

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE
HUNTSVILLE AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MINUTES**

Regular Meeting - May 21, 2018 - 5:10 p.m

**City Council Conference Room, Municipal Building
Huntsville, Alabama**

Committee Members Present:

Mr. John Ofenloch	Chairman - City of Huntsville
Mr. Trent Griffin	City of Huntsville
Mr. Larry Mason	City of Madison
Ms. Jennifer Nelson	City of Huntsville
Mr. Todd Slyman	City of Huntsville
Mr. Tony Smith	City of Huntsville
Mr. Gary T. Whitley	City of Huntsville

Staff Members Present:

Mr. Dennis Madsen	MPO Staff
Ms. Paige Colburn	MPO Staff
Ms. Connie Graham	MPO Staff
Mr. James Vandiver	MPO Staff

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ofenloch at the time and place noted above.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that he would like to have added to the agenda, under Other Business, Election of Officers. He stated that he was not certain how long persons were supposed to serve as Chairman, but he believed he had served longer than his term. He asked the other members of the Committee to consider what they would like to volunteer for.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was Approval of Minutes.

Mr. Smith moved for approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Council held March 26, 2018.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there was any discussion.

Ms. Nelson stated that she had submitted changes to Ms. Colburn.

Chairman Ofenloch noted he had found two typographical errors, but he did not have that information with him at this time.

Chairman Ofenloch called for the vote on the motion for approval of the March 26, 2018, minutes, and it was unanimously approved by the Committee members present.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was the Alabama Performance Management Agreement between ALDOT and the Huntsville Area MPO.

Chairman Ofenloch asked Ms. Colburn if this was the safety matter.

Ms. Colburn replied in the affirmative, stating that it had to do with all performance measures, including safety performance measures. She stated that the Committee members had been provided a packet of materials that she had numbered in the top, right-hand corner in bold.

Ms. Colburn stated that at the prior CAC meeting, they had discussed the letter that was on page 1 in the packet, noting that this was a letter that had been sent to ALDOT from the MPO on February 1, 2018, having to do with their Safety Performance Measures, noting that the targets they had chosen to adopt were the targets that were the State's Safety Performance targets.

Ms. Colburn noted that the pages in the packet were printed both front and back and stated that pages 2 and 3 were the follow-up to that letter. She stated that page 2 was the letter they had received from ALDOT concerning the

requirements of the local MPOs as to Performance Measures. She stated that this set out that the agreement had to be signed by May 27th, and that any amendments to their Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) or Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) that would occur after May 27th must include the items listed on page 2.

Ms. Colburn stated that page 3 began the Alabama Performance Management Agreement itself. She stated that this had been emailed to the members of the CAC the prior week, and they would be emailing it to the TCC and MPO members within the next couple of days. She stated that pages 3 through 8 of the handout contained this agreement in its entirety. She stated that the only thing the MPO staff had seen in this agreement that had not already been covered in their other Performance Measures documents up to this point was on page 4, toward the bottom, I. and ii., concerning performance data. She stated that they had never seen the MPO providing performance data for any of these targets before so that was new information for them.

Ms. Colburn stated that they had communicated with ALDOT about this and what was expected of them, particularly because back on page 2, being the first letter related to the Performance Measures Agreement, under the things required was a Systems Performance Report, and in parentheses, "Evaluation of the Targets." She continued that this was another thing they had never seen before, that they had not seen a Systems Performance Report as a requirement, or an evaluation of the targets, nor had they seen a lot of this data that needed to be provided.

Ms. Colburn stated that ALDOT had assured them that all of this was new to everyone and that they would be sending them the initial evaluation of

targets for the current year, which would have to be added to the plan for the next year. She stated that between this time and the upcoming year, they would be doing a lot of changes, with the upcoming 2020 to 2023 TIP, as well as their upcoming 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Ms. Colburn stated that, hopefully, this agreement would be signed by the MPO on May 30th. She stated that this would be a few days after the May 27th deadline, but ALDOT had assured them that that would be fine, in that this MPO meeting had been scheduled for May 30th for over a year, and they would not have to push it back in order to get the agreement signed by May 27th.

Ms. Colburn stated that the agreement basically discussed how ALDOT and the MPO would collaborate for the purposes of performance measurements and the targets, including all the different types of performance measures, not just Safety Performance Measures. She stated that she had talked with the CAC previously about Safety Performance Measures, but there were others, and they would be hearing a lot more about them in the future, especially as they worked on this agreement.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that it concerned him that they would project there would be 1,000 deaths in a year as a goal to reach, and perhaps not enough people would be injured. He stated that in the document it stated that they could set their own goals, but if ALDOT did not like it, they could change their goals. He questioned all of this. He asked if there was a penalty if they did not meet their goals or if they exceeded their goals.

Ms. Colburn stated that there was no financial penalty for the MPOs related to any of the Performance Measures targets, any of the Performance Measures data collection or reporting. She stated that at one time there was a

penalty related to the Safety ones, but that had been stricken in mid 2017, not long after the new Administration came into office. She stated that any of the financial penalties related to Performance Management had been stricken from this process. She stated that it was an unfunded mandate with literally no recourse if you don't do it, but you have to do it.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if they were just funding more staff for ALDOT.

Ms. Colburn replied in the negative, stating that she believed it was the same staff that had to do all this, that it was just other duties as assigned. She stated that the agreement was just saying that they were agreeing to work with them.

Ms. Nelson asked what kind of Livability Performance Measures would be developed or included in this and when they would be implemented, if it would be the next round of the LRTP, and if they would be tied exclusively back to their goals and objectives. She stated that she had seen a lot of safety things, and a little bit about emissions and a little bit about fleet vehicles, but not much about, for instance, continuity of networks, or people being able to walk to a park, or what percentage of facilities were complete streets, or things like that. She stated that she did not see those in the document. She asked if there was room to continue to develop Performance Measures beyond what ALDOT specified and tied in, within their planning document.

Ms. Colburn stated that she believed they had room to do anything with Performance Measures they wanted to do, as an MPO. She continued that the types of Performance Measures that were required were Safety, Bridges, Freight System Reliability, and National Highway System Reliability. She stated that those were the three big Performance Measures FHWA was looking

at at this time, in general. She stated that none of them had anything to do directly with the Livability principals that were also required by the Feds to be included in all their documentation. She stated that she had seen other MPOs mesh the two and use the required Performance Measures and this Transportation Performance Management Program in general as a way to get Livability factors more power in their planning documents because both the Livability principals and factors and the Performance Management Program materials were required in all of their documentation moving forward, so other MPOs had thought that it made sense to merge them, and merge those goals. She stated that this was certainly something they could do, in theory.

Ms. Nelson asked what, then, would be up for voting for approval, the fact that any Performance Measures were included at all or the specific ones that were listed.

Ms. Colburn stated that, actually, the CAC did not have to vote on the Alabama Performance Management Agreement at all. She stated that the reason it was on their agenda was to make them aware of this agreement. She stated that the MPO had to sign it, that they had to sign it by May 27th, but they had been given a little bit of wiggle room to have them sign it by May 30th because that was their pre-scheduled MPO meeting date. She stated that there was nothing to vote on with this, that if one would notice on the agenda, there was not a resolution attached to this, that it was just a discussion of the agreement. She continued that the reason this agreement was first on the agenda was because when the TCC and MPO meetings would be held, none of the amendments to the TIP and the LRTP, which she noted were also included on the agenda, could happen until this agreement had been signed. She stated that the agreement had to come first, and then the resolutions amending the

documents would come after that.

Mr. Griffin stated that he was looking at, on page 4, the "Interstate System and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program," and that item No. 4 was "Percent Change in Tailpipe CO₂ Emissions on the National Highway System from the Calendar Year 2017." He asked if it was correct that Alabama did not currently do any kind of assessment on those tailpipe emissions.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that there were no safety inspections.

Mr. Griffin asked if this was saying that they would like to move toward measuring these emissions in the state of Alabama.

Ms. Colburn stated that iii. at the top of the page said, "Targets for assessing performance of the National Highway System, Freight Movement on the Interstate System, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program...." She stated that the last one, "Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program," applied only to cities or MPOs that were in non-attainment, or, rather, in attainment. She stated that it appeared to be backwards, but if a city was in attainment of the air quality emissions criteria, which she noted meant the air was too bad, too polluted, these things had to be done. She stated that these things were not required for their MPO because they were in non-attainment, which meant they had not attained the levels of CO₂ emissions, and bad air, and pollution in general, that would require them to do percent change in tailpipe CO₂ emissions, et cetera. She stated that that would be required for the city of Birmingham, noting that the Birmingham MPO was the only MPO in the state that was currently in attainment for CO₂ emissions.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if it was correct that at one time Huntsville

was in attainment because of pollution from Decatur, the winds blowing up the river.

Ms. Nelson stated that she believed they were borderline.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that they were very close because there was discussion about restricting some industry in the Huntsville area.

Ms. Graham stated that it got close, and they had done some studies, and they fell right below the line.

Ms. Colburn stated that since then it had gone down, that between the last time it had been tested, which was before her time with the MPO, and the time it was most recently tested, in 2015, it had gone down significantly, so they were further away from being in attainment at this time than they had been previously.

Ms. Colburn stated that that part of the agreement did not apply to them, but they were still going to put it in there because that was the language they had to use.

Ms. Colburn introduced Mr. Larry Mason, who was just entering the meeting, stating that he was a representative from the city of Madison.

Chairman Ofenloch welcomed Mr. Mason to the meeting.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there were any further questions or discussion concerning the Performance Measures Agreement.

There was no response.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was an Amendment to the FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Ms. Colburn made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Colburn stated that this was an amendment related to Performance Measures again. She stated that as the members had seen in the document

they had been discussing, on page 2, the second requirement, in the third paragraph in the letter stated, "The second requirement relates to the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and their Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). If either of these documents are amended after May 27, 2018, the document **must** include the following." She stated that after that there were the three bullets she had read from earlier.

Ms. Colburn stated that they were, with Resolution No. 04-18, amending the TIP to include those three things, that they were including them in the form of a Performance Measures Appendix. She continued that this would include a copy of the February letter which was page No. 1 in the packet. She stated that this established their Safety Targets, that it showed that they had chosen to support ALDOT's Safety Targets. She continued that it would also include a signed copy of the Alabama Performance Management Agreement that they had just discussed, pages 3 through 8 in the packet.

Ms. Colburn stated that, also, there would be a brief Systems Performance Report, which she stated was currently a placeholder for ALDOT's upcoming evaluation of the current Safety Targets. She stated that ALDOT had told MPO Staff that they were taking care of that for the current year, so MPO Staff was putting a placeholder in for that, for ALDOT to send the language that needed to be there for the Systems Performance Report.

Ms. Colburn stated that they would continue to wait on guidance as to how to do this moving forward and how much MPO work, data collection, and things such as that, would be required moving forward. She stated that, as they had discussed earlier, there was no penalty for the MPO not doing any of this, but there were penalties for the State not doing it, which she noted was why the State was doing so much of it, whereas they were doing a lot of

supporting of the State's numbers.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there was any further discussion of Resolution No. 04-18.

Mr. Griffin moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 04-18, adding a Performance Measures Appendix to the Adopted 2016-2019 TIP.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Smith.

Chairman Ofenloch called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Committee members present.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the Year 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Ms. Colburn made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Colburn stated that this was very similar to the previous item. She stated that Resolution No. 05-18 amended the Year 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan to add a Performance Measures Appendix. She stated that, again, there was a copy of the letter, a copy of the Agreement, and a brief Systems Performance Report that was a placeholder for the information that ALDOT would be adding.

Mr. Griffin moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 05-18, to add a Performance Measures Appendix to the adopted Year 2040 LRTP.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Smith.

Chairman Ofenloch called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Committee members present.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was adoption of the FY 2019 UPWP.

Ms. Colburn made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Colburn stated that the Committee members had seen the Unified

Planning Work Program presentation many times over the course of the years, and they would see a longer version of it when they got to the final Fiscal Year 2019 Unified Planning Work Program, but that in James Moore's absence, she would be doing a shortened version of the presentation.

Ms. Colburn stated that the 2019 Draft UPWP was their budget, essentially, that it was the FY 2019 Planning Funds that were part of the MPO grant. She stated that these Planning Funds were allocated to the City of Huntsville's Planning Department by an agreement with the State and between all the other MPO jurisdictions, and it allowed all the activities, within a financially constrained budget, to be conducted by the MPO staff.

Ms. Colburn stated that this was updated every year, to provide citizens and stakeholders the necessary transparency to see all the funding and which tasks were going to be done with the funding. She stated that it was currently in public review, that the folders she was indicating were in the City of Huntsville Planning Department, as well as at the Huntsville-Madison County Public Library, and they were collecting comments from everyone who loved to read these documents.

Ms. Colburn stated that the draft would be due to ALDOT on June 15, so they could actually make some edits, and things such as that, to the document between this date and June 15, if the Committee members were interested in this. She continued that the final would be due on September 10, so they would be seeing this on their agenda again, but it would be the final version of the UPWP at the August meeting.

Ms. Colburn stated that the tasks of the UPWP included Administration, Data Development and Maintenance, and Special Studies. She stated that they had the Special Studies slide in because they had been talking a lot about these,

the Transit Study they had done the prior year and the Commuter Study. She stated that these studies were examples of the types of studies that were paid for in the UPWP.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if it would be correct to call those slush-fund studies, if it was money they had left over.

Ms. Colburn stated that those were things they really needed to get done because they were way overdue. She stated that the Commuter Study was something she believed would really help their TIP and LRTP report and their Congestion Management Plan, and they had needed a Transit plan for many, many years.

Ms. Colburn stated that the prior year, when the Committee had looked at the FY 2018 UPWP, they had had a question about the 2018 versus 2017, and they had brought it up on the MPO website and looked at all the data, et cetera, so this time she had tried to have it all in one slide, the 2017-2018 Budget vs. the 2018-2019 Budget. She stated that one could see that the budget for 2018 was much higher than the one for 2019, and that was because in March, the MPO had followed this Committee's recommendation to add \$59,700 of FY 2015 Rollover Funds for a Regional Commuter Study. She stated that these funds would expire, and could no longer be used, in September of 2018, that they were only good for three years on any of these planning funds you could roll over. She reiterated that that was why that budget was actually higher, noting that the 2019 Budget did not yet include any rollover funds. She stated that they did not have any that had to be spent by September of 2019, so there was still some time to discuss that with ALDOT, and they would discuss it with some of the member jurisdictions and see if there were more projects that would come up that rollover funds might be good for. She stated that at this

time they did not know how much rollover funds they might have available to them for this UPWP at this time.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if they did not keep a running budget, if they did not have some sense as to where they were in that \$827,000 budget.

Ms. Colburn replied in the negative, stating that she did not personally.

Mr. Madsen stated that Accounting did, but there was always a little bit of movement.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that he was aware that they never wanted to give a firm number because there was always the unexpected, that he understood that.

Ms. Colburn stated that, also, ALDOT's numbers were usually different from theirs, so there was discussion between ALDOT and the City of Huntsville Accounting.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if they should be optimistic for the upcoming year.

Ms. Colburn replied in the affirmative, stating that she believed they should, especially because Tanjie Kling's salary had not come out of that for FY 2017 or FY 2018. She stated that she believed there would be rollover funds, that personally she was optimistic.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there were any questions concerning Resolution No. 06-18.

Mr. Whitley asked, concerning the slide that stated "within a financially constrained budget," what budget that was, if it was a State budget, a Federal budget, or if that was the City. He asked whose budget was financially constrained.

Ms. Colburn stated that was a good question that she could not answer,

noting that that was a James Moore slide. She continued that she was guessing that that was the language in the Code of Federal Regulations, and that all these budgets needed to be exact, that they were not supposed to have rollover, that it was supposed to be doing everything that needed to be done, and all the facts were supposed to meet exactly what the UPWP said they would be. She stated that she was pretty sure that was what that language was and where it came from. She stated that she would determine if that was correct and email him concerning it.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Smith moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 06-18, adopting the FY 2019 UPWP.

Said motion was duly seconded by Ms. Nelson.

Chairman Ofenloch called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Committee members present.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was Adoption of the 2018 Public Participation Plan.

Ms. Colburn made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Colburn stated that this was the adoption of the Final 2018 Public Participation Plan. She stated that this was also still out for public review, in the downtown library or in the City of Huntsville Planning Department. She stated that this document had last come before the Committee in December of 2016, at Tanjie's last meeting with them. She stated that it was the Draft 2017 Public Participation Plan at that time, and at this time it was the Final 2018 Public Participation Plan. She stated that some changes had been made, thanks to the TMA Certification Review, where FHWA and FTA had come down and gone through three days of review of all of their policies and processes, and

everything like that, in February of 2017. She stated that they had had several suggestions for their Public Participation Plan, so they had put those suggestions into the plan.

Ms. Colburn stated that one of these included a chart that listed all the organizations that would be contacted, or could be contacted, in relation to the plan. She continued that, also, they had numbers that needed to be updated in the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) plan, which she noted was another part of this plan. She stated that the second bullet on the display included the Title VI Limited English Proficiency Plan as an appendix. She stated that this was updated to include a lot of their partner agencies that had not existed in 2013, which she noted was the last edition of this plan.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that he knew what "limited English proficiency" was but asked what the plan said.

Ms. Colburn stated that it talked about how to reach populations with limited English proficiency and talked about the density of the population, the number of languages, how many persons spoke languages other than English in the home. She continued that it listed a lot of those kinds of things, that kind of data.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if that was obtained from the Census.

Mr. Vandiver and Ms. Graham replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Colburn stated that this also included how they would get interpreters, when an interpreter was needed, and information on how to get translated versions of their documents.

Mr. Slyman inquired as to how often they would use interpreters.

Ms. Colburn stated that they had not used interpreters since she had been with them. She stated that they had presented this plan, the LEP and the

PPP, to the Hispanic Latino Advisory Council of Huntsville and Madison County and the North Alabama Hispanic Business Association, and they both thought that was good, and they had interpreters they were willing to lend to the MPO in the event they were needed. She stated that they thought the plan looked pretty much like ones they had seen before, and they had had no further comment. She stated that, actually, she was hoping to get a written comment so she could put it in the plan.

Ms. Nelson inquired, concerning the descriptions of the joint committees, the CAC and TCC, if the scope of the CAC had changed at all between the last version and this version of the Public Participation Plan.

Ms. Colburn stated that she was pretty sure it had not.

Ms. Nelson stated that she was looking at it, and some of it she had not been completely aware of.

Ms. Colburn stated that that was language taken from the 2016 agreement. She stated that she did not have the page number, but she could bring it up on the website.

Ms. Colburn stated that the CAC was a huge foundation of the Public Participation Plan, that they were the public, that they were volunteering their time to make all these comments on the documents and the projects of the Metropolitan Planning Organization. She stated that they were talked about somewhat extensively throughout the Plan.

Ms. Colburn stated that what was being displayed was part of the plan, and it talked about the advisory committees, the CAC's and the TCC's roles, where the groups met. She stated that it even stated that the CAC meeting dates may change due to holidays. She stated, concerning whether any of this was different between the 2013 version and the 2016 version, that she had not

changed the section at all, so if any of the bullets were different, they had been changed by Tanjie Kling, who had overseen the new 2016 agreement at the end of 2015. She stated that theirs was the first agreement in the state to include the FAST Act, so it was FAST Act compliant, with all the bullets that were required for the CAC in the FAST Act. She continued that it listed the makeup of the CAC.

Ms. Nelson stated that she thought it was interesting as to initiating activities related to providing area residents the opportunity to input things. She stated that she had not realized they were also supposed to be advertising this kind of thing, in addition to working with the City with the MPO.

Ms. Colburn stated that it did state "This Committee is tasked with the following responsibilities." She stated she believed that was in the Federal language and in their agreement language because it was something the FHWA wanted the public to do, that they wanted the Committee members to be able to have public conversations, and then bring those conversations before the CAC. She stated that they had seen this a lot in other committees, where people had a survey or a questionnaire, throughout the neighborhood associations, and things such as that, for example, and then they would bring that before the Zoning Committee, and other types of committees. She stated that this was similar, in that capacity, that it was within the power of the CAC to do those kinds of things for the MPO.

Ms. Colburn indicated that particular bullet on the display, stating that it was "Initiate actions related to providing area residents the opportunity to input individual, group, private, and semi-private ideas, suggestions, needs, and concepts for consideration and recommendation to the Metropolitan Planning Organization and/or the Technical Coordinating Committee." She

stated that that would be like organizing a neighborhood group or using on-line surveys or questionnaires and bringing those ideas to the MPO, at this CAC forum.

Ms. Nelson inquired as to whether there would be a way to have more dialogue between the CAC and the TCC when they had these ideas, comments, et cetera, prior to it going before the MPO. She stated that for her, that would be ideal, to have a little more dialogue and get a little more feedback on certain things.

Chairman Ofenloch asked Ms. Colburn if she could back up to where it talked about the composition of this Committee.

Ms. Colburn complied with the request.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that it appeared there were supposed to be 16 members of the Committee.

Ms. Colburn stated that was correct.

Chairman Ofenloch inquired as to when they had last had in attendance a representative from Owens Cross Roads or Triana, or if they had had anyone.

Ms. Colburn stated that she believed someone from Owens Cross Roads had attended during the situation with the old Highway 431 bridges, noting that that would have been in August of 2017.

Mr. Madsen stated that these persons were contacted concerning the meetings, but they had to stop short of badgering them. He stated that they certainly appreciated the time of the persons who attended the meetings of this Committee because they recognized how many persons were unwilling to make this commitment, to the point that in the TMA certification, the Feds had actually suggested opening it up so that it became less about appointments and more about just whoever wanted to come could do so.

Ms. Nelson asked if that would mean they would consider more at-large members.

Mr. Madsen stated that that was correct. He stated that the appointment system was generally used so that no one municipality would be over represented, but at this time they were at the point where some did not care, and they could not reach them, even in an informally identified forum.

Chairman Ofenloch suggested they could notify Triana and Owens Cross Roads their slots were being taken away and see what reaction they would get.

Ms. Colburn stated that there was a lot that could be done with this. She stated that after the TMA Certification Review, they had gone through and looked at attendance for all Committee members for as long as attendance had been taken and added the sign-in sheets for 2016 and 2017, at the prompting of FHWA and FTA, and had seen the general attendance of everybody. She stated that they had some perfect attendance people, which was awesome, but they also had some people who had never attended, not once since they had been assigned.

Ms. Colburn stated that since Chairman Ofenloch had been talking about elections, she thought that as part of the election process for the CAC, it would be great to start looking at getting more representatives, even if it was at large. She stated that there was a lot of communication that could happen on how to set that up and what they would do with it. She stated that they would just have to ask FHWA exactly how at large was "at-large," what they meant by setting up the CAC as a "Y'all come" kind of committee.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that he could see that, but he could also see a very active section outnumbering everybody else. He stated that balance was a

good idea, if they could get the balance.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if as one of his outgoing acts, he could ask Ms. Colburn to contact Owens Cross Roads and Triana and ask if they were still interested in having people on the CAC.

Ms. Colburn stated that she could certainly do so, that that was something the staff could do for the CAC.

Ms. Nelson asked if there was a maximum number for this Committee, or if they could just take their 16 and add an additional 8.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the paragraph stated "16 members," but he supposed the paragraph could be changed.

Mr. Madsen stated that he did not believe that was an issue at this time, but as they grew, if at a certain point in the future the spots did become competitive again, and by opening them up, they had created an imbalance, all of a sudden folks might be interested and might feel like they were being railroaded.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the way he was feeling about it at this time, he would like for them to just contact Owens Cross Roads and Triana and see if they were interested. He continued that maybe they were going to say they did not care. He stated that he would like to think they would say, "Wait. You can't take those away from us." He stated that maybe they would make sure that someone would show up, that that would be nice.

Ms. Colburn stated that one thing that she had thought of was the concept of the Madison County representatives representing Owens Cross Roads and the Town of Triana, even though they did not live there. She stated that there were a lot of ways to do this.

Mr. Slyman asked what areas were being represented at this time.

Ms. Colburn stated that there were four or five from the City of Huntsville and one from the City of Madison.

There was a discussion concerning who the Committee members in attendance represented, with six members being from the City of Huntsville and one from the City of Madison.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there were any representatives from Madison County, if the County Commission appointed any representatives.

Ms. Colburn stated that there was no one in attendance at the meeting at this time, but that Madison County had two representatives.

Mr. Whitley asked if there was a list of these representatives in this document, or if it was someplace else.

Ms. Colburn displayed a list of CAC members, noting that, however, it had not been updated recently.

It was noted that Bob Devlin represented Madison County .

Chairman Ofenloch stated that Mr. Devlin had advised him that he had a conflict and would not be in attendance at the meeting. He stated that if Mr. Devlin could not attend a meeting, he always let him know.

Ms. Colburn stated that they had contacted the representatives for Triana and Owens Cross Roads.

Ms. Nelson asked if they could just cut all the designated seats in half, and then have eight at-large seats.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if since they were appointed by politicians, they would be free to change this around.

Mr. Madsen stated that they would have to go through a By-Law amendment process.

Ms. Colburn stated that the Committee members could let them know if

they were aware of persons who would be interested in representing one of the spots on the Committee.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there was any further discussion concerning the 2018 Public Participation Plan, Resolution No. 07-18.

Mr. Smith moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 07-18, adopting the 2018 Public Participation Plan.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Griffin.

Chairman Ofenloch called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Committee members present.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was Review of Administrative Modifications to MPO documents since last MPO meeting.

Ms. Colburn made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Colburn stated that "Administrative Modifications" were routine edits to MPO documents, noting that this also included Highway Safety Improvement Program project additions which were automatically added to the STIP, which she noted was the State Transportation Improvement Program. She stated that the MPO staff, as a result of the TMA Certification Review in 2017, at this time reported these Administrative Modifications to the CAC, TCC, and MPO each quarter. She stated that, however, there were none for this meeting because it had been only eight weeks to the day since the last CAC meeting. She stated that they had not made any Administrative Modifications in those eight weeks, but they had done a TMA Certification Review update.

Ms. Colburn stated that she had mentioned it in passing several times, and the Committee members had seen the TMA Certification Review. She asked that they go back to their packets, with the numbers in the upper,

right-hand corner. She stated that on page 9 was a letter they had received in April from FHWA, requesting an update on the status of the TMA Certification Review recommendations. She stated that they had not had any required actions, noting that they did not want these because there could be penalties. She stated that recommendations were things that they needed to do between this time and the time of the next TMA Certification Review. She continued that the next TMA Certification Review would be in 2021. She stated that as one could see in this letter, they had had to respond by May 15th. She stated that they had listed all the recommendations that were in their TMA Certification Review for the TIP, the LRTP, Civil Rights, and the Non-motorized Planning/Livability.

Ms. Colburn stated that they had responded to this with the letter on pages 11-13. She stated that she believed it was sent one day early. She continued that it had all the actions that had been performed by the MPO on many of these things. She reiterated that most of these things did not need to be implemented yet, that on most of the recommendations they still had several years before they would have to complete their actions for these recommendations. She continued that next to one of them was "To be implemented by the next TIP update" and noted that the next TIP update was 2019, the following year. She stated that these were the ones that would be coming up sooner. She stated that then one would see "To be implemented by the next LRTP and TIP updates," noting that the next LRTP update was 2020. She stated that the next one after that was "To be implemented by the next Certification Review," which was 2021.

Ms. Colburn stated that they had completed several actions toward these recommendations, although none of them were 100 percent complete at this

time. She continued that they did have some years to complete every one of them. She stated that she did not know if they would have to do a letter such as this each year, that she believed they just did an annual review to check up on them, but if needed, they could send a letter such as this each year.

Ms. Colburn stated that there was no voting requirement on this item.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there were any other questions of Ms. Colburn concerning this item.

Mr. Griffin stated that he recalled that at the last meeting they had discussed the stations that would be going up at Alabama A&M, the electric stations, and he had asked a question concerning whether or not the chargers would be accessible to the staff, the students, and the public, and he was wondering if that had been asked upstream, and, if so, what the response had been.

Ms. Colburn stated that the chargers were very specific to the equipment the grant funded, so they would not be available to anyone, except for those vehicles. She stated that that grant would be coming up again, that Madison County was applying for it for the U.S. Space & Rocket Center, for buses on their campus, and that would be the same use, that those chargers were specific to the equipment they were purchasing.

Mr. Griffin asked what had been done in order to get public chargers at UAH, if that was school-funded or State-funded.

Ms. Colburn stated that she did not know the answer to that, but she could find out.

Mr. Madsen stated that it was most likely a UAH initiative.

Ms. Colburn stated that she would look into that.

After further discussion about such chargers, Mr. Griffin stated that the

charger across from City Hall was the only high-speed charger in the city at this time.

Ms. Colburn stated that she believed there were other funding sources, but they had expired at this time. She stated that she would look into that also because there were once specific charging stations and alternative fuels being available at so many different points within a geographic area.

Ms. Nelson suggested that they could make that part of the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that he would think there would be a study to put these several different places around the city, so that not everyone in Huntsville had to come to one spot. He stated that there might be a long line, and in 10 years, there might be a lot longer line.

Mr. Mason stated that he had noticed that one of the things to be implemented by the next Certification Review was Non-motorized Planning/Livability.

Ms. Colburn stated that was correct.

Mr. Mason stated that he was curious as to whether the City had made any policy decisions about electric bikes and electric scooters. He asked whether or not they were going to be considered to be motorized.

Mr. Madsen stated that that answer would be for the City of Huntsville alone and not as part of the MPO. He continued that the City of Huntsville was currently working through an ordinance promoting Bike Share. He stated that at this time, with the current Bike Share, one had to get a business license and then make arrangements to use part of a roadway, but as they started to see more electric bikes and electric scooters, they needed to start considering geofencing areas, where those could be left and where they could not be, as

well as guidelines for using them. He stated that if one had ridden one of the electric scooters, one would recognize one would not want to allow it on a ped-heavy sidewalk or a narrow sidewalk because they moved at about 15 miles an hour, which was a pretty good clip, and, also, it was not something that was consistent with a crowded sidewalk with pedestrians. He reiterated that this was only for the City of Huntsville at this time, that the MPO was not addressing anything like that, and he could not speak for other municipalities.

Mr. Mason asked if they believed the State would weigh in on this.

Ms. Colburn stated that they might call the City of Huntsville and request a copy of what might be passed to use as reference material.

Mr. Madsen stated that cities such as Birmingham were leading this effort at this time, not the State.

Mr. Slyman stated that at the last meeting, they had talked again about Old Monrovia and Capshaw, and they were taking the matter, by letter, to the MPO. He asked if they had done this.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that they had sent a letter concerning this to the MPO.

Mr. Slyman stated that he was just wondering about how that was received, what they had said, et cetera.

Mr. Madsen stated that the Board had received it, and he believed the matter was still under discussion, particularly between Madison County Engineering and the City of Huntsville Engineering.

Mr. Madsen stated that the MPO staff had suggested, especially as Highway 72 languished as they struggled to get the cost back under control there, that Capshaw was a good alternative route.

Mr. Slyman stated that from what he had heard, somebody had said

something about widening Highway 72 as far as they could with the money they had originally set, and he believed somebody had said that might be to Nance Road.

Mr. Madsen stated that the MPO had not been in that discussion at this point, that they were waiting on direction from the State.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that the next item on the agenda was Public Comment. He stated to Ms. Nelson that it was his understanding she wished to comment at this time.

Ms. Nelson stated that if any member of the public wished to comment at this time, to please do so.

There was no response.

Ms. Nelson's comments were as follows:

"My name is Jennifer Nelson, and I am a resident of Big Cove, an MPO Citizens Advisory Committee member, and a registered professional Transportation Engineer and Planner. I would like to submit formal comments on the proposed Cecil Ashburn Corridor project, in light of recent news regarding excessive bid estimates for construction on the entire corridor, which are almost double the initial \$15 million budgeted via the "Restore Our Roads" program.

"As a current resident of Big Cove, I am concerned about the impact of a Cecil Ashburn closure, whether complete or intermittent, on my personal travels and on local businesses and residents on both sides of the mountain. As a citizen and transportation engineer, I am concerned about the project justification, design specifications, and budget overruns, both in the bidding phase and construction phase.

"In short, major negative safety and economic impacts will occur from

complete closure of Cecil Ashburn, which is being proposed as a cost-savings measure. And at a higher level, I believe using traffic volume as the major justification of the project is based on faulty premises relating to perceived total roadway capacity within the Major Street Plan and travel demand modeling software used by ALDOT and the City.

"While there are certainly operational issues on Cecil Ashburn within the study limits of Donegal Drive to 431, there are multiple solutions to fixing these issues within the original budget of \$15 million, without doubling the travel lane capacity of the entire corridor, which will cause major safety issues due to increased attempted travel speeds in an intrinsically hazardous environment on the side of a mountain. (See Appendix for my suggestions.)

"To address multiple concerns relating to safety, timeliness, economic impact, cost overruns, and fear of a general misallocation of significant financial resources, I am proposing the City of Huntsville take the opportunity to revise some of their bid documents to consider Cecil Ashburn corridor improvements in sections or phases, which will allow us to not only prioritize certain sections or phases, but also contract this work out by section, as not many firms have expertise in all components of the proposed roadway project.

"Right now it takes me approximately 10 minutes to get from my house on Taylor Road to Jones Valley. Using either Governors Drive or Green Mountain Road increases that one-way route time to 25 minutes. In the event of total road closure of Cecil Ashburn, my round-trip to Jones Valley, the YMCA, or other destinations in South Huntsville will take almost an hour to complete versus a 20-minute round-trip now, or 30-35 minutes if one leg is timed to occur during the intermittent scheduled peak period "open" window. The difference between 30 and 60 minutes of driving is enough to cause me to

cancel my trip altogether or patronize an acceptable substitute on this side of the mountain, if existing, and I suspect many other residents of Big Cove would make the same choice.

"A problem is that Big Cove is underserved in a variety of measures, whether it is jobs, high schools, good restaurants, clothing stores, churches, summer camps, et cetera, and there is no acceptable substitute over here. Personally, if I am unable to utilize Cecil Ashburn, I will end up canceling my YMCA membership and summer camps for my children. It is unlikely that we will eat at any restaurant or frequent other businesses south of Drake Avenue or Airport Road for the duration of road closure. I cannot easily see two of my doctors, attend a local house of worship, enroll my children in music lessons, or visit Target and other stores we go to on a weekly basis. Our work and pre-school commutes on Governors Drive will get much longer.

"A single year of complete corridor closure is enough to create a significant negative sales and operational impact on all of the aforementioned businesses in Jones Valley and South Huntsville, but it is not long enough to actually entice developers to build something in Big Cove.

"Further, major safety issues arise with complete 24-hour corridor closure versus keeping Cecil Ashburn open several hours a day, and relatively easily openable in the event of emergency. A significant number of doctors and other health care personnel live in the Big Cove area. If there is a crash on Governors, and that road is completely shut down to clear it, as seems to happen every week or two, it will be impossible for these healthcare workers or ambulances crossing the mountain in either direction to access their destinations in a timely manner, and people will die as a result. Using US 72 as an alternative to planned or emergency closure of both

Cecil Ashburn and Governors Drive will more than double travel time, and Green Mountain Road is not capable of being a regular substitute in its present physical condition. Higher traffic volume on that road will magnify the safety issues that already exist due to its geography and geometry.

"Addressing higher level concerns, from the articles I have read, it appears that the main justification for expanding Cecil Ashburn is its current total daily traffic volume of approximately 17,000 vehicles per day, and the perception that this is approaching the capacity of the corridor. As a transportation engineer, my experience is that the intersection capacity and operations along a corridor are actually the limiting factors for overall throughput and a good level of service, not the travel lane capacity. Targeted performance improvements to intersections and roadway sections with multiple driveways will alleviate pressure on the remainder of the corridor, and actually negate the 'need' for additional travel lanes.

"The State of Alabama and the City of Huntsville utilize travel demand modeling software, called CUBE, to help plan infrastructure improvements. I have used CUBE professionally, as well as the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) upon which it is based. The HCM has changed significantly in emphasis and outcome over the last two decades. The 6th edition was released in October 2016. The current Long-Range Transportation Plan and travel model uses much older HCM methodologies and ALDOT 'approved capacities' from 2004, and classifies Cecil Ashburn as a 'collector' facility, which has an 'approved capacity' of around 16,000 vehicles per day.

"However, with no signalized intersections in a 2-3 mile stretch, I believe Cecil Ashburn should actually be classified as a '2-Lane Uninterrupted flow Highway' between Donegal and Old Big Cove, as defined by HCM 2010

Chapter 15, which has a capacity of over 30,000 vehicles per day at the same Level of Service shown in the LRTP.

"Even the projected 2040 traffic volume on Cecil Ashburn is 25,000-27,000 vehicles/day, below the 2-lane uninterrupted flow facility threshold, though the projected volume is likely excessive and does not take into account rapidly changing trends in ridesharing, gas price increases, or optimized development patterns in Big Cove. Why are we are making major planning decisions based on faulty definitions and outdated resources?

"Yes, these planning-level base daily capacity estimates could be refined a bit, but as a frequent user of this corridor, the only time that there ever seems to be a negative impact on my travel experience is eastbound around 5 pm, +/- 30 minutes, approaching Old Big Cove Road and on Sutton, and occasionally on Sutton westbound in the morning if an incident on Governors has caused a higher traffic volume than usual to utilize Cecil Ashburn. At all other times of day, it flows smoothly and provides scenic views at a reasonable rate of speed (~45mph).

"With regard to speed, I am extremely concerned about the effect of increasing lane capacity from two to four travel lanes on vehicular speed on this corridor. With the ability to pass and swerve, the speed at which people will attempt to travel will increase from 45 miles per hour to likely 60+ miles per hour, based on the false assumption that this road is simply another Governors Drive, or any other 4-lane highway.

"The horizontal and vertical curvature of Cecil Ashburn, however, along with the steep cliffs and drop-offs lining the entire corridor, and constant suboptimal weather conditions, lead to hazardous travel conditions at high speeds (>45mph) regardless of the number of lanes. Despite an 8-ft shoulder,

which I am fearful will disappear or be greatly reduced when rebidding the entire corridor, to try to stay within a \$15 million budget, there is very little margin for error here. The single biggest predictor of crash severity is speed. By 4-laning the entire road, the crashes that will result on this corridor from attempted high-speed travel will be frequent and catastrophic.

"Regarding budget, major roadway projects are notorious for exceeding their bid amounts. Given the level of blasting and construction that will need to take place, especially in the proposed multi-elevation, bifurcated roadway section between the hikers parking lot and Old Big Cove, I cannot imagine that the final cost of the entire corridor will come close to the proposed budget of \$15 million, or even the current estimate of \$25 million+, without substantial design changes, such as shoulder reduction, which would decimate overall and multimodal safety, or complete road closure, causing adverse local impacts as previously described.

"In the interest of time, I would like to make the following request to the City of Huntsville: Please rewrite the bid parameters to consider Cecil Ashburn in phases by section within the study corridor.

"Specifically, Sutton Road and its intersections are one section/phase, and several other phases can be defined based on similar cross-section or other parameter, along the corridor back to Donegal. More firms would then be able to bid on the phases or sections in which their core competencies lie, and, as a city, we would be able to better prioritize and schedule desired roadway improvements.

"While there seems to be a push to address the entire corridor at once, completing one or two phases of upgraded sections will substantially improve multimodal traffic operations, vastly reduce construction/business/safety

impacts, come in well under the total budget of \$15 million, and allow us another chance to re-evaluate whether 4-laning the entire corridor from start to finish is actually justified.

"Thank you for your consideration.

"APPENDIX

"BASIC DESIGN SUGGESTIONS FOR CECIL ASHBURN/SUTTON
ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

"Phase 1:

"Replace signalized intersection at Old Big Cove and Cecil Ashburn with a roundabout to allow continuous traffic flow at peak hours so vehicles do not form excessive queues on the mountain or on Sutton.

"Widen Sutton Road to four travel lanes its entire length from 431 to Old Big Cove, with on-road shoulders or wide sidewalks/greenway section.

"Widen Cecil Ashburn to four lanes for approximately 1/4 to 1/2 miles to the west of Old Big Cove Intersection. This allows both a climbing lane that can merge in, similar to the Jones Valley side, and a downhill slip lane or outside lane giving unimpeded right-turn access to southbound Old Big Cove Road.

"Optimize traffic signal timing on Sutton Road (Taylor and 431) throughout the day.

"Evaluate performance and design of access points/driveways as necessary on Sutton Road, in combination with other measures above.

"Additional Phases (can be completed concurrently):

"Ensure continuous 8'+ shoulders along the entire route and proper connections to Aldridge Creek and Big Cove Creek Greenways, as an essential part of the Huntsville greenway and bike networks.

"Stabilize cliffs and erosion as necessary.

"Etc."

Ms. Nelson thanked the CAC for the opportunity to make this presentation.

Mr. Smith stated that one of the things CAC had talked about the prior year, or the year before that, was fixing the ends of the road.

Ms. Nelson stated that that was exactly what they had said.

Mr. Smith asked if the MPO had considered any of that.

Mr. Madsen stated that that consideration was passed on, that this was a City of Huntsville project so they would be the ones to make the decision on how to proceed. He stated that they were aware of the suggestion.

Ms. Colburn stated that the relationship of this project to the MPO, the CAC, and the TCC was that it was a regionally significant project, listed in their documentation because it was regionally significant in terms of cost and populations affected, but there was no MPO funding in it, there was no Federal funding in it, and there was no State funding in it, so the MPO did not have jurisdiction or purview related to making decisions with regard to this project. She stated that it was listed in their documents as regionally significant because it had to be.

Ms. Nelson asked who was matching the City of Huntsville in "Restore our Roads" if it was not the State of Alabama.

Ms. Colburn stated that the way this project was set up was the State of Alabama allowed the City to use portions of their match in the "Restore our Roads" agreement, which was a \$125 million match, to use portions of it, exclusively of their own money, for two projects, this one and the Research Park Boulevard project. She stated that that was also a regionally

significant project in the Transportation Improvement Program. She stated that these two projects were solely financed by the City of Huntsville.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that, then, the MPO might have a political interest in this but no control.

Ms. Colburn stated that was correct.

Ms. Nelson stated that the rescheduled bid meeting to redo this, to get more people to bid on it, would be Thursday at, she believed, 1 p.m., and that was a mandatory meeting for everyone who wanted to bid. She continued that the City Council meeting would be on Thursday evening. She stated that the actual bid documents were due sometime in early June. She stated further that the MPO meeting would be held in approximately a week and a half, and perhaps there would be some input from them to the City on this matter. She stated that the timing was off on this.

Ms. Nelson stated that in light of the very high bids in relation to the budget, there might be some opportunity to review the bid process in a manner that could solve these problems.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if this Committee wanted to agree to forward this to the MPO as just a statement of information.

Mr. Madsen stated that they typically shared all comments, in some form or fashion, with the MPO Board, just so they would be aware of what was mentioned during the CAC meetings.

Ms. Colburn stated that it would be included in the packets for the MPO.

Ms. Nelson asked if they ended up spending \$30 million on Cecil Ashburn, which other projects this would be coming out of.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that it sounded like the City would be making that decision.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if the CAC members agreed that Ms. Nelson's comments would be forwarded to the MPO as a point of consideration.

Mr. Mason moved to endorse Ms. Nelson's concerns about the Cecil Ashburn Road project.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Smith.

Chairman Ofenloch called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the CAC members present.

There was some discussion concerning the election of officers of the CAC, and it was agreed to look into this matter, with elections perhaps being held at the next meeting of the CAC in August of 2018.

Chairman Ofenloch asked if there was any other business to come before the CAC.

Chairman Ofenloch stated that hearing none, the meeting was adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.