

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

MINUTES

Regular Meeting - November 18, 2019 - 5 p.m.

**City Council Chambers, Municipal Building
Huntsville, Alabama**

Committee Members Present:

Mr. Taron Thorpe	Acting Chairman - City of Huntsville
Mr. Larry Mason	City of Madison
Mr. John Ofenloch	City of Huntsville
Mr. Todd Slyman	City of Huntsville

MPO Staff Members Present:

Ms. Shontrill Lowe
Ms. Paige Colburn
Mr. James Vandiver

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Houston Matthews
Engineering Services Manager
Croy Engineering
603 Madison Street
Huntsville, Alabama 35801

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

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that in the absence of Chairman Tony Smith, he would be presiding over the meeting.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that, unfortunately, they could not call a quorum at this time, but they would continue with the resolutions as presented in the agenda. He stated that they would not ask for motions to be made and

voted on, nor would they read the Minutes into the agenda. He continued that the members should have received the Minutes of the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting of August 26, 2019, in a prior email.

After further discussion, Mr. Slyman moved for approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee held on August 26, 2019.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

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

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Jurisdiction Reports.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there was a member present from Madison County who wished to comment at this time.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there was a member present representing the City of Huntsville who wished to comment at this time.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there was a member present representing the City of Madison who wished to comment at this time.

Mr. Mason stated that he would just report that there were a lot of traffic barrels around, that Hughes Road improvements had started, and, also, more work was being done around the Zierdt Road intersection. He stated that other than that, there were no new plans.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there was a member present representing the Town of Triana who wished to comment at this time.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there was a member present representing the Town of Owens Cross Roads who wished to comment at this time.

There was no response.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Discussion - TRiP2045 - Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update. He stated that he believed Mr. Houston Matthews from Croy Engineering was present to assist with this.

Acting Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Matthews stated that he worked with Croy Engineering in Huntsville, and they had been contracted by the MPO to assist the MPO staff in preparing the Long-Range Transportation Plan. He stated that he would be presenting a quick overview on what they had been doing and where they were and a little bit about the process.

(Mr. Matthews made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Matthews stated that he would just flip through some of the slides. He stated that the Long-Range Transportation Plan had been termed the "TRiP2045," so throughout his presentation and throughout the approvals, the document would be called the "TRiP2045."

Mr. Matthews stated that he would be presenting an introduction on the document and what they had done to date, the modeling status. He stated that FuturePlan was a subconsultant to them, whose responsibility was assisting the MPO with the model itself. He continued that they would be following up with the Commuter Study, which was last.

Mr. Matthews stated that what was displayed at this time concerned

what the Long-Range Transportation Plan was. He stated that he would not read all the items, but that, in short, it was the long-range planning document for transportation infrastructure for the MPO. He stated that they would talk a little bit about the model in some future slides, noting that the model drove some of the output. He continued that all of the demographics, the populations, where people went, where people lived, all of that, tied to what the regional plans were for transportation improvements, what roads were not wide enough, where they needed to have improvements. He stated that all of that was driven by the projects that went into the Long-Range Transportation Plan, and therefore into the model. He stated that they were separated in the Plan, that they were either Funded or Visionary.

Mr. Matthews stated that what they had been working through was an update to the document itself, noting that this was required by Federal Highway, and there were a number of inputs that went into it.

Mr. Ofenloch asked how this related to the Study the City had just contracted for as far as traffic flow and things like that.

Mr. Matthews asked the MPO staff if that was the Commuter Study.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Matthews stated that the Commuter Study was related, so the Commuter Study information would be added to and joined with the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Matthews stated that that would be added to the information, but that was being conducted by a different party. He stated that it was a different Study, but that it all rolled into what they would like to consider as a regional or global, an MPO-wide, Transportation Plan. He stated that that was the next item on the agenda.

Mr. Matthews stated that the slide he was displaying at this time showed an overview of the jurisdictions included in the MPO. He stated that there were several inputs into the Long-Range Transportation Plan, again, the TRiP2045. He continued that it was required by Federal Highway, that it helped to identify projects and prioritize projects, again classified between Funded and Visionary. He stated that a big component of it was the traffic model, which he would discuss in a few minutes. He stated that all the information that went into the model helped to predict where there would be capacity issues in the years moving forward. He continued that the plans for transportation improvement helped to mitigate some of the congestion issues.

Mr. Matthews stated, concerning the blurb at the top of the display about a user-friendly document, that when they had first started this, the goal was to not provide a document that one would never look at or never read, that had a thousand pages and was full of text and figures and was hard to understand. He stated that they had compared the current LRTP with some other statewide LRTPs across the country, and they had found some vast differences, so they recommended pulling some of the more concise information out of some of those documents and putting it into this document. He stated that, in short, if the State of California could have an LRTP that was a thickness which he indicated and they had one that was four inches thick, they could probably do a little bit better about a concise document.

Mr. Matthews stated that they wanted the document, and he believed the MPO did also, to be on the Mayor's desk, in persons' offices, something they could point to, and that if elected officials had a potential road project, they could go to the document and find out if the project was already in the LRTP or if it was included as a Visionary project, and then determine what they could do

to move the funding forward. He stated that they wanted it to be in a usable format and usable context.

Mr. Matthews stated that that was their initial approach. He stated that most of that formatting and organization had been incorporated into the draft document they had been working toward. He stated that it was really the transportation vision for the MPO moving forward.

Mr. Matthews stated that the slide he was showing at this time depicted an overview of what had been done to date and where their schedule was, noting that at the very end it showed that the adoption of the document was scheduled for March 2020. He stated that there was a public comment period that they were on track to meet, beginning in January. He continued that a draft document would be ready for review in January.

Mr. Matthews stated that they had held two of three Engineers and Leadership meetings, with the third one of those to be in early December. He stated that, of course, there was the update he was presenting at this meeting, and they would do the same thing with the TCC and the MPO on the following Wednesday.

Mr. Matthews stated that the slide he was displaying at this time was just an overview of a couple of templates they had looked at. He stated that they had tried to pull out, from an organization and content perspective, some of the reformatted, better format, better organized, ways of presenting the information, so they had reached out and looked at a number of examples that were good examples of that.

Mr. Matthews stated that next was the Table of Contents, noting that they had put this in just to show they had been working toward these different sections. He stated that one could not read this, but it kind of gave an overview

of the sections that were included in the document, just for their reference. He stated that there was "Vision and Goals, Socioeconomic Content and Demographics, Environmental Context and Land Use, Roadway Infrastructure and Traffic Forecasts, Multi-Modal Infrastructure, Congestion Management, Safety and Security, Freight, and Financial Plan," with a number of appendices. He stated that these were, from a content perspective, the general areas on which the document focused.

Mr. Matthews stated that the document was required as part of the certification process that Federal Highway administered through the Transportation Management area. He stated that that was a lot of words to say that it was required by the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Matthews stated that they were on track to meet their deadline for the 2020 approval. He continued that the MPO was ahead of schedule in updating this particular document.

Mr. Matthews stated that the next few slides he would be showing were some of the informative things that had gone into this. He stated that these were some changes in demographics from 2015. He stated that 2015, from a modeling standpoint, was the baseline, and 2045 was how far out they were predicting. He stated that he would roll through some of this information generally. He continued that the slides that followed this were the slides that were the output from the model, that it would show where the model showed congestion at this time versus where the model showed congestion in the future, with some of the existing projects implemented.

Mr. Slyman asked if there would be a slide that would show the geographic area they were covering.

Mr. Matthews stated that the document was for the entire MPO area, so

he did not have a slide that showed the area they were covering, per se, but it was for the complete MPO area. He continued that he had a slide that showed, from their transportation network, again an output from the model, where some congestion was. He continued that this was countywide, that it was the entire area of the MPO. He stated that this was not a regional plan, not a regional model, that it was limited to the MPO area.

Mr. Matthews stated that one would notice that they were indicating a 38 percent, over 30 years, increase in population; and just under that in households; a 19 percent increase in employment; and a 10 percent increase in school enrollment. He stated that all of these demographics were pieces that went into the model, that were fed into the model, that helped predict capacity issues as the output.

Mr. Matthews asked Mr. Vandiver if he could give him a thumbs up on that.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Matthews stated that he was not the model expert, that Mr. Vandiver was, and that was why they had FuturePlan as a part of their team. He continued that he was limited as to what he exactly understood about the model.

Mr. Matthews stated that the next slide he was displaying was "Change in Trips." He stated that this was, again, similar increases in Change in Trips, Routine Person Trips, Truck Trips, External Trips. He stated that when he looked at this, what stood out to him was they were looking at increasing from 1.5 million to 2.1 million. He continued that these 38, 45, 48 percent increases were a significant factor, noting that it was a product of the growth they were seeing and the economy they were seeing in the area.

Mr. Matthews stated that the next slide was "Transportation System Performance Statistics." He stated that "E + C" was "Existing and Committed." He stated that this was the 2015 base, and comparing that against the 2045 model, which included the Existing and Committed projects, and the 2045 model that was Financially Constrained. He stated that there were slight differences in those two different models. He continued that this was rolled up into Vehicle-Miles Traveled, Vehicle-Hours Traveled, and Congested Speed.

Mr. Matthews stated that, in general, a lot of data went into producing what, in its most simplistic form, was a part of one of the outputs of where they could predict congestion. He stated that, really, what this model did was indicate where they could predict congestion, and because of that, where should they apply and plan for transportation improvement projects. He stated that this information rolled into the 2015 Existing on the left, and the 2045, with existing models that were in the project currently, on the right. He stated that this was for the entire area.

Mr. Matthews stated that he had a couple more slides that showed some zoomed-in areas. He stated that this was major roadways, and everyone could probably guess where they would see these. He stated that it was I-565, US 431, US 72, AL 53, some patches there on Patton Road, and Memorial Parkway. He stated that it was not anything terribly out of the blue here.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if the red indicated major congestion.

Mr. Matthews replied in the affirmative. He stated that red was bad, and purple was not as bad.

Mr. Mason asked if all that congestion was vehicular congestion. He asked if in the simulation software they were able to look at other modes of transportation and compare them, in terms of miles traveled and mobility. He

stated that he was wondering if it was all about traffic flow or if there were other factors that went into it that they could actually begin to look at, pedestrian fatalities and pedestrian safety, and start thinking in terms of mobility, in terms of people rather than vehicles.

Mr. Matthews stated that this model was for vehicles, that it did not include pedestrian data, that it was vehicular, traffic-related only.

Mr. Mason asked if it would be prudent to start looking at some of that and bringing that to the attention of ALDOT.

Mr. James Vandiver stated that he was with the City of Huntsville, the Huntsville MPO staff, and he was helping out with FuturePlan in the modeling effort.

Mr. Vandiver stated, to answer Mr. Mason's question, that they got this software from ALDOT, and it was simply a vehicular travel model, that it did not take into account pedestrians or transit or anything like that. He stated that they would like to do that at some point in the future, but that was not the purpose of what they were doing at this time. He stated that they could look at Vehicle-Miles Traveled, that that was one of the metrics they used to measure congestion. He stated that the on the maps Mr. Matthews would go through in the next few slides, there were V/C ratios, Volume-to-Capacity ratios. He continued that if they went above "1" on a Volume-to-Capacity ratio, that meant they had gone over capacity on a road in the model, and that meant it was supposed to be congested, in terms of vehicular traffic.

Mr. Vandiver stated, to answer Mr. Mason's question, that no, they did not have anything more than vehicular, but they were looking into that for the future.

Mr. Slyman asked if these two depictions assumed the roads remained

the way they were at this time or if it included any improvements that were being made along the way.

Mr. Matthews stated that it included some improvements, that it included, as he understood it, the projects that currently existed in the LRTP, and he believed it included some of the projects that had been presented to them as a part of their work.

Mr. Matthews asked Mr. Vandiver if that was correct.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the E + C was basically anything that had been built or that was under construction at this time.

Mr. Matthews stated that the E + C map, which one could see there on the right of the display, was everything that had been built or was under construction at this time. He stated that Cecil Ashburn would be included on this, as well as the Blake Bottom Overpass. He stated that things like that would be included on that map.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if this included the widening of 565.

Mr. Matthews stated that that would come into the Financially Constrained map, which he noted would be the next one.

Mr. Slyman asked if it was correct that 565 was already being restriped to be three lanes in each direction.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that they were adding a lane.

Mr. Matthews stated that it was in the model he was indicating.

Mr. Matthews asked Mr. Slyman to repeat his question.

Mr. Slyman stated that he believed that at this time 565 was being striped to three lanes in each direction, all the way to 65. He asked if that was correct, and if this reflected that.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that his understanding was they were adding a lane,

that they had determined that the base of the right-of-way along the side of the regular lanes was firm enough that they could repave it, which would result in a new lane, that he did not think it was restriping.

Mr. Matthews stated that he would agree that they were not widening it, that they were utilizing the existing footprint to add an additional lane.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he believed the question was if that was included here.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was included in the Financially Constrained because it was not built or under construction at this time.

Mr. Slyman asked if it was correct that once that happened, it would go purple instead of red.

Mr. Matthews stated that it would be a little less red.

Mr. Matthews stated that one could see the differences there, where it was labeled "I-565," between the left and the right.

Mr. Slyman stated that 72 was not as red, and asked how that was, if they were actually assuming that it was going to be widened all the way through to County Line.

Mr. Matthews stated that if it was Financially Constrained, yes.

Mr. Slyman asked for an explanation of "Financially Constrained."

Mr. Matthews stated that it was in the Capital Plan of the City of Huntsville to be funded and constructed.

Mr. Matthews asked Ms. Lowe if it was in the TIP as well.

Ms. Lowe stated that 565 was.

Mr. Matthews inquired as to University.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative, stating that she believed it was in Year 2022 or 2023.

Mr. Slyman stated that, then, what they were saying was that "Financially Constrained" did not necessarily mean there was not the funding, that it assumed that the funding was there and they would go ahead and construct it.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was everything they could do within current funding constraints. He stated that that meant TIP projects, anything that the cities or the counties had in their Capital Improvement Plans, that anything like that would be in there.

Mr. Slyman stated that, then, it was not a wish list, but what they felt they could do with the funds that were there.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the wish list came into the Visionary scenario of their model, which they had not worked on yet, that they were still working out what they wanted to do in the Financially Constrained. He continued that they still needed to refine a few projects and check with the jurisdictions to make sure they had all the projects they wanted them to have on there, and then they would get into the Visionary phase of this.

Mr. Mason asked if all of that had looked at just existing rights-of-way and highways or if there was any effort in the model to look at increasing network efficiency, like taking some other links and making them into more highways, as opposed to continuing to dump the same amount of traffic on existing roads, which they all knew really just induced demand rather than solving it.

Mr. Vandiver stated that part of their work with FuturePlan had been to update the numbers that kind of built the model underneath, talking about trip rates and things like that, based on income, based on the number of vehicles per household. He stated that they had the most up-to-date numbers

in there at this time, and it seemed to validate pretty well. He stated that they had to validate the 2015 Model, to make sure it was pretty much in line with what happened in 2015. He stated that they looked at the average daily travel and travel counts of most of the roads in the MPO study area to do that. He stated that they had been updating the model, and it looked pretty good, from a modeling standpoint. He stated that, of course, it was not going to be perfect, that they did not have a 100 percent crystal-clear vision of what 2045 was going to look like, in terms of if they would still be driving cars, but they would see what happened.

Mr. Slyman stated that he did not see the Greenbrier Parkway, and he asked if this was included.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was included in the Financially Constrained. He stated that it was the little, kind of backward "S" on the very left side of the display.

Mr. Slyman stated that that, then, would continue all the way over to 65.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the MPO study area did not go all the way over to 65, so they had just kind of ended it there, right about the intersection of Browns Ferry and Greenbrier Parkway.

Mr. Matthews stated that if one were looking right at that spot, they would see that it was included in that model and not on the one on the left.

Mr. Matthews stated that what he was displaying at this time was a slide that he had skipped earlier. He stated that this was the same information, just slightly zoomed in, into the metro Huntsville area. He continued that there was the same slide they had looked at previously, and it was zoomed in, with a little more detail, in the metro area.

Mr. Matthews stated that the draft document would be presented and

due at the January MPO meeting. He stated that they would be back to update them, as he understood it, on January 27th for their next meeting, and January 29th for the MPO meeting. He stated that following that would be a 45-day public comment period, and then the final report would be due to ALDOT and Federal Highway at the end of March.

Mr. Matthews stated that the slide being shown at this time gave a little information concerning the 2020 Commuter Study, scheduled to be completed in August of 2020.

Mr. Matthews stated that was the end of his presentation. He asked if there were any other questions. He stated that his contact information was there, and that Ms. Colburn and Ms. Lowe knew how to get in touch with him, and if they had any questions that came up between this time and January, he would be happy to sit down with them and answer any questions in detail.

Acting Chairman Thorpe thanked Mr. Matthews for the presentation.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Discussion - Regional Commuter Study. He recognized Ms. Colburn.

(Ms. Colburn made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Colburn stated that she was on the MPO staff, and she had organized the Regional Commuter Study up to this point. She stated that the most recent activity on the Commuter Study was the agreement with the consultant, which would be Metro Analytics. She stated that this had been signed, and they had been given the notice to proceed after the last City Council meeting. She stated that their notice to proceed was November 8. She stated that Mr. Rob Schiffer, who was working on all of the model things they had seen in the prior slides, the TRiP2045, would be the lead analyst with Metro Analytics. She continued that as soon as Mr. Schiffer got through with his Croy Engineering contract on

TRiP2045, he was going to start helping them out with the Commuter Study. She stated that he would be doing a lot of back and forth between both of them, as the two projects overlapped as well.

Ms. Colburn stated that Metro Analytics also included a team of people who would help them visualize the results of the Commuter Study. She stated that the Commuter Study had four primary goals, with the first being to get accurate data of commuters in a 14-county region around Madison County, and specifically focusing on federal workers. She stated that their existing data sets did not include federal workers. She continued that there were some that did, but they were older. She stated that that was another James Vandiver question.

Ms. Colburn stated that the biggest reason for the Commuter Study was because they had a larger than average proportion of federal workers on the highways, and they would like to be able to capture data on where they were coming from and where they were going. She stated that they would be working very closely with Redstone Arsenal, the Garrison. She stated that the Colonel had agreed to give them data on entrances and exits of all of the Redstone Arsenal gates. She stated that there would be an employee survey that would be done through the Chamber of Commerce and through the Arsenal as part of this Study.

Ms. Colburn stated that the Study had commenced in the current month, that they had been given a notice to proceed, and it would be concluded in November of 2020.

Ms. Colburn stated that they would get a draft of the Commuter Study in August of 2020. She stated that what this was actually going to end up being for TRiP2045, the document they had just heard about from Mr. Matthews, was

that it would be Chapter 7, the Congestion Management Plan. She stated that their current Long-Range Transportation Plan had a chapter that was the Congestion Management Process and the Congestion Management Plan. She stated that that chapter was not going to be changed very much in TRiP2045, with the exception of some updates of “These projects have been done in the last five years, and, by the way, we are doing this enormous Commuter Study that is going to replace this chapter in November of 2020.”

Ms. Colburn stated that the goal of the Study was to get as much data as possible on where cars were coming to and from and through the MPO area. She continued that, again, the focus was on the MPO study area. She stated that to answer the question on the MPO study area from Mr. Slyman earlier, that it had not changed yet, so everything they were doing with TRiP2045 and with this Commuter Study would be based on the same MPO study area they had been working with for the last several years. She continued that they expected the MPO study area to change as a result of the 2020 Census, but that would not be for a while, and they needed to keep moving forward with these plans and these documents that were federally required, with the current MPO study area and urban area.

Mr. Slyman stated that since their jurisdiction included Madison County, the city of Huntsville, the city of Madison, the town of Triana, and the town of Owens Cross Roads, if when the city of Huntsville and the city of Madison bled into Limestone County, that was included in the study area.

Ms. Colburn stated that it was currently. She stated that it did not go all the way to 65, as Mr. Vandiver had stated, but they did have a good chunk of Limestone County in their MPO study area currently.

Mr. Slyman stated that, then, anything that was in the city limits of

Huntsville or Madison, even though it was in Limestone County, was within the MPO study area.

Ms. Colburn stated that it was currently.

Ms. Colburn stated, concerning the Commuter Study, that their kickoff meeting would be on the upcoming Wednesday, that the consultants would be with the MPO staff, talking to them about the Study, and then they would do a presentation to the TCC and to the MPO. She stated that if any CAC members wanted to attend the TCC or the MPO meetings to learn more about the Commuter Study, that would be the kickoff event. She stated that the consultants were from out of town and did not have a Huntsville-based office, so they had not had them come Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, that they would just be present all day Wednesday. She stated that the TCC would be meeting in the 7th Floor Council Conference Room, at 3 p.m., and the MPO would be meeting in the City Council Chambers, at 4 p.m.

Mr. Ofenloch stated to Ms. Colburn that twice she had said "currently." He asked if there was any reason why she had said that, if she had some reason to believe that that might change, where it did not include all of Huntsville.

Ms. Colburn stated that it would definitely include all of Huntsville. She stated that she was just thinking it was going to go outside, like farther outside. She stated that that was another James Vandiver question.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it would include all of Huntsville, including what was in Limestone County, and actually now in Morgan County.

Ms. Colburn replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Ofenloch reiterated that twice Ms. Colburn had stated "currently," and he had just been wondering about that.

Ms. Colburn stated that it was just that it was going to change and get

bigger, not smaller. She stated that they definitely expected the study area and the urban area to grow and get bigger as a result of the 2020 Census. She thanked Mr. Ofenloch for the clarification.

Mr. Mason stated that he had a question, which was basically the question he had asked previously. He stated that Ms. Colburn had stated that they were going to count the cars that came into Redstone. He asked if there would be any effort to count the people who came into Redstone Arsenal and to look at alternative ways of getting people there, rather than single-purpose vehicles.

Ms. Colburn stated that one of the deliverables of the Commuter Study included park & ride locations. She stated that in August of 2020 and then again in November of 2020, the consultants would be required to present to this body, and to the public, and the Arsenal, and the MPO staff recommended park & ride locations for the region, based on the data collected from the Commuter Study, where people were coming from and how they were getting to the Arsenal. She stated that the Arsenal, from their discussions with the Colonel, had already been looking at the realities of their future as a base that used park & ride options. She continued that park & ride was where people coming in from Athens might park at a Walmart or a Publix, or some large parking facility, between Athens and Huntsville, and then a bus would take them to the Arsenal.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that Bridge Street had been designed for a rail system from Bridge Street through the Arsenal. He continued that he believed, however, that was right before 9/11, when the gates were locked up.

Ms. Colburn stated that that was the best transit stop in the city, that it was absolutely beautiful. She stated that if persons had not seen the transit

stop that was funded by MPO dollars at Bridge Street, they should definitely go and check it out. She stated that it was gorgeous, that it was an FTA-funded transit stop, and it was certainly an option that she hoped they would consider and look at as well because it was a nice location and a nice facility.

Ms. Colburn stated that that would be one of the things they would be required to deliver at the end of this, park & ride locations. She reiterated that the Arsenal had already been in discussions about that, so they were looking forward to those suggestions as well.

Mr. Slyman asked if greenways were included in the study.

Ms. Colburn stated that in the Commuter Study, she did not know how they were going to be looking at alternative modes of transportation beyond transit. She stated that there would be a lot of public involvement that would be part of the Study, and if it came up a lot in public comment and public review, she was sure they would have no choice.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that the City had bought a lot out in front of the bakery for a park & bike into the Arsenal . He asked if anyone had looked and seen if that worked, if anybody used it.

Ms. Colburn asked if Mr. Ofenloch was taking about at Cabela's.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that it was near Cabela's.

Ms. Colburn stated that they had not put a sign out there yet that said "Redstone Gateway Greenway." She stated that once that sign was there, she believed more people would be using it because they would be thinking of it in terms of a parking lot for a transportation mode. She stated that Redstone Gateway Greenway was used, at least as far as Strava data let them know. She continued that Strava was an app that cyclists used to track their routes. She

stated that, also, someone had said that there was a running app that was similar that showed that people ran on it. She stated that when Bike-to-Work Week happened, apparently people biked to work from that parking lot into Boeing. She stated that especially Boeing employees were using it.

Ms. Colburn stated that, also, although this was not at all MPO-related, that the City of Huntsville was currently, with City of Huntsville money, in the process of constructing Redstone Gateway Greenway, Part 2, which would connect from Old Madison Pike, down around the Cabela Lake, up over Governors West Bridge, to that greenway, so that there would be an actual greenway that would go from Boeing's parking lot at Redstone Gateway to the existing greenway west of Bridge Street, north of Old Madison Pike. She stated that there was a big retention lake there that was built by a private entity, for beautification and storm retention, and that they would be able to connect those two resources.

Mr. Slyman asked if that was the same greenway that people entered from Old Madison Pike, just east of Slaughter Road.

Ms. Colburn stated that perhaps it was, noting that she did not know where the north terminus of that one was.

Mr. Slyman stated that that one went all the way up through Research Park and all the way to MidTowne.

Ms. Colburn stated that she would bring up a Google map and perhaps they could determine this.

After further discussion, Ms. Colburn stated that there were some missing pieces in this greenway, and it looked like it probably stopped at the Explorer Boulevard loop, that it did not get all the way to 72.

Mr. Slyman stated that if Ms. Colburn would go a little farther to the

west, she would see that there was also a greenway there. He asked if she saw the one running north and south.

Ms. Colburn stated that that was Indian Creek.

Mr. Slyman stated that that went up in MidTowne, or next to MidTowne, and then stopped short of making a connection to the greenway in Providence.

Ms. Colburn stated that that was not related to the Redstone Gateway project, although the purpose for crossing Madison Pike at the location she was indicating on the slide and connecting where she was indicating was that there was a fairly wide sidewalk at the location she was indicating which people could then use to connect down Old Madison Pike to the Indian Creek Greenway. She stated that east and west there was a connector there from the Redstone Gateway Greenway they were discussing at this time to the Indian Creek Greenway that Mr. Slyman was asking about. She continued that up on the north end, that was an entirely different project, unfortunately. She stated that she wished they could just build them all at the same time.

Ms. Colburn asked if there were any other questions regarding the Commuter Study.

Ms. Colburn stated that the CAC members could come to the meetings on Wednesday for a full discussion, at the kickoff meeting with Mr. Rob Schiffer.

Acting Chairman Thorpe thanked Ms. Colburn for the presentation.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Resolution No. 27-19.

Acting Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

Ms. Lowe stated that since there was not a quorum present, she was going to skip the Title VI slide.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 27-19 was an amendment to decrease the funding on SR-1, Memorial Parkway, from 0.31 mile south of CR-75, Mastin Lake Road, to County Road 65, Winchester Road, structure removal and selective clearing and grubbing. She stated that the old estimate was about \$2 million, and it had come down at this time to about \$500,000, simply because they did not need as much as they had thought to clear and grub the area.

Ms. Lowe stated that she was displaying a location map of that particular project.

Ms. Lowe stated that since the CAC was not going to recommend approval, they would just move on to the next item on the agenda.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Resolution No. 28-19.

Acting Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 28-19 was an amendment to delete this project completely. She stated that this was a Transportation Alternatives project, to have a section of the Mill Creek Greenway in the city of Madison deleted, because with federal funds the timeline would be a little bit drawn out, and there would be more boxes to check off, so the City of Madison had decided to utilize City funds to go ahead and start the project and get this section of the project done.

Ms. Lowe stated that she was displaying a location map of that particular greenway and this section, Phase 2, of the project.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Resolution No. 29-19.

Acting Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 29-19 would increase the funding for the design phase of the Redstone Arsenal East connector, from I-565 to Redstone Arsenal Gate 10, the Patton Road gate. She stated that she believed this was actually old funding, and the City had decided to up their matching into it so they could go ahead and design it out and figure out all the logistics for this particular project, so they had increased the funding.

Ms. Lowe stated that she was displaying a location map of that particular project.

Mr. Ofenloch asked that Ms. Lowe leave the map displayed for a moment.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he did not remember this one from before, but he had missed a couple of meetings. He asked if this was to widen Jordan Lane/Patton Road from 565 to Gate 10. He stated that was a four-lane road at this time.

Ms. Lowe replied in the negative. She stated that this was the old Southern Bypass, that it was the area from Jordan Lane/Patton Road, on the back side, the south side, to Triana, up the back side, up to 565.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if north was up.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative. She stated that this would be a new road. She stated that it would be a limited access, 60-mile-per-hour corridor.

Mr. Slyman asked if most of this was on the Arsenal.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Slyman asked if this was going to be open to the general public or just persons who had access to the Arsenal.

Ms. Lowe stated that that question was still unanswered. She stated that she was not exactly sure who would be able to get on and off and what exits would be where and who it was limited access to. She stated that they were in the design phase, and she could gather more information as they had it.

Mr. Ofenloch asked Ms. Lowe to send some more information concerning this, noting that he did not recall this ever having come up previously.

Mr. Slyman stated that he believed this was the first time he had seen it.

Ms. Lowe stated that this was the first actual mapping of it, simply because it had changed names, and it had been through different TIPs and different LRTPs. She stated that, as she had said, it was named the "Southern Bypass" previously, and at this time it was the "Redstone Connector."

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he could see the river, and he could see where it came into the Parkway, down at the bottom of the display, that he just did not see where it tied into 565 at the top.

Ms. Lowe stated that this was because there were other phases of it.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it would come off of 565 and get to the top of the display.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative. She stated that she believed this one only went to Triana. She stated that she would get more information on this.

Mr. Ofenloch asked that Ms. Lowe send the members this, and also how it tied to 565, if it went Triana to the 565 interchange, or however that was going to connect.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that there were not many connectors

over there to get to 565, short of around the Airport.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that perhaps they were planning something at 565 and Triana. He stated that it looked like 565 and Triana down to this point on Triana. He stated that that was what he was having trouble visualizing.

Mr. Slyman stated that the reason they had originally done away with the Southern Bypass was because it was going to affect their ability to get BRAC in the future. He continued that he would assume that this was going to be limited to folks who would have access to the Arsenal.

Ms. Lowe stated that as more information came in, she would get it to the CAC members. She continued that as of this time, this was all she was aware of. She stated that she would dig more and get more information for them.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Resolution No. 30-19.

Acting Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 30-19 called for this project to be moved fiscal years. She stated that it was in 2020, and they were going to push it out to 2023. She stated that this was a railroad crossing improvement that had a little bit of federal funding tied to it, hence the reason why the MPO had this in their Transportation Improvement Program.

Ms. Lowe stated that she was displaying a location map of that particular project.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if that was a non-gated crossing.

Ms. Lowe stated she believed this was one she had crossed before. She

stated that she did not think there were any gates or any lights around this one. She stated that her recollection was a little bit fuzzy and asked that they not hold her to that.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was correct that that was the Huntsville railroad, that it was not L&N, that it was not a major line, that it was the switch line that took the freight to the Intermodal.

Ms. Lowe stated that was correct.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that they did not go very fast when they went through there. He asked if the improvements were going to be a bridge over the railroad tracks, or what was the improvement.

Ms. Lowe stated that she was not sure what the improvements actually were.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that whatever they were, they were going to be delayed.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Resolution No. 31-19.

Acting Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution 31-19 supported adding a project that would basically help fill in and maintain the bridge abutment on Nick Davis Road over Limestone Creek. She stated that they would be replacing backfill material and placing riprap, et cetera, to make sure the abutment on that bridge was maintained. She stated that this project was added, with federal funding, to the TIP.

Ms. Lowe stated that she was displaying the location map of that particular project.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion concerning this particular item.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that that concluded all the amendments as presented.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was CAC Member Comments. He asked if there were any comments from any of the members.

Mr. Slyman stated that he was assuming they kept track of attendance, and he asked if they had an attendance policy for members of this Committee.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that missing three meetings without an excuse was reason to ask persons to resign. He stated that he did not know if this was to be reported to whomever had appointed such persons.

Mr. Slyman asked how many total members they were supposed to have on this Committee.

Ms. Lowe stated that she believed it was 16.

Mr. Slyman stated that, then, they had 25 percent present. He stated that that was pretty sad.

Ms. Lowe stated that some meetings were better than others. She continued that there were a few folks who got the emails and the calendar updates and knew that there was a meeting, but they, for whatever reason, just did not show and did not let them know they were not coming.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he believed if they were going to legitimize this Committee, they needed to enforce this, or at least tell the Council member, or

whomever such persons had been appointed by, that their appointees were not showing up at the meetings and were in violation of the Bylaws. He stated that they did have an attendance Bylaw.

Ms. Lowe stated that was correct.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he had thought Mr. Tony Smith was pushing this.

Mr. Mason stated that Mr. Smith had done so when he was first elected, that two meetings prior, he had sent out a huge email, and it was followed up by the Planning staff, who had received assurances from everybody that they were still interested. He stated that he had missed the last meeting, but he was present at this meeting. He stated that it did seem like attendance was kind of falling off. He continued that they were getting into that time of year when it was hard, but that was not to make an excuse. He stated that he guessed they could cross their fingers and hope for a little better for the next meeting.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that he believed the point had duly been made and noted that attendance was recorded, and it was on record, and it was very valuable to legitimize this Committee.

Ms. Lowe stated that at the next meeting, they would go through the election or replacement process to try to figure out if people needed to be replaced or wanted to be replaced, or how this should be handled.

Mr. Mason stated that he was wondering if a little bit more social-media-type outreach might be appropriate, so they could get some of the issues out to the public and start letting them know that they did have a voice, that they did not just have to take every funding project that came down the pike for granted. He stated that perhaps they could have a Facebook page that talked about the Citizens Advisory Committee and what the issues were that

would be coming up.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he was not sure he wanted a lot of the public present at the meetings when only four CAC members would show up.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further comments from the CAC members.

Mr. Mason stated that he had one more comment. He stated that they had talked about it before, and he did not know exactly what more they could do, but he would like to see a much bigger push for a Vision Zero policy in Huntsville and the MPO area, where they really started looking at how they could make traffic a lot safer for people who were not in cars. He stated that he believed there was a lack of awareness and a lack of caring about those kinds of passengers or mobility users. He stated that he did not have anything specific to say, other than he wanted to put it out as a comment, on record, that he thought they needed to start paying a little bit more attention to that in all of their plans and all of their efforts.

Ms. Lowe stated that that was duly noted.

Acting Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any members of the public present who would like to comment.

Acting Chairman Thorpe stated that hearing none and hearing nothing further from the Committee members, the meeting was adjourned.

Meeting adjourned on November 18, 2019, at 6:00 p.m.