

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

MINUTES

Regular Meeting - February 22, 2021 - 5 p.m.

Huntsville, Alabama

Committee Members:

Mr. Taron Thorpe	Chairman - Madison County
Mr. Dario Gonzalez	City of Huntsville
Mr. Gary Whitley	City of Huntsville
Mr. Larry Mason	City of Madison

MPO Staff Members:

Mr. Dennis Madsen
Ms. Shontrill Lowe
Mr. James Moore
Mr. James Vandiver

Also present:

Mr. John Autry	Manager of Public Transportation, City of Huntsville
----------------	---

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the first item on the agenda was Approval of Minutes.

Mr. Mason moved for approval of the Minutes of the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee held on November 30, 2020, via Zoom Web Conference, which motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

Chairman Thorpe called for the vote on the above motion, and it was

unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Jurisdiction Reports. He asked if there was anything to be reported from Madison County.

There was no response.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was anything to be reported from the city of Huntsville.

There was no response.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was anything to be reported from the city of Madison.

Mr. Mason stated that work was continuing on Hughes Road, and also Wall-Triana Highway. He stated that it was kind of torn up, that they were putting in drainage pipes on the side and filling in the ditch, and things like that. He stated that there were probably some things going on over on the west side also, but he was not familiar with that.

Chairman Thorpe stated that there was progress on the west side, and as they went into Huntsville as well.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was anything to be reported from the town of Triana.

There was no response.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was anything to be reported from the town of Owens Cross Roads.

There was no response.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an informational item, an update on the County's grant award of Planning Funds from ALDOT.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that this was the award for the PL Funds the County had received from ALDOT. She stated that they had received \$80,000, federal, and they had put in a match of 20 percent, \$20,000, for a total of \$100,000.

Ms. Lowe stated that with these funds, the County was going to create an implementation program for their Transportation Master Plan.

Ms. Lowe stated that the objectives were to coordinate transportation planning between the MPO and the County; to build upon and enhance the MPO Long-Range Transportation Plan, TRiP2045. She stated that the study area was the unincorporated areas of Madison County.

Ms. Lowe stated that the schedule was displayed, and she stated that they were looking at an end date of June 2021. She stated that in Phase I, Existing Conditions, they were looking at the employment trends and the population trends, and going over what already existed, the overall growth, and just looking at where the County was so far.

Ms. Lowe stated that taking those traffic conditions into consideration, the congested corridors in 2045 in the unincorporated areas, Highway 53, US 431, US 72 East, and Winchester Road, and taking a look at Wall-Triana Highway and Old Railroad Bed Road, they were experiencing significant traffic growth. She stated that there were also other congested "hot spots" in the unincorporated areas of the County.

Ms. Lowe stated that what was displayed at this time was a level of service map from the Plan.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide was again looking at the Project Schedule.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide was looking at what they had done as far as Phase II, looking at different growth scenarios, looking at different households and looking at the shifts from different subdivisions and traffic within those areas.

Ms. Lowe stated that the slide being displayed at this time was Conclusions About Growth Scenarios. She stated that the shift in household growth that was tested for the study had generally minor impacts on the predicted highway congestion. She stated that the alternative growth scenario travel model was used for evaluating projects for the Madison County Transportation Study. She stated that the MPO staff should continue to monitor actual growth trends in the County to evaluate the growth assumptions in the alternative growth scenarios.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide was that the connectivity improvements had been tested. She stated that three of these projects were found to have significant traffic benefits, being a new two-lane road between Bo Howard Road and Patterson Lane to help relieve congestion in the Pulaski Pike area; a new two-lane road connecting Orvil Smith Road to Kelly Spring Road to provide some relief to the Nick Davis Road area; and widening a short segment of Pulaski Pike between Grimwood Road and Morris Road, overlapping in the traffic patterns there.

Ms. Lowe stated that on the displayed slide, looking at Phase III, they had done Hot Spot Identification/Access Management Recommendations, that using the alternative growth scenario, potential improvements were evaluated and prioritized by Level of Service, Safety, and Local Knowledge. She stated that the projects included connectivity, intersection, and corridor project types.

Ms. Lowe stated that going to the next slide, Access management strategies were evaluated: Traffic study, Auxiliary lanes, Access connection design/frequency recommendations, and Additional Right-of-Way dedication. She stated that Access management strategies were expected to be tied to a County Classification system to make enforcement simple and effective. She stated that local County-maintained roadways were to be delineated by one or more classes, based on expected growth; and "Hot Spot" areas could be proactively managed to meet expected growth.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide was continuing on with their schedule, and the next phase was Phase IV - Cost Estimating, Funding Sources, Prioritization and Phasing. She stated that this was to develop strategy to address identified needs, planning level estimates for each project, with available funding sources identified. She stated that projects would be classified by estimated financial constraint as they fit within the planning horizon. She stated that they would take a scenario they had looked at in this particular implementation plan and look at the funding that was available and look at the planning horizon from the LRTP, TRiP2045, to match those years.

Ms. Lowe stated that the final phase would be the Final Report. She stated that they were expected to help guide Madison Country through a period of expected significant growth.

Ms. Lowe stated that this summary presentation would be provided to the MPO Board as well.

Ms. Lowe asked if there were any questions.

There was no response.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was also an informational item, a TMA Certification Review.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that the last certification for the MPO was done in May 2017. She stated that this TMA Certification was completed every four years, and it consisted of updating plans, financials, bylaws and committee members, et cetera.

Ms. Lowe stated that the certification was expected to be around April 13th or 14th of the current year. She stated that the Federal team consisted of the Alabama Division of Federal Highway and Federal Transit. She stated that Federal Highway would be Vontra Giles from the Community Planning Department, Aaron Dawson, and Lian Li. She stated that from FTA, it would be the Atlanta Regional Office, with Nicole Spivey.

Ms. Lowe stated that as she had mentioned, every four years FTA and FHWA jointly reviewed the MPOs for the processes they used, in the areas with a 200,000 population and over. She stated that part of this review included seeking public input.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide showed that to give their opinions of the MPO and the transportation planning process was the reason they were present, and also to be conduits of the transportation planning process.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide asked "Why Certification Reviews are a requirement by law?" She stated that every four years, the TMA, for populations over 200,000, was required to certify to the government that they were in compliance with the law, using the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations 49 and 23.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide asked the question "How do we evaluate the MPO process?" She stated that they used the 3-C process,

continuing the planning process, being cooperative, and looking at the comprehensive, overall plan; and looking at multimodal, if the MPO looked at everything from bike plans to highway plans to transit plans, et cetera.

Ms. Lowe stated that public input was needed in all those particular phases.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide asked "What is the Planning Process?" She stated that this was a process by which transportation decisions were made and projects were planned, selected, and prioritized for implementation within the region.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide asked "Why is the Planning Process Important?" She stated that a lot rode on the substantial share of federal funding that was available nationwide. She continued that because of limited funding, the MPO must prioritize the regional needs and determine the best and most economical solution, through planning. She stated that the process laid the framework for the future of the transportation system in Huntsville and the surrounding area.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide asked "Who is involved?" She stated that this was the MPO itself, the Policy Board; the Technical Committee; this committee, the Citizens Advisory Committee; the State DOT, ALDOT; the Public Transportation operators, trams and shuttle, Huntsville Public Transit; the Local jurisdictions, the cities, the county; the local citizens; any Interest Groups, FTA, and FHWA.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide showed the Products of the Process. She stated that most MPOs planned and developed, delivered, the Unified Planning Work Program, the UPWP, annually; the Long-Range Transportation Plan, which had a horizon of 15 to 20 years; the Congestion Management

Process; the TIP, the Transportation Improvement Program; and the Public Participation Plan.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide asked "What is ... Unified Planning Work Program?" She stated that this was a mechanism document describing the planning activities to be completed and costs; that it described the MPO Budget; and "A Plan for Planning."

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide asked "What is ... the Long-Range Transportation Plan?" She stated that the LRTP was a 20-year multimodal guide to regional needs and potential solutions to transportation. She stated that it was financially feasible, conformed to Clean Air Standards, and contained financial plans, local goals and objectives, and public involvement processes.

Ms. Lowe stated that it also had the Congestion Management Process, with short-term and long-term strategies, with short-term looking at current traffic and transit problems, trying to solve those, and the long-range trying to prevent problems from occurring, looking at the 20 to 25-year horizon.

Ms. Lowe stated that the TIP, the Transportation Improvement Program, was a four-year list of financially feasible projects. She stated that this document prioritized regional projects for funding and implementation. She stated that if the region had air quality issues, this mix of projects must be within given emissions limits. She stated that this was mainly for the Birmingham area of Alabama.

Ms. Lowe stated that what was displayed at this time was a flow chart for all of that, for public involvement processes.

Ms. Lowe stated that what was displayed at this time was another flow chart for public involvement processes, how each of those products fit together

within a bigger realm.

Ms. Lowe asked if there were any comments based on the following questions that were displayed: “Do you have an adequate opportunity to participate in the MPO Transportation Planning Process? Have you been involved in the MPO Transportation Planning Process? What are your views of the process?”

Ms. Lowe stated that when they were thinking about those questions, given the time frame of the review, the outcome of the review should be a report that was issued in approximately 60 days, summarizing the discussions during the review. She stated that the process gave them a Certified, a Certified Subject to Corrective Actions, or Certified for Use of Only Certain Construction Funding Categories.

Ms. Lowe asked that if anyone had any questions, they please contact Ms. Vontra Giles at FHWA, noting that the displayed slide showed her contact information.

Ms. Lowe asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if there was a minimum threshold for public participation.

Ms. Lowe replied in the negative.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if there was a budget for public outreach. He stated that he was wondering if there could be a minor budget, to get a webpage up, or maybe have a couple of radio ads, on public radio, or something like that, just to get more people in attendance. He stated that this was really important for the entire community, and he thought that most people were really not connected to what was going on.

Ms. Lowe asked Mr. Gonzalez to see her after the meeting so they could

get some of those contacts and try to reach out to more of the public.

Mr. Mason asked Ms. Lowe, as to the questions she had displayed, who answered those questions. He stated that they were great questions, and he asked if there was a survey that would come to the members of this committee, or how they would answer those questions.

Ms. Lowe stated that what Ms. Giles had left out of the particular PowerPoint was that the Committee members would be notified to be available for a two to five-hour session with FHWA/FTA to go into detail of the process and how they were involved, and if they were involved, how thoroughly they were involved, et cetera. She stated that that should be coming soon. She stated that it would be about April 13th or 14th, somewhere around that time frame, and she asked that they please hold their calendars.

Mr. Mason asked if this would be done one-on-one, with each of them.

Ms. Lowe stated that it would be a public forum, that they would more than likely try to set up teams, or a Zoom or Webex, or they might be in the Council Chambers, in person. She stated that they were still trying to get the details together at this time.

Mr. Mason stated that to follow up on Mr. Gonzalez's comments, he thought that was a really great idea, and they really needed to investigate whether there were some funds available for doing that.

Mr. Madsen stated that Ms. Lowe had never actually been through a TMA process as of yet, but, fortunately, he and Mr. Vandiver had. He stated that based upon some things in the past, although things were sometimes changed from year to year, they would set up multiple sessions, some general public sessions and also Committee-specific sessions, to meet with the Board, the TCC, and the CAC, usually in some kind of closed format. He stated that as far

as public outreach, the MPO usually had that in their annual budget, and it was something that the City could also add to. He stated that, typically, they would post everything on the existing website, and they would also set up independent surveys, through whatever vehicle, and there would be community spots. He stated that there would be items like that, and they would post it in the newspaper, and they would go through various social media outlets. He stated that that was kind of the standard for the outreach within the TMA Certification process.

Mr. Madsen stated that there was not a minimum threshold, that they just said, "We want you to do 'xyz,'" and they should hit those. He stated that, generally, they wanted to try to get as much public outreach and public feedback as they could, but they also knew that sometimes the subject matter was a little dry, and they really had to beat the bushes pretty hard to find enough folks to come out and talk about it. He stated that at the last one they had done, they had had some pretty good, robust public meetings, that they had managed to do a pretty decent job in getting feedback.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions.

Chairman Thorpe stated that, then, this would be finalized for 2021, and that would be their certification.

Ms. Lowe stated that was correct.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was the adoption of the Final Huntsville-Area Bikeway Plan, Resolution No. 01-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. James Moore.

(Mr. Moore made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Moore stated that this was the adoption of the Final Bicycle Plan. He stated that he had come before the Committee at their November 2020 meeting

with a draft version of this.

Mr. Moore stated that the BASC Committee had reviewed the plan, and they had a few minor changes, mostly the rewording of statements, and things of that nature. He stated that they wanted to create links to the on-line maps so that the user could see them clearly. He stated that, also, they had 12 projects, which were recommended by the BASC Committee. He stated that the Bike Plan itself originally had 52 projects already in it, so staff had suggested that they put the BASC projects in the Sidewalk Plan, noting that they believed they could get done a lot faster that way, rather than being in the Bicycle Plan, per se.

Mr. Moore stated that all the changes had been made except the links to the maps, and they were going to get that done.

Mr. Moore stated that he thought this was a good plan, and he had heard some good things about the plan. He stated that he appreciated all the BASC Committee members who had actually reviewed it and given some input on it. He stated that they had some really good recommendations, and that a majority of them were in the updated plan.

Mr. Mason stated that he had a question. He stated that he had helped put together the comments from BASC. He stated that one of the things that really concerned him was that bicycle safety was not considered the top goal of what that plan should be. He stated that he thought the death of any cyclist was one death too many. He stated that they should not just reduce deaths by a percentage, that they should actually try and dig into why these crashes occurred. He stated that he thought most of the plan was a pretty good plan, but it did very short shrift to the safety aspect of bicycling and transportation. He stated that a lot of what was trying to be accomplished in Huntsville was

that they wanted to make bikes not just for recreation, not just a lifestyle kind of, "Oh, gee, it's a hobby. Let's get out on our bikes on Saturday." He stated that they wanted to make it a viable transportation option, and to do that they needed safe streets, they needed streets that were safe for bicyclists. He continued that he did not believe there was enough attention paid in this plan to that safety issue.

Mr. Moore stated that the plan was an overall guide on going forward, that it had no time limits, per se, in it. He stated that he understood Mr. Mason's concern about safety, and that education was a big part of it also. He stated that some years ago, they had done a bicycle safety program, called the "CARS Program." He stated that back in 2009, they had the buses, that they were using the buses for promoting safety, and things of that nature, and he could not say it did all that great. He stated that, however, things had changed since then, that that was 12 years ago. He stated that there were new platforms in place at this time that could actually make a difference. He stated that he felt the plan was doable, that it could be done over a period of time, that it could be done in segments. He stated that they could create a campaign for safety, bike safety, education for kids, or for adults, whatever, along with including all the parties involved, the stakeholders and the local governments. He stated that it was an MPO plan, so they would have to consider that also.

Mr. Moore stated that he thought the plan had a lot in it, and he thought a lot of things could come of it over a period of time, that it was just a matter of commitment and going forward and sticking to it and getting things done in a timely manner.

Mr. Mason stated that he agreed that it was a good plan, and there was a lot in it that was good, but the one thing he thought was missing from it was

that safety should be the No. 1 goal of what they did in terms of bicycle plans, and pedestrian plans, going forward. He stated that this plan did not reflect, at this point, that safety was the No. 1 goal.

Mr. Moore stated that it was an overall plan, that it did not focus specifically on safety, because, from his point of view, when they got into safety, it was how were they going to address it, who were they going to address it to, who was the audience they were trying to go after, how were they trying to make things happen. He stated that from his point off view, he thought it would take an overall effort from everybody involved to create that kind of atmosphere. He stated that he thought it could be done. He stated that it was not like it was an open-and-shut case, that going forward, safety could be a priority, included in other parts of the plan itself.

Mr. Mason stated that this plan replaced a plan that was done in 2006, which was more than 15 years prior. He asked if this was going to be the plan they would have to live with for the next 15 years. He stated that if it was, he did not see enough emphasis being placed on safety.

Mr. Moore stated that that was why he had said the plan could be modified. He stated that this was a 2020 plan or a 2025 plan, that the plan would go on over time, that things would happen over time and change over time. He stated that people would come, and people would go, and more people would come and get involved in it, and from that point of view, it would evolve. He stated that it was a good basis, a point of reference, at this time, going forward, but in time those things would happen, that at least he believed that.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that he believed Mr. Moore had done a good job on this, and he wanted to thank him for his efforts.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that he had a couple of questions for Mr. Moore. He asked why this plan was 15 years old. He asked if an LRTP happened, like, every five years.

Mr. Moore stated that was correct. He stated that, like he had said, the plan could be updated every two or three years, depending on what went on. He stated that they could go through and lay out the groundwork for going forward, trying to accommodate, for instance, safety or education, and changing it along the way. He stated that it did not have to be another 15 years.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that, then, it was sort of an evolving document.

Mr. Moore stated that was correct, that that was why he had not put any limits on it, that it was kind of an open plan, per se. He stated that the BASC Committee could get together, and they could focus on this, to try to get this done by 2022 or 2023, something of that nature, creating a small committee, so they could focus on small things.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that he believed this plan should be elevated a little bit, so that it was not just Huntsville's deal, but the County's deal. He stated that he felt the County should get involved.

Mr. Moore stated that it was an MPO plan.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that the City wrote it, and then the MPO adopted it. He stated that he thought the County should get involved in a very specific way. He stated that city boundaries would change, that Huntsville was going to keep growing, that maybe it was going to find little islands to grow maybe within Madison, that he was not sure, but the County's boundaries would not change. He stated that the number of deaths, pedestrian and bicycling deaths, were only going to increase, percentagewise and numberwise, as they had a greater volume of traffic and drivers, maybe driving larger and larger SUVs, in a county

that was just going to get more and more dense, with residents and tourists and activity. He stated that the number of deaths was going to increase, that there was no way around that. He continued that he really thought that not just the CAC but the MPO should elevate this issue, to get serious about zero fatalities, that they should aim high and make progress to it, that it was very direct and simple, and they did the same in so many areas of their lives, and he thought it was time for that.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that that was a comment directly to the MPO and not to Mr. Moore, that he knew it was probably a larger thing than what he could do.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that the other thing he wanted to say was that he thought they should look at this more than just every five years, that they should look at a document that had targets, and they should monitor those targets, and see how they were doing every year. He stated that they should make it a programmatic thing, to where they made a document that was actually better, not just missing something and then going back, and maybe ignoring some of the things they should be monitoring. He stated that he thought they needed to take this more seriously, and he did not think they were doing a good job of that so far. He stated to Mr. Moore that it was not him, that it was the County and the MPO itself. He stated that they needed to elevate this, that it was a serious matter. He stated that they could not have another pedestrian die and just say, "Oh, they were drunk," when, actually, there was no sidewalk in the area. He stated that there was a reason why people in wheelchairs took to the roads, that there were no sidewalks, and they could not just, after they were dead, say, "Oh, it's a one off," or whatever, that they were intoxicated. He stated that it was not fair, not for them, not for their families,

and it was not fair to the citizens and not fair to the city, that they could do better.

Mr. Mason stated that he had one other question. He stated that in the draft version, noting that he had not seen the final version, the language regarding the Bicycle Advisory and Safety Committee did not make that committee a standing committee, that it was not in any kind of enabling resolution or anything that the City actually recognized, and, yet, Mr. Moore had just said they were going to use BASC to make these improvements as they went. He asked if part of the plan should be to get some kind of an enabling resolution from the City, that this was a standing committee.

Mr. Madsen stated that he did not know if it was a standing committee or not.

Mr. Moore stated that it was not a standing committee.

Mr. Madsen stated that they could certainly do that.

Mr. Moore stated that they could move forward and do that. He stated that it was 2009 or 2008 when this was done. He stated that they could modify things to make things work. He stated that if everybody had an open mind to it, they could make it work, no matter what, that whatever the goal was, they could get it done.

Mr. Mason stated that he had one other question. He stated that he totally agreed with what Mr. Gonzalez had said, that this was a great plan, that Mr. Moore had done a great job, and he did not mean to sound like he was needling him.

Mr. Mason stated that the other thing was that he thought this should be called an Active Transportation Plan because it actually included pedestrians, and it included many other modes, such as wheelchairs, and they really needed

an Active Transportation Plan. He stated that he was trying to figure out how they could actually change the name because they had brought it up before, and they had been told that they could not change the name because it would confuse everybody. He asked if they needed another plan that they would call an "Active Transportation Plan," and then meld this into it. He asked how they would get from here to there, in a way that they could get beyond just calling this "Bicycles," because it was much bigger than that.

Mr. Moore stated that it did include other modes.

Mr. Mason stated that he was aware that the plan did, that that was what he was saying, but the title did not. He stated that if one looked at the title, it looked like a bicycle plan, and they really needed it to be an Active Transportation Plan.

Mr. Moore suggested that they go back and talk about this some more, and perhaps they could come up with a suggestion to resolve the issue, one way or the other.

Mr. Mason stated that he guessed he was fine with it being the Bikeway Plan right now, but he wanted to know what would be the process that they could get to it saying it was an Active Transportation Plan. He stated that he had brought this up a long time ago, and it was, like, "Oh, well, maybe we could," and then all of a sudden, it was that they could not because it was too late, and besides that, they would confuse people because it was a Bikeway Plan, but it should be an Active Transportation Plan. He stated that he was just trying to figure out how they could get that name changed in the final analysis.

Mr. Moore stated that they would work toward that and see if they could come up with something to resolve that issue. He suggested that they just do that.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions. He stated that all of those were very good points, and he was glad they had been brought up.

Chairman Thorpe stated that this item was an action item, and he asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 01-21, adopting the Final Huntsville-Area MPO Bikeway Plan.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Gonzalez.

Chairman Thorpe called for the vote on the above motion, and the following vote resulted:

AYES: Whitley, Gonzalez, Thorpe

NAYS: Mason

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 02-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 02-21 was a resurfacing project on Governors Drive, west of the Parkway. He stated that this was a decrease in the project cost, that it had gone from an estimate to the actual cost of the project, as it was authorized back in December.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the orange line on the display showed the extent of the project.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any questions on this action item.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if this was roadway resurfacing.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if there was any attention paid to intersection

crosswalks, if they would be restriped as they did the resurfacing.

Mr. Vandiver stated that he did not believe so, but they could bring that up with ALDOT.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that, then, there would be resurfacing without restriping, that they were not going to replace the crossbars.

Mr. Vandiver stated that he was sure they would replace the ones that were already there. He stated that he thought Mr. Gonzalez had meant adding more, and he did not believe they were adding more as part of this project.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 02-21, amending the National Highway System Projects section in the Adopted FY2020-2023 TIP, to make funding changes to the "RESURFACING ON SR-53 FROM SR-1 (US-431/231 - MEMORIAL PKWY) TO 14TH STREET."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 03-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 03-21 was an increase in funding for Blake Bottom Road, a widening project from Jeff Road to Research Park Boulevard. He stated that it was the right-of-way phase of the project, and there was an increase in the cost. He stated that it was very similar to what was happening in Resolution No. 02-21, that this was a change from estimated cost to actual cost.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next slide showed a project extent map, that

the orange line showed where the project would start and where it would end.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any questions for Mr. Vandiver.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 03-21, amending the National Highway System section in the Adopted FY2020-2023 TIP, to change the funding of Project 100067314, "WIDENING FOR ADDITIONAL LANES ON CR-47 (BLAKE BOTTOM ROAD) FROM CR-19 (JEFF ROAD) TO SR-255 (RESEARCH PARK BOULEVARD)."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 04-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 04-21 was another resurfacing project, on I-565, from 0.28 miles east of Intergraph Way to 0.26 miles east of the Triana Boulevard overpass, which he noted was basically where the urban viaduct started on 565. He stated that this was an increase in cost, as well. He stated that they were changing the scope of work of the project to include the pavement of ramps on the project. He stated that the total cost was \$21,286,500.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next slide showed the extent of the project.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any questions on this project.

Mr. Mason moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 04-21, amending the National Highway System Projects section in the Adopted FY2020-2023 TIP, for funding changes to Project 100069195,

"RESURFACING AND TRAFFIC STRIPING ON I-565 FROM 0.28 MILES EAST OF INTERGRAPH WAY (MP 10.100) TO 0.26 MILES EAST OF THE TRIANA BOULEVARD OVERPASS (MP 18.332)."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 05-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that this resolution adopted and supported the Transit Safety Performance Measurement Targets, as approved by ALDOT. He stated that these Performance Targets were from the Huntsville Transit Safety Plan. He stated that John Autry from Huntsville Transit was in attendance at the meeting if there were any questions.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if Mr. Autry could briefly tell them about this, noting that he did not have to go into all the details.

Mr. John Autry, Manager of Public Transportation for the City of Huntsville, appeared before the Committee. He stated that the PTASP was the Public Transit Agency Safety Plan, noting that this was new, that it was a federal requirement. He stated that the Federal Transit Administration required all grantees of public transportation funds to develop a PTASP. He stated that the initial deadline was in July, and they had made an informative presentation back then as to what it was.

Mr. Autry stated that, just briefly, this took principles of an SMS, a Safety Management System, so it was not just about avoiding vehicle accidents,

that it took a more comprehensive approach, as far as facility inspections, hazard identification, risk management, in addition to things one might expect, like a Safety Committee, hazard communication boxes throughout the facilities, and things of that nature.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that he was understanding that it was systemwide, not just for users, safetywise. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Autry replied in the affirmative. He stated that it was not just accident rates or injury rates or miles between mechanical breakdowns, which were the performance measures and targets that were required to be adopted. He stated that the overall PTASP was a lot more than that, that it dealt with employees, administrative staff, that it looked at the policies and procedures corporately, as a way to create a safe system approach, whether it be workplace safety or the service they provided on the street.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Mason moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 05-21, concurring with the recommendations of the Technical Coordinating Committee and adopting and supporting the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Performance Measurement Targets, as approved by ALDOT.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 06-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 06-21 adopted and supported the Highway Safety Performance Measurement, or PM1, Targets. He stated that these were the ALDOT-approved Performance Measurement Targets, which were statewide. He stated that the MPO was looking to approve these.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any questions for Mr. Vandiver.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 06-21, concurring with the recommendation of the Technical Coordinating Committee and adopting and supporting the Statewide Safety Performance Measurement (PM1) Targets, as approved by ALDOT.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 07-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 07-21 adopted and supported the System Performance Measurement, or PM3, Targets, as approved by ALDOT. He stated that, once again, these were statewide performance measures, that these were not Huntsville specific.

Chairman Thorpe asked if it was correct that these were issued to them.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative. He stated that these were the statewide targets. He stated that as part of the FAST Act, they were required to approve some sort of performance measures, and that these were the ones ALDOT had approved.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any questions for Mr. Vandiver.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 07-21, concurring with the recommendation of the Technical Coordinating Committee and adopting and supporting the Statewide System Performance Measurement (PM3) Targets, as approved by ALDOT.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 08-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 08-21 adopted and supported the FY2018 Alabama A&M University FTA 5339b Bus and Bus Facilities grant, as approved by ALDOT. He stated that this was a grant that was awarded to A&M back in 2018. He stated that FTA and ALDOT had requested the MPO to add this project, as a new project, into their FY2020-2023 TIP. He stated that it was in the 2016 to 2019 TIP, and they were just moving it forward. He stated that they were awarded a grant to purchase two zero-emission buses, which he believed were electric buses. He stated that this was to replace buses that had reached the end of their useful life. He stated that it was also to build a facility to garage the buses.

Chairman Thorpe asked if they knew who the provider would be for the buses, which company.

Mr. Vandiver stated that Proterra was going to build the buses.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Whitley asked if there was a typo, the number "2" in the A&M

contribution.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative. He stated that it was \$752,206.60.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 08-21, amending the Transit Projects Section of the Adopted 2020-2023 TIP, to add the Bus and Bus Facilities Program Grant (FTA Section 5339b) (Capital Apportionment FY2018) 2 Electric Buses and Bus Storage Facility grant project for Alabama A&M University.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 09-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 09-21 adopted and supported the FY2020 Alabama A&M University FTA 5339c LONO, or Low or No Emissions, grant, as approved by ALDOT. He stated that A&M would be receiving funds to purchase charging stations, as well as two zero-emission buses. He stated that these were for buses that had reached the end of their useful life. He stated that these were two more buses, in addition to the ones before, so there would be four.

Chairman Thorpe asked if they knew who would provide the charging stations.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the negative.

Mr. Whitley asked if they were just charging stations to be put around

the campus.

Mr. Vandiver stated that he did not know that. He stated that they could be overhead, like induction chargers.

Ms. Lowe stated that they could, or they could actually be the ones that they would carry around with them and plug in to actually charge them.

Mr. Whitley asked if these were chargers just for the buses or chargers for regular vehicles.

Ms. Lowe stated that if they did not do the overhead, it could be chargers for other vehicles, but she believed that these were specific to the type of bus. She stated that she did not have those answers, but she could definitely find out for them.

Chairman Thorpe stated that they were building a facility to house the buses, and he was making the assumption that the charging station would be inside that facility.

Mr. Whitley stated that they already had two, so they had to be charging those somewhere already.

Ms. Lowe stated that it could be that the charging was mobile, that there was also a mobile charging station.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 09-21, amending the Transit Projects Section of the Adopted 2020-2023 TIP, to add the Low-No Emissions Bus Program Grant (FTA Section 5339c) (Capital Apportionment FY 2020) 2 Electric Buses and Charging Stations grant project for Alabama A&M University.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

Chairman Thorpe called for the vote on the above motion, and it was

unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 10-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 10-21 adopted and supported the construction phase of the I-565 interchange at Zierdt Road, as approved by ALDOT. He stated that this was the Town Madison interchange. He stated that Phase 1 was the ramps, that there was one coming from eastbound 565 onto Town Madison and one going eastbound on 565, toward Huntsville. He stated that this was Phase 2, that these were the flyovers that would complete the interchange. He stated that the City of Madison was proposing to add this construction phase into their plan, that this was a TIP amendment for this project. He stated that it was local funds, that there were not any federal funds involved with this. He stated that that explained why it was not in the TIP.

Chairman Thorpe asked if it was local funds from the City of Madison.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was local funds, but he could not tell them exactly where they were from. He stated that it was local funds, that no federal or state funds were being used.

Mr. Gonzalez asked Mr. Vandiver if he was saying that there was no federal contributing to this project.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was correct, that this was a fully locally funded project.

Mr. Gonzalez asked why it was coming to the MPO. He stated that he thought the MPO was to help distribute some of the federal funding.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was a request by the City of Madison to add

this to the TIP.

Mr. Whitley stated that it was a highway.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was on a federal highway, that it was a functionally classified road, so it could be put in the TIP, that it was optional, that they could or could not, as they chose.

Ms. Lowe stated that, also, with this being in the TIP, federal funds could be applied for, and local funds could be used as a match if they applied for those federal funds. She stated that it was looked at as it needed to be in there in order to actually apply for any federal funds.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Mason moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 10-21, amending the National Highway System Projects Section in the Adopted FY2020-2023 TIP, for new project addition of "CN PHASE of I-565 INTERCHANGE at ZIERDT ROAD."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 11-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 11-21 adopted and supported the change in funding for intersection improvements, including adding a roundabout, at Jordan Road and Homer Nance Road, as approved by ALDOT. He stated that this was a State-funded project, and as they were discussing previously, the MPO usually did federal projects. He stated that, however,

ALDOT had requested that since this was a Rebuild Alabama project, it be included in their TIP.

Mr. Vandiver stated that what he was displaying at this time was a map of the location, at the intersection of Jordan Road and Homer Nance Road in northeast Madison County.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any questions for Mr. Vandiver.

Mr. Whitley moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 11-21, amending the National Highway System Projects Section in the Adopted FY2020-2023 TIP, to include Rebuild Alabama funds for Project #100071401, "INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING ADDING A ROUNDABOUT, AT JORDAN ROAD AND HOMER NANCE ROAD."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 12-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 12-21 adopted and supported a project addition, for Thatch Road. He stated that this was a bridge replacement in Limestone County. He stated that once again, very similar to the roundabout project in Resolution No. 11-21, this was a Rebuild Alabama project. He stated that this was State funds only, but ALDOT was requesting that it be added to the TIP. He stated that as to the location, it was in Limestone County, and that was all he could tell them.

Chairman Thorpe asked if this was a bridge out in the Moores Mill Road

area.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was a little farther north. He stated that he knew it was between 72 and Ardmore, somewhere in that area, northeast Limestone County.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if this was an existing bridge, if it was a functioning bridge.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was an existing bridge, and he knew that Limestone County had been trying to replace it for several years, and they were awarded Rebuild Alabama funds, which were part of the gas tax increase, that this was part of that funding.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Mason moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. 12-21, amending the National Highway System Projects Section in the Adopted FY2020-2023 TIP, to include Rebuild Alabama funds for Project #100071307, "BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (BIN 004132) ON THATCH ROAD OVER UNNAMED BRANCH."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Agency Reports, from the Alabama Department of Transportation.

Mr. Vandiver stated that he would handle that, that it was just a quick projects update on some of the State projects that were going on in the MPO. He stated that this was for information only, that no approval was needed.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that the first project was Church Street Phase I,

between Pratt Avenue and Monroe Street, and it was 75 percent complete, with a projected completion date of summer of 2021. He stated that they should be moving through the new intersection at Pratt Avenue and Church Street shortly.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was the Northern Bypass from Pulaski Pike to US Highway 231/431, Memorial Parkway. He stated that the plans were 85 percent complete, and the right-of-way acquisition was to be completed in the current year. He stated that the estimated cost was \$40 million, with an anticipated start date of sometime in the current fiscal year, and an anticipated completion date in FY2024.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Martin Road between Zierdt Road and Laracy Drive. He stated that these were two separate projects that would be built in phases. He stated that, of course, Phase I was currently under construction, and it was approximately 60 percent complete, with a projected completion date of fall 2021. He stated that Phase II was scheduled for FY2023, although it could be done sooner if funding was found. He stated that the estimated cost for both phases was \$25 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was North Parkway at Mastin Lake Road. He stated that the structure removal project that had been going on the prior year had been completed, at a cost of \$520,000. He stated that the projected start date for the overpass was FY2022. He stated that the plans were 90 percent complete, the right-of-way acquisition had been completed, and the utility relocation was currently under way. He stated that the project cost was \$42.6 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Access Management on US 231, Memorial Parkway, between Weatherly Road and Hobbs Road. He

stated that the plans were 50 percent complete. He stated that there should be a virtual public involvement process in the spring of 2021. He stated that the estimated cost of the project was \$15 million, which included moving medians and working on curb cuts along that corridor. He stated that the anticipated start date was the fall of 2022, with an anticipated completion date of the spring of 2024.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Winchester Road from Dominion to Naugher Road. He stated that the plans were 90 percent complete, and the right-of-way acquisition was ongoing. He stated that the estimated cost was \$15.5 million, with an anticipated start date of FY2022 and an anticipated completion date of FY2024.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project, in Madison, was improvements to Balch Road from south of Browns Ferry Road to north of Gooch Road. He stated that the plans were 65 percent complete, with an estimated cost of \$1.7 million, an anticipated start date of FY2022, and an anticipated completion date of FY2023.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Research Park Boulevard widening, from US 72 to south of Old Madison Pike, at a cost of approximately \$23.4 million. He stated that work had started in August of 2019, and it was approximately 60 percent complete, with an anticipated completion date of late 2021.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was US 72 West between Providence Main and County Line Road. He stated that the plans were 30 percent complete. He stated that they were still working on adjusting the cost of the project because it was going way over budget. He stated that the right-of-way acquisition was anticipated for FY2022, with a construction start

date currently scheduled for FY2025, and an anticipated completion date of FY2028.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Zierdt Road between Madison Boulevard and Martin Road. He stated that this was in four different phases, and the last phase was currently under construction, and it was 60 percent complete, with an anticipated completion date of summer of 2021.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Winchester Road, from Naugher Road to Riverton Road, and it was substantially complete, at a cost of approximately \$6.6 million. He stated that the start date was February 2019, and the anticipated completion date was pretty much at this time.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Four Bridge Replacements on Old Highway 431. He stated that these were 50 percent complete, and the cost was \$13.5 million, with an anticipated completion in the spring of 2022.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was I-565 Interchange Improvements at Greenbrier Road. He stated that these were done, at a cost of \$10,264,000.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was I-565 Additional Lanes from I-65 to County Line Road. He stated that this was under construction at this time and was approximately 45 percent complete, with a projected completion date of Fall 2021, at a cost of \$18.7 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was I-565 Additional Lanes from County Line Road to Wall-Triana Highway. He stated that this had been approved by the MPO at the November meeting, and the design phase was recently authorized. He stated that the projected start date was FY2024. He stated that this was bridging the gap, so to speak, between the six-lane section that ended at Wall-Triana and the six-lane section that would begin at

County Line Road, at a cost of \$46.8 million.

Chairman Thorpe stated that that seemed higher than other projects for a shorter distance.

Mr. Vandiver stated that from what he had heard, there were a lot of bridges that needed to be redone. He stated that it was a more complicated section of the interstate that would need to be rebuilt.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Jeff Road, Additional Lanes from south of Capshaw Road to north of Douglass Road. He stated that this was under design, with a projected start date of the following year, at a cost of \$13.5 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Interstate Improvements on Wall-Triana Highway at Graphics Drive. He stated that the plans were 30 percent complete, with a projected start date of sometime in the current year, at a cost of \$1.6 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next project was Interstate Improvements on SR53 at Harvest, McKee, and Old Railroad Bed roads. He stated that this was a new project, that they were looking at scoping at this time. He stated that there was a projected start date of FY2023, at a cost of \$5 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the total amount of work and design and construction at this time by ALDOT was more than \$381 million.

Chairman Thorpe stated that he did not see anything in there for Browns Ferry, Browns Ferry to 65.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was right. He stated that was a City of Huntsville project, not an ALDOT project, so that would not be part of what they would be working with this. He stated that on the west side of 65, that was a state project, a Rebuild Alabama project, that it was at this time a

state route there, going into Tanner. He stated that was a state project, that it was not within the MPO area.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was the opportunity for public comment.

Chairman Thorpe stated that hearing no public comment, they would move to Board member comments. He stated that he believed Mr. Mason had a few comments, with pictures.

(Mr. Mason made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Mason stated that he would try to make his presentation as short as possible, but he wanted to make a statement as sort of a followup to what they had discussed earlier.

Mr. Mason stated that from WHNT news from January 22, 2021, "Huntsville Police identified the man killed in a wreck at Spring Branch Road and Bob Wallace Avenue on January 21. 65-year-old Albert L. Demars was struck by a vehicle Thursday night around 6:20 PM, according to police. The report says Demars was in the roadway at the time of the wreck. He was taken by HEMSI to the hospital and was pronounced dead, according to Huntsville Police."

Mr. Mason continued to read, "al.com News," "A man in a wheelchair was struck and killed in a traffic crash Thursday night in Huntsville. Lt. Jesse Sumlin of Huntsville Police said the incident happened around 6:20 p.m. at Spring Branch Road and Bob Wallace Avenue. Albert L. Demars, 65, was struck by a vehicle, someone said. He was transported to the hospital, where he died. Demars was in the roadway at the time of the accident, Sumlin said."

Mr. Mason continued, "WAAY-TV, Huntsville Police have released the

identity of a man killed Thursday night when the wheelchair he was in was struck by a vehicle. Albert L. Demars, 65, was hit about 6:20 p.m. Thursday at Spring Branch Road and Bob Wallace Avenue. Police said Demars was in the roadway at the time of the accident."

Mr. Mason stated that those were very, very brief news stories at the time, and that was the end of the story. He continued that he did not think it should be the end of the story. He stated that, interestingly, the WAAY-TV reporter, Megan Reyna, had asked a couple of very pertinent questions. He stated that she had said the police did not know how fast the vehicle was going, and, further, she said that she had reached out to the City to see if there were any plans to address the infrastructure in regard to the pedestrian death, and the only person that had answered was Councilman Bill Kling, and he was not very specific about any improvements.

Mr. Mason stated that he did not know what state of mind Ms. Reyna was in, but he would imagine it did not take long for her to see that there were some serious infrastructure problems at that intersection.

Mr. Mason stated that yes, Mr. Demars was in the roadway, as the police had stated, but the question remained why was he in the road in such a vulnerable position. He stated that he definitely had the right to be in the road, that it was a public space, but he also had the right to be safe in the road.

Mr. Mason stated that the slide that he was displaying was that night at 6:20, and they could see that on the Honda side it was fairly well lit, but over on the other side it was not. He indicated Spring Branch Road on the display, as well as some apartments. He stated that he did not know whether Mr. Demars had lived in those apartments, that he did not know where Mr. Demars was going or where he was coming from, or anything like that. He

stated that he was not trying to investigate this accident, but he just wanted them to look at the infrastructure there. He stated that they had these sidewalks, if one could call them that, along the bridge, but they dropped off into the dirt, and there were no curb cuts, that there was nothing there, so if one was in a wheelchair, one would not have very many opportunities but to be in the road. He stated that if Mr. Demars was coming from Spring Branch Road toward Bob Wallace, it would be the same thing, that, again, there was no sidewalk extension there, that it just kind of fell off. He indicated Spring Branch Road, looking across, and he stated that that was pretty daunting even during the day, let alone at night when it was dark.

Mr. Mason stated that, again, there were the apartments, and he stated that he did not know whether Mr. Demars was visiting someone there, going there, or whatever, but, basically, there was a set of apartments there, but, yet, there was no pedestrian access anywhere around there.

Mr. Mason stated that that was all he would bore them with on the pictures.

Mr. Mason stated that in many cities and jurisdictions, there were multi-disciplinary task forces, which included traffic engineering, urban environmental designers and planners, data analysts, communication specialists, and even politicians, as well as the police, that would convene at such a crash scene and look at all of the factors that might have played into the crash. He stated that the task force was often referred to as a "Vision Zero Task Force" because one fatality was one too many.

Mr. Mason stated that over the years, the US Highway Transportation Safety Administration had done a terrific job of making vehicles safe, that is, safe for the people on the inside, not so much for the people on the outside. He

stated that as speed capabilities and enormous sizes increased, the speed-to-mass ratio had been killing people on bikes and foot, and in wheelchairs. He stated that these were the vulnerable users of the road network that needed to have a champion.

Mr. Mason stated that the City of Huntsville was in the process of making policy changes that would implement what was called a "Complete Streets Policy." He stated that he hoped more of the jurisdictions in the MPO looked at designing Complete Streets.

Mr. Mason stated that Vision Zero took Complete Streets to the next step, by helping to make sure the concept of "safety for all" was actionable. He stated that most people agreed that everyone deserved to be safe on the streets, whether walking, bicycling, or in a wheelchair. He stated that Complete Streets policies needed to be strengthened for safety for those outside of the vehicle as well as inside, and that should be the guiding force.

Mr. Mason stated that some said the MPO could not implement a Vision Zero policy on its own, without the blessing of ALDOT, but municipalities and jurisdictions could make policies that investigated and worked to find solutions to unsafe mobility and infrastructure issues, particularly for the vulnerable users of the network. He stated that while he understood that the MPO was not enabled to make policies for the entire metropolitan area, he would call upon the jurisdictions of the Huntsville MPO to work together to implement a Vision Zero Action Plan as an integral part of an Active Transportation Plan, a plan that did not view "active transportation" as a mere alternative to motorized traffic but as an equal user of the transportation network.

Mr. Mason stated that he was calling upon the MPO to pass a resolution

that supported a path to the implementation of Vision Zero Policies and Actionable Strategies. He urged that they take action to achieve zero incidences of traffic violence, fatalities, and serious injuries in Alabama, and, specifically, the Huntsville MPO area.

Chairman Thorpe thanked Mr. Mason for his presentation, for articulating it so that it was on record and could be shared with the MPO. He stated that they were excellent points.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further comments by any of the Board members.

Chairman Thorpe stated that seeing none, he would ask for a motion for adjournment.

Upon motion, duly seconded, the meeting was adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m. on February 22, 2021.)