ran past commercial areas, where they could have cyclists who would ride to get a pizza or go to a restaurant or go to a park, and that this would provide an opportunity to access a very, very heavily used green space in Providence Square.

Mr. Madsen asked Ms. Graham if she would like to address this more specifically.

Ms. Graham stated that, also, it was free, that the land was donated.

Mr. Whitley inquired as to how this worked into the overall Providence PUD, if the future road expansions or any other developments were planned to tie back into the overall Providence PUD.

Mr. Madsen replied in the affirmative, stating that they had worked with them to make sure they did not get crossways with any of their master planning. He stated that the Slymans, the developers, who were sometimes at CAC meetings, were very much in support of it, and they had said this should not cause any conflict. He continued that a lot of folks were now pushing for making that connection underneath 72, which was something they were still working on.

Ms. Nelson asked why they had chosen this project first versus connecting the top of the Indian Creek Greenway.

Mr. Madsen stated that it was mainly a target of opportunity. He stated that this one was significantly less expensive, and that that one was going to fall in a longer



timeline.

Mr. Madsen asked Ms. Graham if she had more information on this.

Ms. Graham stated that, also, there were property owners between the north end and the south end from whom they were going to have to actually purchase property, and that many of them did not want the greenway along their property.

Ms. Nelson asked if for greenways or bike lanes or sidewalks, or for road projects in general, there was a way they could make the prioritization scheme of high need, medium need, or whatever, more transparent and in the documents so that when things such as this came up quarterly, it would not be such a random surprise, that it would be great to have but why.

Mr. Madsen stated that they totally understood that. He continued that this was part of the Greenway Master Plan Update the City of Huntsville was conducting at this time, in concert with the Land Trust. He stated that in future meetings they should have that published and have the prioritization criteria on it.

Mr. Jeff North, a guest, asked if where the greenway crossed the heavily traveled Providence Main Street there were improved pedestrian markings there, or something.

Mr. Madsen asked Ms. Graham if she knew what the plan was for setting aside that crossing.

Ms. Graham replied in the negative.

Ms. Nelson stated that she believed this was concerning it going under the bridge, that it crossed underneath.

Mr. Whitley asked Mr. Madsen, aside from maybe the clearing of some trees and brush, what the hard cost would be.

Mr. Madsen stated that it would be putting down a path and improving access to the path.

Mr. Whitley stated that that would be the ADA compliance.

Ms. Nelson stated that there was such good access to the Village Green already via surface streets that this seemed a little bit redundant.

Ms. Graham stated that once they made the connection around Providence and continued north, when one would see the overall Greenway plan, this would make sense.

Mr. Madsen stated that that was a good point.

Ms. Nelson stated that there was not that much context on the screen.

Mr. Madsen stated that in the future, they could actually include these within the broader context of the Master Plan Update as part of future CAC presentations.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any further discussion.

There was no response.

Ms. Nelson moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 10-17, amending the Transportation Alternatives Section of the Adopted FY 2016-2019 TIP to add a Transportation Alternative(TA) grant project for the Dry Creek Greenway in the

city of Huntsville.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Griffin.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any discussion of the above motion.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the next item on the agenda was Amendment to the FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program.

Acting Chairman Devlin recognized Mr. Madsen.

Mr. Madsen stated that Resolution No. 11-17 amended the Transit Projects Section of the adopted FY 2016-2019 TIP to add a new FY 2017 Transit Project Number for Existing Section 5317 FTA Funding for Genesis Residential. He stated that this was really almost administrative. He continued that this was something that had been approved in October 2016, and there was no new grant and no new money, just a new project number.

Mr. Ofenloch moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 11-17, amending the Transit Projects Section of the adopted FY 2016-2019 TIP to add a new FY 2017 Transit Project Number for Existing Section 5317 FTA Funding for Genesis Residential.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Griffin.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any discussion of the above motion.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the next item on the agenda was Amendment to the FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program.

Acting Chairman Devlin recognized Mr. Madsen.

Mr. Madsen made a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Madsen stated that Resolution No. 12-17 amended the Other Surface Transportation Program Projects Section of the adopted FY 2016-2019 TIP to add a utility phase to an existing project on Martin Road from Old Jim Williams Road to Zierdt Road for the City of Huntsville.

Mr. Madsen stated that per Engineering, they were using State funds previously allocated by the City of Huntsville for construction on Martin Road since all the utilities, regardless of phase, would be relocated at the same time.

Mr. Madsen stated that Kathy Martin, Director of Engineering for the City of Huntsville, was present at this meeting if there were any questions.

Ms. Nelson inquired if it was being buried, if it included fiber and things like that, or exactly what the project was.

Ms. Martin stated that it was just utility relocation, that it was gas, water, and sewer. She stated that these were the only reimbursable utilities, that everything else was not

reimbursable through Federal and State funds.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there were any other questions.

There was no response.

Mr. Ofenloch moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 12-17, amending the Other Surface Transportation Program Projects Section of the Adopted FY 2016-2019 TIP to add a utility phase to an existing project on Martin Road from Old Jim Williams Road to Zierdt Road for the City of Huntsville.

Said motion was duly seconded by Ms. Nelson.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any discussion of the above motion.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the next item on the agenda was Amendment to the FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program.

Acting Chairman Devlin recognized Mr. Madsen.

Mr. Madsen stated that Resolution No. 13-17 amended the Other Surface Transportation Program Projects Section of the Adopted FY 2016-2019 TIP to increase the cost of construction for an ATRIP project, the Blake Bottom Road interchange at Research Park Boulevard.

Mr. Madsen made a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Madsen stated that this was an existing project, and there was an increase of approximately \$5 million of potential additional costs, so that this had to be adjusted in the TIP. He stated that this was for a future interchange at Blake Bottom Road at Research Park Boulevard. He stated that this was ATRIP money, so the additional cost would not actually affect MPO funds. He continued that the old estimate was approximately \$7 million, and the new estimate was approximately \$11.6 million.

Mr. Madsen stated that if persons had any questions concerning this interchange, Houston Matthews with Madison County Engineering was present to address any detailed questions.

Mr. Whitley asked if Mr. Matthews had a presentation concerning this or any comments.

Mr. Matthews stated that he did not have a presentation on this. He stated that the reason for the resolution was that in their process, they had an initial estimate that the project was initiated under, and that through the course of the design, their engineers provided an engineering estimate, and as the project proceeded through the approval process at ALDOT, the ALDOT engineers provided an estimate. He stated that ALDOT had started at \$7 million, and County engineers had estimated the cost, prior to the letting, at \$8.5 million, and ALDOT had estimated the project at \$11.6 million. He stated that this

was the reason for this resolution, and, of course, a funding agreement from the State for the total project cost of \$11.6 million. He stated that ALDOT had opened the bids on the project, on the prior Friday, and the bid came in at \$7.8 million.

Mr. Matthews stated that there were lots of different numbers out there on this project, but he had been assured earlier on this day that the resolution needed to move forward, as did the funding agreement. He stated that he had the funding agreement that should be on the agenda for the County Commission to consider the following week. He noted that this was for \$11.6 million, and it was per ALDOT's requirement.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the ALDOT estimate stated that it was \$11.6 million, but they knew it was \$7.8 million, from the bidding process.

Mr. Matthews stated that that was the apparent low bidder. He stated that it should be clear, also, that the ALDOT estimate included construction inspection. He stated that that was an addition in there that was not corresponded to in the bid estimate, so the \$7.8 million was raw construction cost.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the cost might be accurate still.

Mr. Matthews stated that it had not been approved, that it was an apparent low bidder. He stated that ALDOT's previous estimate, at \$11.6 million, included construction, engineering,

and inspection, and the other costs that would go into Federal funds being involved in the execution of the project.

Mr. Mason questioned the \$4 million, the difference between the ALDOT estimate and the bid.

Ms. Nelson stated that \$4 million seemed excessive.

Mr. Matthews stated that it was excessive, that it was more than their engineers estimated but he had zero control over what that number was, as well as zero control over whether they could go back and amend the funding agreement. He stated that when there were State and Federal funds involved in a project, the State sent over a funding agreement, and that was what they were asking to move forward with.

Mr. Madsen stated that this was, as had been referred to in the past, an "ALDOT says" agreement. He stated that it came down to ALDOT had done their estimates, and the County had responded to them as best they could.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that, again, it was their money.

Mr. Matthews stated that this money was encumbered through the MPO for this particular project, and that when the project was completed and closed out, if there was a balance there, a left-over amount, it would roll back to the MPO and would then be distributed among the MPO members, or to cover project overruns in cases where they may have underestimated another project. He continued that if one looked into all the spreadsheets and all the numbers that made all the MPO finances



work, there was a lot of give and take there, and this was an example of that. He stated that it was more than he would have really preferred, that it was a big difference, but it was an example of the overruns and underruns that were all washed through and managed and kept track of through the MPO.

Ms. Nelson stated that this project had been on the books for quite a while and asked if Mr. Matthews could talk a little about what the proposed design was. She asked if the design had changed at all in the course of this and if the road itself allowed east-west continuity on Blake Bottom, with the interchange that was being put in.

Mr. Matthews stated that he would point this out on the displayed map, noting that he believed it would make a little more sense. He stated that the short answer was no, the design had not changed since they had done an estimate. He stated that the project did allow for east-west continuity. He stated that, obviously, in the current condition, one could not cross Blake Bottom, that there were no overpass there, that there was no way to go across, that this was an elevated median. He stated that the new project would bring a service road, or, really, a new Blake Bottom Road, as he was indicating on the display. He stated that the overpass came over Research Park at an angle as he was indicating, and then there was a loop-around that connected back to the area he was indicating. He stated that the easiest way to think about this was that if one were traveling north on Research Park

Boulevard, one would exit off at the service road, as one does today using the existing exit, and merge over into the flyover lane and fly over the new bridge at Research Park and get onto Blake Bottom, which would tie back in at Anslee Farms. He stated that one would go up and over, as he was indicating, and tie back into Blake Bottom.

Mr. Matthews stated that if one were going the other way, it would be the exact opposite, that one would come back across where he was indicating on the map and come back down and go back to the north. He stated that one would still be allowed to come out and make a right-hand turn and go south on Research Park Boulevard.

Ms. Nelson asked if one could just continue straight through on Blake Bottom.

Mr. Matthews replied in the negative. He stated if they were to have put the overpass at a location he was indicating on the map, one could see that the cluster of homes and residential property he was indicating on the map would have most likely all had to have been relocated. He stated that, therefore, they shifted that down. He stated that one could not go straight across, but if one were coming over and needed to access Blake Bottom, one would come over and hit the service road at a location he was indicating on the map and then go north and make a right-hand turn.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that one could get across but just could not go directly across.

Mr. Matthews stated that one could not go directly across. He stated that the bridge was not planned for just going straight across there, that they had had to shift it down so that it came across at an angle. He stated that it had a little bit of a cloverleaf, indicating this on the map, to turn back in and hit Research Park Boulevard, again on the service road, and then make a right, and then another right on Blake Bottom to come out.

Mr. Whitley asked what year it was that one could at one time go straight across on Blake Bottom.

Mr. Matthews stated that he could not answer that, that he would not even want to hazard a guess.

Ms. Nelson stated that she believed it was 10 or 15 years prior.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that it was perhaps after 2005.

Mr. Matthews stated that someone present might know about this but stated that when the overpass was put in at Highway 53, the approach to that began to be elevated south of Blake Bottom. He stated that he did not recall whether one could go across there as one could at a grade-level interchange before that, but that when they had put that in, because it was elevated there, it would have eliminated the ability to cross. He stated that he did not remember when that was, but he thought it was related to the approach to the overpass at Highway 53. He stated that that began to be elevated south of

Blake Bottom, so it would have cut it off at that time. He reiterated that he did not remember what it was before. He stated he remembered when there was no Research Park Boulevard there.

Mr. Slyman asked if it was correct that if one were coming from the east and headed west, there was no way to cross Research Park going in that direction, and there would be no way to cross.

Mr. Matthews stated that one would either have to go up and make a U-turn and come back or come further down and get on the service road and come back up and over.

Ms. Nelson asked if, since they had this \$4.5 million buffer between the low bid and what they were allocating, it would be possible to relocate this and just put a regular bridge, straight across, with a couple of on-ramps. She continued that there were a lot of confusing on and off ramps.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that it had been stated that because of the commercial properties there, they could not get a bridge.

Mr. Matthews stated that it was residential. He stated that he thought it was all single-family, but that there was a cluster there.

Mr. Whitley asked if anyone had talked to these homeowners, either to say if they would have a preference regarding the project or if they would be willing to sell. He stated that what Mr. Matthews had described looked very ugly in

his head, in terms of infrastructure. He stated that, also, concerning the flyover that would take one north, houses inside this circle were going to hear that traffic, from the way the circle loop had been described.

Ms. Nelson stated that it appeared to be like a jug handle.

Mr. Griffin stated that it was a semi-cloverleaf.

Mr. Matthews stated that it was like a half cloverleaf, that it just dead-ended at a spot he indicated on the map. He stated, regarding the noise, that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had required them to do a noise study, so the noise effects had either been mitigated through the design or shown not to be an issue, per State and Federal standards.

Mr. Matthews stated that this project had been conceived before he became employed with the County. He continued that he had not talked with any of these property owners. He stated that he had talked to all the property owners from whom they had acquired property from a line he indicated on the map south. He continued that they had had some property acquisition at another location he indicated on the map as well. He stated that he could not say whether someone from the County had been in touch with any of those property owners or not, that he simply did not know.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked Mr. Matthews if there had been a public hearing that he knew about.

Mr. Matthews replied in the affirmative. He stated that

there had been more than one, if he remembered correctly.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there were any other questions.

There was no response.

Mr. Griffin moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 13-17, amending the Other Surface Transportation Program Projects Section of the adopted 2016-2019 TIP to increase the cost of construction for an ATRIP project, the Blake Bottom Road interchange at Research Park Boulevard.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any discussion of the above motion.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that the next item on the agenda was Review of Administrative Modifications to MPO Documents Since Last MPO Meeting.

Acting Chairman Devlin recognized Mr. Madsen.

Mr. Madsen stated that there were a lot of things that the MPO Staff could do administratively because they fell under certain guidelines and were minor modifications. He continued that the MPO Staff felt it was wise to keep the CAC, the TCC, and the Board up to date on these. He stated that these were generally routine edits to the documents that occurred between

meetings. He continued that by ALDOT practice, this also included HSIP project additions, which were automatically added to the STIP, so they could do those administratively, without a vote, but they did intend to make sure that the public and the associated committees were apprised of what was going on.

Mr. Madsen made a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Madsen stated that the first Administrative Modification was changes to the FY 2017 UPWP, which he noted was primarily due to the ALDOT bookkeeping process. He stated that there were a few changes in the financial table, but there was nothing substantive or nothing that was necessarily impacting the funds they received or how they disbursed them.

Mr. Madsen stated that the second Administrative Modification was a project addition. He stated that this was not ALDOT but Federal Highway. He stated that it was Federal maintenance on State Road 53, all the way to the Limestone County line. He stated that it was in the amount of \$2.6 million, and that it was Federal and State funds only, no MPO funds, but because the work was in the MPO area, the MPO Staff was compelled to let the MPO committees know this was happening.

Mr. Madsen stated that the last Administrative Modification was at the Wheeler National Wildlife Refuge. He stated that they were not adding it to the TIP because it was FY 2020, and they were not adding it to the LRTP because it was not a capacity adding project. He stated that this was

actually the addition of a turn lane and a resurfacing project. He stated that it was 100 percent Federally funded through the National Park System.

Mr. Madsen indicated the area on the displayed map.

Acting Chairman Devlin inquired as to the exact location.

Mr. Madsen stated that it was just south and east of Mooresville, off Swancott Road.

Mr. Whitley asked if they had traffic counts through Wheeler and asked if they really needed a turn lane.

Mr. Madsen stated that he could not answer that. He stated that this was a Federal project, and they were keen to do it, that he believed they thought they had to have it. He stated that he did not know if they actually kept traffic counts on Federal land.

Ms. Nelson stated that she would say that most of it was probably resurfacing and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Madsen stated that he believed it was.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any Public Comment.

Ms. Nelson stated that on the scheduled quarterly meetings they had for the upcoming year, that in March the meetings fell on the time of Spring Break for Huntsville City Schools, and that the CAC meeting after that fell on Memorial Day. She stated that she would like to propose that they move these meetings back on the calendar one week so that persons might be able to actually attend the meetings.



Acting Chairman Devlin asked Mr. Madsen if this could be done as an Administrative matter.

Mr. Madsen stated that they could do so, noting that the biggest challenge would be coordinating the Board members' calendars. He stated that it could be a little bit of a challenge to schedule because of the Mayors and the County Chairman.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if they could agree that they would move them off those dates.

Mr. Madsen stated that they would take a look at it and see if they could move them off those dates.

Mr. Slyman stated that he had a question concerning Old Monrovia and Capshaw. He stated that he had heard they might be talking about moving that up in the schedule and asked if Mr. Madsen had any update on that.

Mr. Madsen stated that he did not have an update at this time.

Mr. Slyman asked if Mr. Madsen could send something out on this or if they could get this at the next meeting.

Mr. Madsen asked Ms. Martin if she knew of anything on this.

Ms. Martin stated that they were looking into it, that they were getting a proposal to do a corridor study to investigate whether or not Capshaw would be a viable alternative to the widening on US 72 West.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that they were going to do both, that

it was a question as to which one they would do first.

Ms. Martin stated that was correct.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that they had sent that request to the MPO.

Mr. Alan Spearman, a guest, stated that he would be interested to know, from all the data that was collected, what the annualized spending for Huntsville Metro was on roads and highways for the last five years, and what the projection would be for the next five years. He stated that, obviously, with "Restore Our Roads," Huntsville was going to take a share of the total Alabama road and highway spending, and it would be interesting to know how much share it was going to take.

Mr. Madsen stated that he did not have that information at his fingertips, but that he believed between the municipality and the MPO, they could figure out a number.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if the basic information would be on the website.

Mr. Madsen stated that if one wanted to go through it and do the addition, it would be.

Mr. Jeff North, a guest, stated that he had a question about the Highway 72 lane expansion from Providence Main Street to County Line Road. He asked if there was any official information about the status of that project. He asked if it had been put out for bid or anything.

Mr. Madsen stated he believed it was in Preliminary Engineering.

Ms. Martin stated that was correct. She stated that the State was moving forward in that design. She stated that she could not speak for them, but she knew that the last time they had talked about it, ALDOT was trying to bring it back to within budget.

Mr. North asked if the land acquisition had started.

Ms. Martin stated that they had not started the land acquisition.

Mr. North asked if they happened to know if that project was high on the list.

Mr. Madsen stated that it was considered priority, that he thought the delay had been because it came in so far over budget and ALDOT was trying to figure out how to get it back within the number they needed. He stated that if one went along there and looked at the difficulties, both infrastructurally and widening, that the cost of acquiring the right-of-way was a significant part of it, and one of the lanes would be in an existing culvert. He stated that it came in so far over that the City of Huntsville had to ask the State to re-examine how it would get done. He stated that if one drove it, one knew there was a congestion issue there.

Acting Chairman Devlin asked if there was any other businesses.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Devlin stated that they stood adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned on August 28, 2017, at 5:40 p.m.)

