

**TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
OF THE
HUNTSVILLE AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

MINUTES

Regular Meeting - November 20, 2019 - 3 p.m.

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

Committee Members Present:

Mr. James Moore	City of Huntsville, Planning Division
Ms. Kathy Martin	City of Huntsville, Director of Engineering
Mr. Chuck Faulkner	Madison County, County Engineer
Ms. Kaela Hamby	Redstone Arsenal, Community Planner
Mr. Rodney Ellis	Alabama Department of Transportation

MPO Staff Members Present:

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

Also Present:

Mr. Andy Somers
Regional Manager
Croy Engineering
603 Madison Street
Huntsville, Alabama 35801

Mr. Robert G. Schiffer
President
FuturePlan Consulting, LLC
1256 Walden Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32317
and
Metro Analytics
National Practice Leader
Travel Demand Forecasting
1256 Walden Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32317

The meeting was called to order by Mr. James Moore at the time and place noted above.

Mr. Moore stated that the first order of business was approval of the Minutes of the prior meeting.

Mr. Faulkner moved for approval of the Minutes of the Technical Coordinating Committee meeting held on August 28, 2019, which motion was duly seconded by Ms. Martin.

Mr. Moore called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Technical Coordinating Committee members present.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was Discussion - TRiP2045 - Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update, a brief update by Croy Engineering on TRiP2045, Huntsville Area MPO's 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Andy Somers of Croy Engineering appeared before the Committee. He stated that he believed most of the members of the Technical Coordinating Committee were pretty familiar with where they were in this process, so they would get pretty quickly to Mr. Rob Schiffer with FuturePlan, the subconsultant that they had doing the heavy lifting with the modeling effort. He continued that he believed most persons were present to see what they were identifying as critical in the coming Plan.

(Mr. Somers made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Somers stated that what was being displayed was a synopsis on where they were with the Plan to date. He stated that he would quickly run through the very brief agenda.

Mr. Somers stated, concerning the foundation for the 20-year horizon,

that they had to update every five years through FHWA in order to keep the Planning money flowing through. He stated that they had a reboot they were excited to do with this Transportation Plan update. He continued that this would be a different document than they had been used to seeing. He stated that they were going to do kind of a two-part Plan. He continued that the primary document was going to be more of a user-friendly, everyday-use document, what he would call a coffee table or executive summary type of document they wanted the members to have at their office, at their desktop, to help guide them in their transportation decisions on an everyday basis. He stated that the technical appendix they were used to, which was very thick, would be one that would sit on the shelf and be one that the staff would want to get into more, with the details, the modeling, the data, and a little bit more of the format they would want to see. He stated that there was a desire of staff to reduce the document into a more user-friendly form, and they had tried to accomplish that with their efforts to this date.

Mr. Somers stated that while they needed the update, which was mandated by the FHWA, they were looking for a more user-friendly document. He continued that they wanted to identify the priorities for the next 20 years, for funding, identifying projects, for appropriating the resources needed to mitigate the congestion and the weak links in the network that they were seeing, and to establish a vision for how they were going to innovate the network over the next 20 years.

Mr. Somers stated, as to a quick synopsis of where they were in the status, they had had the project kickoff, and they had come through two engineering leadership meetings, and they were coming up on the third one, which would be the middle part of the following month. He stated that they

were on track at this time for a draft ready for review in the January 2020 time frame, and they were on schedule for adoption of the final completed Plan by March of 2020.

Mr. Somers stated that what was being displayed was a sample template of a cover page and kind of where they were in the process of what they were doing. He stated that part of their efforts included a literature review of other plans that had been working around the country. He stated that they had focused in on several documents, and what had kind of stood out to them was that the state of California had a document that might be in the 20 to 25 page neighborhood, for the entire state, whereas previous plans for them had been in the hundreds of pages, with all the technical appendices, the spreadsheets and such. He continued that they wanted to mimic that format. He stated that that had stood out to them, and they wanted to mimic it and get them something that would be better to use.

Mr. Somers stated, concerning what was displayed, that he would not go through the Table of Contents specifically, but this was to show that the document had all of the major components and sections they were used to seeing, the Financial part, the Multi-Modal part, Congestion Management, Transit, Freight, all of the requisite and required components of it.

Mr. Somers stated that the last slide was for background information, why the FHWA required it, going back to the TMA certification. He stated that he would not read this, but it was hammering home the point that every four years they had to update the planning process and update the model, to update the Plan with new data.

Mr. Somers stated that he would at this time hand off to Mr. Rob Schiffer with FuturePlan, who was working under them as a subconsultant. He

stated that Mr. Schiffer had been working hand-in-hand with Mr. Moore and Mr. Vandiver on updating the model output, and he was going to get into the weeds on his modeling efforts to date.

Mr. Schiffer stated that he had been working closely with Mr. Moore and Mr. Vandiver on getting the model in good running order.

Mr. Schiffer stated that he wanted to look at a few metrics and visuals, in terms of how things were changing between 2015 and 2045.

(Mr. Schiffer made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Schiffer stated that what was being displayed looked at some of the demographics and how those were anticipated to grow over a 30-year period. He stated that it showed the percent change overall as well as the percent annual growth rate, the compounded annual growth rate. He stated that one could see from the bar chart that things were trending up in the future, as expected, at fairly similar rates for all the demographics they had there. He stated that Population and Employment equated with Trip Making, that they wanted to look at how trips were changing and growing over time. He stated that they had kind of divided up the trips into three components. He stated that they could go into more detail if desired, but this was probably good enough. He stated that they had Routine Person Trips, which were people going to work, going shopping, going to school, going to the doctor, and all of that. He stated that one could see that this had grown about 37 percent over the 30-year period.

Mr. Schiffer stated that Truck Trips, which he noted would be any kind of freight trucks, delivery trucks, or what have you, were growing at about the same rate. He stated, concerning External Trips, that these were trips that came from outside of Madison County and the eastern part of

Limestone County, for example, coming in on 565 from I-65, and so on. He stated that some would be passing through the region, but most of them were actually coming from adjacent counties, and the trip would end in Huntsville. He stated that a lot of these were work trips, for people who worked, for example, at the Arsenal or UAH and lived in adjacent counties. He stated that these trips were actually anticipated to grow at a higher rate than the other trip purposes. He continued that this was due in part to what they saw as the traffic count trend in these locations, as well as some of the growth that was anticipated in some of the adjacent counties.

Mr. Schiffer stated that overall they were looking at a future growth of about 39 percent in trends of vehicle trips, auto or truck.

Mr. Schiffer stated that next was System Performance Statistics. He stated that someone in the federal government thought this was very important, and he agreed that it was. He stated that they wanted to somehow look at Planning efforts and try to quantify them and identify whether or not they were achieving reasonable goals as they went through the process. He continued that they would look at a few things, that they would look at Vehicle-Miles Traveled, which was basically the measure of the trip length, and Vehicle-Hours Traveled, which was really a measure of trip time, and then Congested Speeds, which were average operating speeds under congested conditions. He stated that they looked at these in three different scenarios, with one being what they called the "2015 Base," which was the actual year the model had been calibrated to, and then they would look at two 2045 scenarios, the Existing + Committed Network and the Financially Constrained.

Mr. Schiffer stated that one could see how things changed, that, obviously, the biggest change was from 2015 to 2045 E+C. He stated that they

were talking about 30 years' worth of growth.

Mr. Schiffer stated that the differences between the E+C and the Financially Constrained scenario were more subtle because, for one thing, they did not have all the projects in there just yet. He stated that they could not afford to entirely get themselves out of congestion, that there were some limitations in terms of what resources they had financially to resolve congestion problems, so they could only take that so far.

Mr. Schiffer stated that one could see some significant increase in Vehicle-Miles Traveled as one went out to the Year 2045, and that it increased even in the Financially Constrained network because they were adding a few more projects and networks, people were driving a little farther than they had been. He continued that one would notice that the Vehicle-Hours Traveled was highest for the 2045 E+C scenario because they were providing some additional capacity, which would mean that in the Financially Constrained scenario they would actually get a slight reduction in Vehicle-Hours Traveled.

Mr. Schiffer stated that, of course, Congested Speed operated the same way, except in reverse, because speeds were higher in the base year, and as the congestion increased, the speeds would go down. He stated that the worst scenario here was the 2045 Existing + Committed. He continued that the 2045 Financially Constrained scenario actually improved the Congested Speed just a little bit because there were some projects in there that were not in the Existing + Committed scenario.

Mr. Schiffer stated that the maps that were being displayed at this time depicted some comparisons between the different scenarios. He stated that on the left it showed 2015, and on the right it showed 2045 Existing + Committed. He stated that the darker and thicker the lines, the more congestion. He

continued that the thick, red lines, for example, were the most congested locations for 2045. He stated that one would notice that on I-565 there was some significant congestion, particularly in Limestone County, as it got closer and closer to I-65. He stated that US 72 and 431 were also corridors that had significantly more congestion in the future than at this time.

Mr. Schiffer stated that they had been looking at kind of the outer areas, and they had an insert, which was being displayed, that showed, getting closer into the central business district, how most of those roads looked. He stated that one would notice even some congestion showing on Holmes Avenue, for example, not really bad congestion but kind of borderline congestion. He stated that I-565, US 72, and US 432 were experiencing more congestion, as well as US 231. He stated that the gate in and out of County Road into the Arsenal was also looking very congested.

Mr. Schiffer stated that they had looked at 2015 to 2045 Existing + Committed, and those were only projects that were in the TIP, that the funding was committed to construct those in the next few years.

Mr. Schiffer stated that what was being displayed at this time were the Top 20 Congested Road Segments. He stated that some of these were very short segments. He stated that some of these could be improved just by adding some lanes to ramps or adding some through and turn lanes at key intersections. He continued that some of these could be looked at as longer segments, too. He stated, concerning University Drive, for example, it was not that just this one segment was deficient, that there were also some other longer segments that were problematic, but this was where the worst problems were, between Pulaski Pike and Memorial Parkway, and also between Hughes Road and Nance Road. He stated that there were other segments between those two

points that also showed congestion in the future. He stated that this was just to wet the whistle, more or less, and show some initial findings on where some of the worst congestion would be in the future. He stated that he would not go through each one of these, but it was information to provide to everybody to look at and comment on.

Mr. Schiffer stated that on the next slide, they would look at 2045 in more detail and look at how things would progress from the Existing + Committed network to the Financially Constrained network. He stated that on the left was the Existing + Committed, which was shown earlier in comparison to 2015. He continued that at this time he was showing how things would change if they added some more projects in the Year 2045. He stated what they should see here were some improving conditions, which one did see. He stated that looking in the Limestone County area of I-565, the Existing + Committed scenario was all red pretty much, but when one went to the Financially Constrained scenario, one would see that the congestion was not as bad, because this segment was slated for six-laning in the new plans. He continued that once that was done, it would eradicate the congestion problem, by and large. He stated that it would still be heavily traveled, that it had this pinkish-mauve sort of color, but it was not as bad as what they saw with the red. He continued that it was the same thing for US 72, that one would notice more red where he was indicating, and it was gone in the future, because of the six-laning of 72.

Mr. Schiffer stated that there were also other corridors. He stated that he would go to the next map and zoom in a little bit, and one would see some other corridors with slight improvements. He continued that part of Governors Drive was not as deficient, that it was not a lot, but a small segment

was actually better off than it was before. He stated that there was some slight improvement on US 231. He indicated how red Patton Road had been previously, and he stated that the improvement was because of the Arsenal connector that was being proposed, and had been plugged into the network, connecting I-565 with the Arsenal gate. He continued that the downside of this was that it had increased congestion at the Sparkman interchange with 565. He stated that one could see a lot more red where he was indicating on the map than they had at another location he indicated. He stated that they were fixing a problem where he was indicating on the map, near the Arsenal gate on Patton Road, but potentially creating a problem where he was indicating on the map.

Mr. Schiffer stated that, as he and Mr. Vandiver had just discussed, there was no design for this at this time, so they did not know exactly how that was going to tie in. He stated that should this road be built in the future, they would come up with something to hopefully prevent this congested area from occurring, perhaps some additional ramps directly connecting into 565 so there would not be all this connection on the arterial streets.

Mr. Schiffer stated that what was being displayed at this time was a listing of the 2045 Congested Segments as well. He stated that a lot of these were the same ones as were on the earlier table, although generally he did see in almost every case that the Volume-to-Capacity ratio was slightly lower if one was in both tables, so one could see some progression of improvement in traveler flow moving from the Committed network to the Financially Constrained network.

Mr. Schiffer stated that the next slide was the wrap-up slide, and he asked Mr. Somers if he had any comment at this time.

Mr. Somers replied in the negative.

Mr. Schiffer stated that what was being displayed were the next steps. He asked if there were any questions for him or Mr. Somers on any of the information they had provided.

Mr. Schiffer stated that he would be continuing to work with Mr. Vandiver on a model and issues in the network. He stated that as recommendations came in from the various jurisdictions, they would be put into the model, and they would re-run it and revise the results accordingly. He continued that that was as they did with the maps, that even though it might be just a few things that would need attention, they would take care of that, kind of on an iterative basis.

Mr. Schiffer stated that he would be present after the meeting and could answer any questions.

Mr. Somers stated that everyone would be back together at the next MPO meeting, in January. He stated that if anyone did not have contact information for him, they could get it from Mr. Houston Matthews. He stated that he also had his card available, and he was available, and Mr. Matthews was also available, as well as was the MPO staff.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was Discussion - Regional Commuter Study (Congestion Management Plan). He stated that the MPO would announce the consultants to work on the Commuter Study, which would be the update to the Congestion Management Plan. He continued that consultants would work closely with Croy Engineering, the consultants for TRiP2045, Huntsville Area MPO's 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Mr. Moore recognized Mr. Schiffer.

Mr. Schiffer stated that he was the Project Manager on this contract, although he was doing it through a different group, Metro Analytics, where he served as their technical lead for travel demand modeling work nationally.

Mr. Schiffer stated that, basically, this project was just kicking off, which was his reason for being present at this time. He stated that they had had a meeting prior to this with the staff to kind of go over some of this same information.

Mr. Schiffer stated that what he wanted to do at this time was talk about the reason they were doing this study, what the study entailed, in terms of tasks and activities, what some of the data might be that they would look at during this project, and the project schedule. He continued that after that, he would take any questions or comments.

(Mr. Schiffer made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Schiffer stated, as to why they were doing this, that the key issue was really understanding worker travel patterns within Madison County and between adjoining counties, and, more specifically, federal employees, which not only was a key component of the region, with the Arsenal, but also kind of a missing piece in some of the databases. He continued that there were some databases that excluded the reporting of federal government workers, so they needed to kind of nail that down and get a better feel for where they were and how they were impacting the transportation system.

Mr. Schiffer stated that what they would find out from the study would be used to develop the Congestion Management Plan for the MPO, as well as to refine the Travel Demand Model he had discussed previously. He stated that, really, no Travel Demand Model was perfect, that they knew there were some areas for refinement, and looking at employment at the Arsenal, within the

Arsenal, flows into and out of the Arsenal, were certainly important things. He stated that they had used the best information they had at this time, but they were going to get better information as part of the study that would help improve the model in those areas.

Mr. Schiffer stated that the slide being displayed at this time concerned Project Tasks, noting that they had three. He stated that Task 1 was Data Collection. He stated that what they would be doing here would be filling in some of the gaps on existing data sets. He stated that they would be looking at commuter flows, looking at travel times from home. He stated that this was something that the Census Transportation Planning Products actually looked at but on a more limited basis, and in some cases perhaps not representing the federal workers as much as they would like. He stated that they would also be looking at travel patterns and routing, how people were getting to and from the Arsenal and other sites, again focusing on federal workers, by and large, trying to get a better feel for them.

Mr. Schiffer stated, looking at the colored areas on the map being displayed, that these were the subareas they would be looking at to differentiate travel patterns. He stated that they would be looking at to and from the Arsenal from these areas, for example, as well as adjacent counties. He stated that on the Arsenal, they would actually be looking at trying to break that down into more detail rather than just aggregating it. He stated that at this time one could see that it was just one shade, as he was indicating, and they would like to know more about what was going on within it and how many people were going to the various gates within the Arsenal.

Mr. Schiffer stated that there were a number of data sources to be used for a study of this sort. He stated that one big category was what they called

"Big Data," which essentially was passive or anonymous data that tracked the flow of people and vehicles around a region. He continued that this was a fairly new phenomenon, that they could not really do this until the last, say, dozen years, that prior to that they did not have this information. He stated that at this time just about everyone had a cell phone, so there were a lot of ways of tracking people's movement at this time that previously had not been available.

Mr. Schiffer stated that there had never been a survey done of this region, where they had actually had people fill out what were called "Trip Diaries," saying, "I do this pattern every day," and blah, blah, blah. He stated that this provided a way of getting to that information.

Mr. Schiffer stated that the slide that was being displayed at this time just showed some of the different vendors and new methodologies for collecting this information and some of the pros and cons of the different methodologies. He stated that this was kind of a moving target, that it was definitely high tech, and one thing they all knew about high tech was that it was ever changing. He stated that some of these vendors, while they initially used just one way to get at these flows, that as new data became available, they started incorporating other methods and trying to merge methods together. He stated that traditionally, for example, AirSage was a company that used cellular triangulation as their main method of computing the flow of vehicles through a region, whereas another company, StreetLight Data, had typically used what was called "Navigation GPS Vehicles," as well as Fleet Navigation, for trucks.

Mr. Schiffer stated that both of them, however, had latched onto what was called "Location-based Services Data," which was basically that one was

using one's cell phone and would say, "I am here." He stated that all that data got captured. He stated that this gave them a better idea, that they were here, and they were there, and then they were there. He stated that these companies took that data and compiled it, to tell where people were coming to and from. He stated that this was on and on and on, that it was not like they knew that Joe Smith was going from this house to this school, or anything like that, that it was very aggregate and very anonymous, so they were not going to get into those fine levels of detail.

Mr. Schiffer stated that another thing was Proprietary Employment Data, as he had been discussing with Mr. Vandiver earlier. He stated that the TCC had access to several different Employment Data sets already, but it was good to comb through those and see if there was something more they could get out of them than they already had. He stated that they knew some of the orientations of them, but this was still a part of what they were trying to get at here.

Mr. Schiffer stated that what he thought was going to be really important was somehow contacting the Arsenal and getting a better feel for how the workers, and potentially visitors, were accessing the site and where they were actually coming from. He noted that there was a representative of the Arsenal on the TCC and present for this meeting.

Mr. Schiffer stated that there were a number of different ways this could be done. He stated that, obviously, the most basic was conversation and finding out what information they already had at their disposal that they could give to them, recognizing that there were a lot of security limitations and whatnot. He continued that another way was to actually survey the employees, noting that this could be done in a number of different ways. He stated that

one he thought might be effective would be to potentially do a postcard survey, where they would be handed out to people as they were leaving the gate, or entering the gate, and then have persons fill that out, and they could drop it off at the gate when they returned or it might have a postage-paid stamp where they could just drop it in the mail.

Mr. Schiffer stated that they could ask some very simple questions, noting that they would obviously need to speak with staff at the Arsenal about what questions they would include, making sure that they would be comfortable with those. He stated that this was a good way to find out where people were in general going to on the site. He stated that they did not need the specific building, but they did need to have an idea of what gates they were using and to what general areas of the base they were going. He stated to Ms. Hamby, the Arsenal representative, that they could also work with them on identifying ways of describing the various areas on the site, noting that he was sure they had some kind of a map that identified the areas. He stated that they did not want to get down to security issues, but they did want to at least have an idea that people were generally coming from a location and going through a gate he was indicating on the displayed map to get to an area he was indicating, fairly general areas.

Mr. Schiffer stated that another way to do this would be to do an on-line survey, where the employees would just do this on line. He stated that they could do both, potentially, as well. He stated that this could be for folks who preferred to do it on line.

Mr. Schiffer stated that this was something they felt was vital to actually getting the information. He stated that where they had some data concerning the Arsenal and the employees, it was fairly general at this point, that they did

not know how many were within each area, which made it difficult to tell how many were going into or out of each gate.

Mr. Schiffer stated that the next slide was Task 2, Data Presentation. He stated that this was largely a visualization exercise. He stated that they could look at, on the map, some of the subareas he had shown earlier and come up with what was called an "Origin Destination Matrix," which kind of showed the flows within the area, and also the surrounding counties, looking at how the flows were from those areas into the subareas he had shown earlier. He stated that the map on the right was an example of a map he had done previously, using AirSage data, showing some of the flows between different areas of a region. He stated that the travel time was based on when people left in the morning from their houses and headed to work.

Mr. Schiffer stated that they would look at the percentage of workers from outside the MPO area, which he noted was really important, and some of the commuter routes that were used, to subareas as well as to the Arsenal gates.

Mr. Schiffer stated that Task 3, the final task, was where they presented their findings. He stated that they would have these Aggregate TAZ OD matrices to display and show and document, and the tables he had mentioned. He stated that also at that point in time, they would have the Congestion Management Plan. He continued that they would look to determine if there were ways to build on this work with more data collection in the future, or more data procurement, or what have you. He continued that they would look at some of the congested routes, for example, what routes were being impacted most by Arsenal employees, and what they could do to resolve those problems. He continued that if they knew when those people were leaving for work, then

they would know what time periods they might be impacting the region the most.

Mr. Schiffer stated that they would also be looking at alternate commuter routes, whether these would be new corridors or possibly alternative modes, based upon the length of the trip and the origin and destination point. He continued that there might be other ways of satisfying some of that demand, using other modes of transportation. He continued that there were some opportunities for park & ride locations, where folks could park their car and take an express bus to the Arsenal, or a shuttle, or something of that nature.

Mr. Schiffer stated that the next slide showed the Project Schedule. He stated that it was about a one-year project. He stated that they would be back in February with some of their initial data findings, in terms of what data they had looked at, what they recommended procuring, what data methodologies they would use. He continued that from there they would actually go into obtaining the data, and they would come back in May of 2020 with a presentation on what they had initially found from the data they had procured. He stated that in August of 2020, they would present a draft report, and they would go into a 45-day comment and review period, and that in November of 2020, they would present their final report, to reflect any comments during that period from August, September, and October, on what they had provided thus far.

Mr. Schiffer asked if there were any questions for him or any comments from anyone.

Mr. Somers stated that this was kind of an innovative project that the MPO had masterminded, getting into something that some areas just kind of

glossed over. He stated that in the context of the greater Huntsville region, this was very important, and, clearly, it was an area where they needed to have a little more confidence in the information they had.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He stated that Resolution No. 27-19 adopted and supported decreasing funds for Project No. 100070087, (CN) SR-1, Memorial Parkway, from 0.31 mile south of CR-75, Mastin Lake Road, to CR-65, Winchester Road, structure removal and selective clearing and grubbing, as approved by ALDOT, into the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP.

Mr. Moore recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint Presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that the funding was decreasing on this project, that it was going from approximately \$2 million to approximately \$500,000. She stated that they were looking for the Technical Coordinating Committee's approval on this.

Ms. Lowe stated that what she was displaying at this time was a location map of this particular project.

Ms. Martin moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 27-19, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP with Project SR-1, Memorial Parkway, from 0.31 mile south of CR-75, Mastin Lake Road, to CR-65, Winchester Road, structure removal and selective clearing and grubbing funding decreased.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Faulkner.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Moore called for the vote on the above motion, and it was

unanimously approved by the Technical Coordinating Committee members present.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He stated that Resolution No. 28-19 adopted and supported deleting Project No. 100070604 (CN) Greenway at the northeast corner and southeast corner of the intersection of Browns Ferry Road and Balch Road.

Mr. Moore recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint Presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 28-19 asked for deletion of this project because the City of Madison thought that it would be feasible to utilize their own funding to put this project together. She stated that she believed this was the second phase of the Mill Creek Greenway. She stated that the City of Madison was going to do this rather than utilizing the federal funds, which might take a longer timeline.

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

Mr. Faulkner moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 28-19, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP by deleting a project, "Greenway at the northeast corner and southeast corner of the intersection of Browns Ferry Road and Balch Road."

Said motion was duly seconded by Ms. Martin.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Moore called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Technical Coordinating Committee members present.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He stated that Resolution No. 29-19 adopted and supported increasing funds for Project No. 100070584 (PE), Redstone Arsenal East Connector from I-565 to Redstone Arsenal Gate 10, Patton Road Gate.

Mr. Moore recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint Presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 29-19 asked for approval on a project funding increase, from approximately \$2 million to approximately \$2.8 million. She stated that this was a new project for the TIP, and it had phases, Design and Right-of-Way.

Ms. Lowe stated that what she was displaying at this time was a location map of the project.

Ms. Hamby stated that she had a question. She asked how the project cost could be raised if they did not have a design or anything like that, how they would go about doing that. She asked if Ms. Lowe knew anything about how that came about.

Ms. Lowe replied in the negative. She stated that this came from ALDOT, and they had said that it was \$2 million. She continued that she thought it was repurposed funds that were used to raise it, according to her understanding.

Ms. Hamby stated that they could not actually know the cost of it yet.

Ms. Martin stated that this was the result of an agreement to repurpose federal dollars that had been previously allocated for the Southern Bypass, that it was leftover federal money that had to be allocated to the same project, and that this was the same project under a different name, basically. She continued

that they were kind of starting over from scratch with the Corridor Study. She continued that their intent was to use all of the repurposed federal earmarked dollars to begin anew with Phase 1 of the Corridor Study.

Ms. Hamby thanked Ms. Martin for the explanation.

Ms. Martin moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 29-19, amending the Highway System/Interstate Maintenance section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, with project funds increased for Redstone Arsenal East Connector from I-565 to Redstone Arsenal Gate 10, Patton Road Gate.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Faulkner.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Davis, who was in the audience, stated that he had a question.

Mr. Davis stated that on the display, the lower line, the box, only went to Patton, but the description said it was going to Triana Boulevard, which was another mile to the east.

After further discussion, Ms. Lowe stated that the map was correct, but the description was incorrect. She stated that she would have her GIS person help her correct that. She thanked the speaker.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Moore called for the vote on the motion to recommend approval of Resolution No. 29-19, and it was unanimously approved by the Technical Coordinating Committee members present.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He stated that Resolution No. 30-19 adopted and supported moving fiscal years for Project No. 100066585, (CN) DOT No. 736-007H-Railroad Crossing Improvements on CR11, Martin Road, and James Record Road at the Huntsville-Madison County

Airport.

Mr. Moore recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint Presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 30-19 was before them for amendment. She stated that the Railroad Crossing Improvements had come before them because it qualified on the list of railroads that were kind of hazardous. She stated that this was one that would be going into the Intermodal Facility, and that the improvements were to add cantilever mounted signals, with two bells, gates, and markings. She stated that this was just moving the fiscal years around in the TIP, that it was not going anywhere, and it was not increasing the funding or anything of that nature, at this time.

Ms. Lowe stated that she was displaying the project location map for this project.

Ms. Martin moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 30-19, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, moving the fiscal years for DOT No. 736-007H - Railroad Crossing Improvements on CR-11, Martin Road, and James Record Road at the Huntsville-Madison County Airport.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Faulkner.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Moore called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Technical Coordinating Committee members present.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was an amendment to the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He stated that Resolution No. 31-19 adopted and supported adding Project No. 100070491,

(CN) Scour Repair at West Abutment on County Road 44, Nick Davis Road, over Limestone Creek.

Mr. Moore recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint Presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 31-19 was coming before them as an amendment. She stated that this was another project that was moving fiscal years around in the TIP. She stated that this project was basically to help maintain a bridge abutment over Limestone Creek, with riprap and backfill materials, et cetera.

Ms. Lowe stated she was displaying the location map for the project.

Mr. Faulkner moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 31-19, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance Section of the adopted FY2020-2223 TIP, with project moving fiscal years, for Scour Repair at West Abutment (BIN 003254) on CR-44, Nick Davis Road, over Limestone Creek, to replace backfill material, place riprap and shotcrete.

Said motion was duly seconded by Ms. Martin.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Moore called for the vote on the above motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Technical Coordinating Committee members present.

Mr. Moore stated the next item on the agenda was Jurisdiction Reports.

Mr. Moore asked if anyone representing Madison County had a report at this time.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore asked if anyone representing the City of Huntsville had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore asked if anyone representing the City of Madison had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore asked if anyone representing the Town of Triana had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore asked if anyone representing the Town of Owens Cross Roads had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was Agency Reports.

Mr. Moore asked if a representative of FHWA had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore asked if a representative of the FTA had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore asked if a representative of the Alabama Department of Transportation had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore asked if a representative of Public Transit had a report.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore stated that the next item on the agenda was TCC Member Comments. He asked if any members would like to comment at this time.

There was no response.

Mr. Moore stated that with no further business to come before the Technical Coordinating Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m. on November 20, 2019.)