

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

**MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting - September 20, 2021 - 5 p.m.**

**Huntsville, Alabama**

**Committee Members:**

Mr. Taron Thorpe	Chairman - Madison County
Mr. Trent Griffin	City of Huntsville
Mr. John Ofenloch	City of Huntsville
Mr. Todd Slyman	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 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 of the meeting on May 17, 2021.

Mr. Ofenloch moved for approval of the minutes of the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee held on May 17, 2021, which 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 Jurisdiction Reports. He asked if there was anything to be reported from Madison County or the city of Huntsville, respectively.

There was no response.

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

Mr. Mason stated Hughes Road was still under construction, that they were moving to the other side at this time. He stated that the good news was they were getting a traffic circle, and it was probably 60 or 70 percent complete and looking good, that it was going to be a much more efficient way to move traffic. He stated that as far as any other things going on in Madison transportationwise, he was not aware of anything.

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

There was no response.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an informational item, the Regional Commuter Study.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that he would be covering this item for Rob Schiffer, and if the CAC members had any more technical questions than what he was aware of on the Commuter Study, he would be happy to pass them along to Mr. Schiffer, who would be in attendance on the upcoming Wednesday to talk to the MPO Board.

Mr. Vandiver stated this would not be the first time they had talked to the CAC about the Commuter Study, that he believed it was the sixth, and it would probably be the last time they would talk about it. He stated they were bringing Mr. Schiffer back one more time, to talk about post-COVID impacts, that they had him take a look at the data again, and they would have pre-COVID, during COVID, and post-COVID trip patterns as a part of the Commuter Study. He stated that was not what they had expected to do during the Commuter Study, but it just so happened that everything had happened during the time they had Mr. Schiffer and Metro Analytics, so it had just worked out that way.

Mr. Vandiver stated that Mr. Schiffer had also taken a look at external travel patterns, people coming into the MPO from certain areas, that he had looked at ten different stations around the MPO area and looked at the trips either going through the MPO without stopping or coming into the MPO, where they would stop and then come back out. He stated they would go over some conclusions based on the data Mr. Schiffer had collected.

Mr. Vandiver stated, to give a quick recap on the Commuter Study, what had started all this was Census data, noting they had a lot of Census data on commuting, and they had great websites on commuter data, that they could get all the way down to neighborhood-level commuter data, where they could look at one tract and find out where people were going. He stated the problem was that this did not include federal employees, and in a metro area like Huntsville, that was 20 percent of the workforce in the MPO, federal employees, so they would have just lost 20 percent of the workforce in the Census data. He continued that they needed a fuller picture of the commuters, and that was why they had started the Commuter Study and the MPO had funded it.

Mr. Vandiver stated they were trying to figure out where people were coming from and where they were going to, and they had used StreetLight InSight, which was a big data software solution that basically used aggregated cell phone location data, and it figured out where one was starting a trip and ending a trip. He stated that they had also used Redstone Arsenal data, noting that they were very helpful in getting Metro Analytics and the MPO a pretty substantial percentage of Arsenal employees' ZIP Code data, so they could figure out how many ZIP Codes, how wide of a commuter shed, they were actually looking at. He stated that, in fact, they thought they had about 13 counties in their commuter shed for Redstone Arsenal, but it actually turned out that it was closer to 25 counties throughout northern Alabama and southern Middle Tennessee. He stated that there were people coming in from Wayne County, Tennessee, which was probably a two-hour drive from Huntsville, and in the opposite direction, they had people coming in from Cherokee County, Alabama, that they had a very wide area of draw for commuters coming into the Arsenal.

Mr. Vandiver stated that looking at the StreetLight data and the Redstone Arsenal data, they were able to figure out origins and destinations, figure out where the big trip points were, that, for example, they could figure out how many people were going from Madison to Greenbrier. He stated that they had divided that 13-county area into 50 zones, and they could figure out how many people were coming in from Lauderdale County and going to the Medical District. He stated that it was a pretty cool data set they had at this time. He stated that they had mapped those, that they had looked at them by time and day.

Mr. Vandiver stated that they had also gotten some freight data, because

FHWA, as a part of the TMA certification, was asking about how they got their freight data, if they could beef up their freight data, so that was something they had asked Metro Analytics to help them out with. He stated they had located future Park-n-Ride lots, both inside and outside the MPO area, using that trip data they had gotten, so they were looking at places not just within Madison County and the eastern portion of Limestone County but also places like Decatur, Athens, Guntersville, Scottsboro, and Fayetteville. He stated that they had done an analysis of those different areas and saw where the Park-n-Ride lots would be most beneficial.

Mr. Vandiver stated that they had talked a lot about that in the previous presentations, and all those presentations were on line, on their website, at [huntsvillempo.org](http://huntsvillempo.org). He stated that at this time he was going to talk a little bit about the post-COVID numbers that Mr. Schiffer had gotten and about those external trips, where the biggest external trips were coming in from, and the number of trips.

Mr. Vandiver stated that hopefully the CAC members could see the graph that was displayed, noting that it was a very interesting graph of pre-, during, and post-COVID, the travel during the day. He stated that, basically, it showed the percentage of trips by the hour, from 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. He stated that the purple and pink lines were 2019 and 2021, and they were almost exactly the same, which was really interesting. He stated that the 2021 was just a little bit lower than 2019. He stated that 8 percent of the trips during the day were taken between 7 a.m. and 8 a.m. in 2019, and at this time it was about 7 percent, that there was a little bit smaller AM Peak, and the PM Peak was about the same, that it was the same pattern in 2019 and 2021, but in 2020, which was the green line, there was no AM Peak, that they could see that it was

very low, that there was just one peak during the day, right about 5 p.m. He stated that did not mean there were more trips being made at 5 p.m. during COVID, that it just meant there was a greater proportion of trips being made. He stated he would show how many trips were made during that time period in a minute.

Mr. Vandiver stated that in 2019, there were the traditional AM and PM Peaks, and in 2020, there was just a PM Peak. He continued that in 2021, they were right back to 2019, just a little bit smaller.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if he was reading that right that during COVID, people went to work later, and it was kind of spread out over the whole day, as opposed to going to work all at the same time.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was correct, and it was a smaller number of trips, that fewer people were going to work, at later times in the day, that it was more spread out, and there was a greater percentage of trips happening during the middle of the day, where they were going shopping, or whatnot. He stated this was not just people going to work, that it was also people going shopping. He stated that during non-COVID times, it would be people going to school, things like that.

Mr. Mason asked if the graph also had real numbers, noting that those were percentages.

Mr. Vandiver stated that he did not have the numbers with him, but they did have the number of trips done per hour as part of this data.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated that this was the number of trips made in each month. He indicated April of 2019, and he stated that had about 7.5 million trips made in their 13-county area. He continued that in April of 2020, it had dropped by about 3 million trips, so it was about

4.5 million trips that were made in April 2020. He stated that in April 2021, they were back up to 7 million trips. He stated that as of April, they were getting pretty close back to where they were before COVID. He stated that some of the areas that had the greatest impact were the Arsenal zones, obviously, because Arsenal workers were off, and they were still at lower capacity. He stated that the Research Park zone had a greater reduction in trips, as opposed to, say, a residential area like Madison or Hampton Cove, places like that. He stated they did not have as great a drop in 2020. He stated there was also downtown Huntsville. He stated that most of the employment areas, areas with lots of office employment or industrial employment, had a greater decrease in trips in 2020, as opposed to areas that had a better mix of residential.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated that, like he had said, they were looking at some of the freight data. He stated that 2019 had about 5.5 million trips; 2020 had about 4 million trips; and for 2021, they were back up to just under 5 million trips. He stated that the Arsenal zones did not really change a lot in 2020. He stated that one he thought was interesting was Meridianville, where the Toyota engine plant was, that it had seen a huge decrease in the prior year, between 2019 and 2020. He stated that the plant was shut down for some time because they were not producing engines, so they did not need as many trucks. He stated that he was looking at Town Madison, for example, that they had a zone for Town Madison because they were interested in seeing how that would progress over the next few years. He stated that there were a greater number of truck trips in 2021 than there were in 2019 because there was all that construction traffic, that there was a lot of that going on, with Zierdt Road still being built. He stated that it was the same thing with

Greenbrier, with the Mazda Toyota plant going up, higher truck trips in 2021 as opposed to 2019.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated they would talk about the external trips. He stated this was important for their travel demand model they used for their Long-Range Transportation Plan, that they looked at trips that just went straight through the MPO without even stopping, called “external-external” trips, and then there were also “external-internal” trips, which were trips that came from outside the MPO into the MPO. He stated that they had Metro Analytics take a look at 10 different stations around the MPO, noting that these stations were major entry and exit points in the MPO, places like 72 East, going toward Scottsboro; 72 West, going toward Florence; the Tennessee River bridges, going through Decatur, on 65; and what Rob called Alternate US 72 West, what he just called Highway 20; and then 65, North and South; US 231/431, going toward Fayetteville; Winchester Road; the Whitesburg Bridge, 231, and also 431. He stated that they could not see much on the map that was displayed, that he was just trying to figure that out.

Mr. Vandiver stated that of the five external-external trips, the big one was 65 North and 65 South, people just driving through the MPO on Interstate-65. He stated that was pretty obvious, that 65 was a major north/south national interstate corridor, so it made sense that would be by far the greatest external-external pass-through trip. He stated, concerning some of the other ones, that this was very interesting, that 65 South would be people coming in from, say, Hartselle or Cullman, places like that, and taking Exit 340, which was 565, but instead of going toward Huntsville, they would go toward Decatur, so they were using 65 as a Decatur bypass, to get around Decatur, so they would not have to use 6th Avenue or the Beltline, or anything



like that. He stated that 72 East to Decatur was another one, that they would be coming in from Jackson County and going through Huntsville and Madison to Decatur. He stated that was the third one. He stated that the fourth one was 65 North, coming in from Tennessee to Decatur, and then another one would be coming in from Tennessee and going toward Florence, in Lauderdale County.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated that was looking at external-internal trips, which would be people coming from outside the MPO into the MPO area. He stated that the top one would be going over the Whitesburg Bridge, from Lacey's Spring, Marshall County, Morgan County, down in there, going into southeast Huntsville. He stated that was the top trip; the second one was coming in from Decatur to Greenbrier; the third was coming from Decatur to Madison; the fourth was 231/431, coming in from Tennessee to Hazel Green; and the fifth one was coming in on 65 from Hartselle, Cullman, Birmingham, to Greenbrier. He stated that Greenbrier and Madison were fairly significant areas for people from outside the MPO coming into the MPO.

Mr. Ofenloch asked Mr. Vandiver if he would back up to the prior slide.

Mr. Ofenloch asked Mr. Vandiver if he was saying that out of Decatur, heading toward Huntsville, 1,000 cars a day peeled off at Greenbrier, and the 2700 that were left would get as far as Madison.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the negative, stating that what it meant was that approximately 3,600 trips, just one way, were coming from that point, the Decatur bridge, going over 31, to the Greenbrier zone. He stated that did not mean there were only 3,600 trips coming out of that bridge, that it was just from that point to that other point.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he meant there were one-third of those people who turned off at Greenbrier, and two-thirds continued on to Madison.

Mr. Vandiver asked where Mr. Ofenloch was getting that figure of one-third.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that was if there were a total of 3600.

Mr. Slyman stated that there was a total of approximately 3600 going to Greenbrier, and 2756 going to Madison.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the 3600 was not a total number of trips, that that was just one kind of trip.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that if there were 3600 cars getting off at Greenbrier, he was trying to figure out where they were going.

Mr. Vandiver stated that they were going to Mazda Toyota, to the Target Distribution Center, to Polaris.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that it just seemed like a tremendous number of cars getting off there.

Mr. Vandiver stated that it was a major employment center. He stated that this did not separate the number of trucks getting off there, and there were a lot of trucks that got off at Greenbrier, that there was a lot of truck traffic, and they were going out to places west, Florence, Memphis.

Mr. Vandiver stated that when they were talking about the MPO, they were including all of Madison and Limestone counties. He stated that if they were coming from Athens into Greenbrier or the Arsenal, or somewhere like that, that was considered an internal trip, for the purposes of this study. He stated that the first slide was external-external, and this one was external-internal, so these were areas outside of Madison and Limestone counties coming in.

Mr. Vandiver stated, concerning some of the conclusions, that they were able to figure out where the employment was happening on Redstone Arsenal, thanks to their friends at the Arsenal who had helped them with figuring out, for the purpose of their travel demand, where the employees were on the Arsenal once they got to the Arsenal, and also where they had come from. He stated they were able to figure out those flows to and from the Arsenal which were not available in the Census data previously. He stated they had the share of trips across the MPO area, that they could figure out the zone-to-zone trips that were the highest in those time periods, that they had it by the time of day, and also they had the freight data the FHWA wanted them to get.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated they also had Park-n-Ride locations they had identified, in the MPO area and outside the MPO area. He continued that they were updating their Congestion Management Plan, noting that a big part of this whole process was to include this data as part of the Congestion Management process, which was a requirement for them to have in the Long-Range Transportation Plan, which was Chapter 7.

Mr. Vandiver stated that, also, they had the COVID-19 analysis, which was not something they had planned on having in their original study, but it just fell upon them that they needed to do that, and that was a really interesting study on how traffic patterns changed during the pandemic. He continued that they now had really good origin/destination data, by zone, and as they were just mentioning, the external-internal and external-external information, which would ultimately help them out with improving their travel demand model, which was part of their Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if they had any Park-n-Ride locations at this time.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the negative, stating they had no official ones.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he would suggest a survey be done to see if people would be willing to use them before they started building any. He stated the mentality in Huntsville, Alabama, was everyone drove their own car. He stated he did not know many people at all who carpooled, that everybody wanted to have the opportunity to leave work at their own time.

Mr. Vandiver stated that if they looked at the study where they identified the Park-n-Ride lots, these were existing parking lots, that they were going to utilize underused space. He stated that, like, along 72 West, they had identified a parking lot, noting he believed it was Wall Triana and 72 West. He stated they had identified that as a potential Park-n-Ride location. He stated they were not building brand-new lots at this point, that this would just be that they would put a sign up saying it was a designated Park-n-Ride lot. He stated that at this time, that would be for carpooling, but later on, they would like to have some sort of bus service, as people would get used to it. He stated they would have to build up to it.

Mr. Slyman asked how that would work, that they could use a private parking lot.

Mr. Vandiver stated they would have to ask permission, that that would be part of it. He stated that some developers were more amenable to that than others, that they would have to see how that would work out.

Mr. Slyman asked if there would be compensation for that use.

Mr. Vandiver stated he did not think so. He stated he did not know how that would work out, if they would lease it or what.

Mr. Autry stated Transit had talked about this, and one of the advantages for retailers was if they had a bunch of folks congregating in front of their

store, morning and afternoon, there were more potential customers. He stated prior to the Cecil Ashburn project, they had approached Publix and Walmart, at Sutton Road and 431, and they were all over it because it was an opportunity to bring more people to their business. He stated that usually they were not going to try to negotiate a fee for using excess parking space in their parking lot. He continued that, however, in different places around the country, he was sure there were fees, and in big urban cities, they would actually build transit-specific Park-n-Ride lots.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was all he had, and he asked if any of the CAC members had any questions.

Mr. Mason stated he would like to comment concerning what Mr. Ofenloch had said. He stated he thought there was a lot of study that showed if transit was available and frequent enough, and the price of gas went up, and the pain of driving went up, a lot of people would in fact use transit. He stated they could not just do a survey and some would say, "I don't use transit now; therefore I would not use it in the future." He stated he thought they needed to be careful about having the mindset that cars were the only way they could go.

Mr. Autry stated that was exactly right, that it was not all or nothing. He stated if they surveyed the entire population, probably 97 or 98 percent would say, "No, I am not interested," but the 2 or 3 percent who were could fill up 10 buses at a Park-n-Ride, going into the Arsenal. He stated what was great about carpools/vanpools/express buses was the scale, that they might start with only two or three buses, two or three departures every morning, and then once they reached capacity, were overfilled, they would just add to it. He stated it was not an all or nothing; if 100 percent of the population was not for it, that

people did not want a Park-n-Ride. He stated there were always going to be more people who did not than did, but there was always that small percentage who would rather not drive, that they would rather save the money.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further comments.

Chairman Thorpe stated there would be no action on this item, that it was for information only.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was an informational item, the Madison County PL Grant, the Madison County Long-Range Transportation Plan grant.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated she would be making this presentation for Madison County. She stated that their objectives for the Planning grant were to build upon and enhance the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan, with the coordination of the MPO and Madison County. She stated that their study area was only the unincorporated areas of Madison County.

Ms. Lowe stated that Phase I was looking at their Existing Conditions, which was evaluating the employment trends, population trends, and availability of growth-supporting infrastructure, such as their water systems, and looking at the major employment growth and generally looking at what was occurring in the southwestern part of the county while residential growth was focused on the northern county where large tracts of land were.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated that this was Traffic Conditions in the County, coming straight out of the TRiP 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan. She stated that there was 53, 231/431, 72, Winchester Road, Nick Davis Road, Wall Triana, Old Railroad Bed Road.

Ms. Lowe stated that Phase II was looking at the Alternative Growth Scenarios, looking at subdivision data, showing that 63 percent of household growth in northern Madison County occurred in District 1, and that a larger share of household growth through 2045 may occur in the northeastern portion of the county. She stated there were alternative growth adjustments here for the households, through 2045.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated this was Conclusions About Growth Scenarios. She stated there was a shift in household growth that was tested for this study that had generally minor impacts on predicted highway congestion. She stated that the Alternative Growth Scenario Travel Model was used for evaluating projects for the Madison County study. She stated that the MPO staff should continue to monitor these growth trends.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated this was Connectivity Improvements Tested. She stated that ten new road connections were modeled to determine potential congestion relief in the key corridors that were mentioned earlier. She continued two of these projects were found to have significant traffic benefits, that a new two-lane road between Bo Howard Road and Patterson Lane helped relieve the congestion in the Pulaski Pike area, and a new two-lane road connecting Orvil Smith Road to Kelly Spring Road provided some relief to the Nick Davis Road area.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated that Phase III was basically Hot Spot Identification/Access Management Recommendations, using the Alternative Growth Scenario, Level of Service, Safety, Local Knowledge and Input, and providing connectivity, intersection, and widening of these particular types of projects.

Ms. Lowe stated that what was displayed at this time was the

North Madison County project map. She displayed another slide, and she stated this was the South Madison County project map. She stated that they could see bits of Huntsville there in the green, and Madison in the orange.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide displayed was the statistics of the widening projects versus the intersection projects. She stated they could see that connectivity projects were very minimal.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated this was some recommendations. She stated that Access Management strategies were evaluated and provided to the County for consideration, things such as the traffic study, auxiliary lanes, access connection, 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 of this simple and effective, so that the "Hot Spot" areas could be proactively managed to meet expected growth coming into the County.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated that the next phase was Cost Estimating, Funding Sources, and basically prioritizing and phasing these projects. She stated that planning level estimates were prepared for each project, with available funding sources identified. She stated that in the LRTP, they used current dollars to kind of go forward to 2045. She stated that some of the funding sources that were discussed were ATRIP funds by ALDOT; Rebuild Alabama funds; Restore our Roads; the Highway Safety Improvement Plan; the High-Risk Rural Roads Grant Program through ALDOT; MPO funding; and also the RAISE, or as it had previously been called, the TIGER grants.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated that the next phase was the Final Report. She stated that the Final Report had been prepared and



provided to Madison County. She stated she was not exactly sure when they were going to the Commission to give their final discussion of this. She stated it also included the things they had heard, the Existing Conditions Analysis, the Alternative Growth Scenarios, the Projects and Associated Costs, and the Potential Funding Sources for those particular projects.

Mr. Ofenloch asked, concerning the majority of the funding required in the county, if those roads were in the county and not in the city limits.

Ms. Lowe stated that if they were in the Madison County maintained roads area, then they were within this particular project.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he understood that, but he was asking if the road physically was not in the city of Huntsville nor in the city of Madison.

Ms. Lowe stated that was correct.

Mr. Slyman asked if the funding sources they found had enough money to take care of all the projects identified.

Ms. Lowe stated she thought Madison County's idea with this was basically if there were some funding sources to come up, such as those RAISE grants or ATRIP grants, et cetera, they could apply for them because they had done the study already, and they could say, "We know we can get this project done with this amount of funds because we have already studied it, we have already looked at it in close proximity, and we are ready to get some funds and get moving on it."

Mr. Slyman asked if she thought they had prioritized the projects in the order of some metrics.

Ms. Lowe stated she was interested to see the Final Report because she believed this was exactly what they were trying to do with it.

Mr. Mason asked if there was any public process, for public input, on any

of the Madison County plan.

Ms. Lowe stated she believed so, but she would definitely check to make sure. She stated that if not, he could slide his comments in to her, and she could get them on over to them.

Mr. Mason stated that particularly in priorities, and some design questions, he thought the public had the right to make some comments on it.

Ms. Lowe asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Slyman asked when the Final Report would be out.

Ms. Lowe stated it should be by the end of the month. She stated that whatever that Final Report was, she would try to get it on the website so they could review it.

Chairman Thorpe stated this was for informational purposes only.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 19-21, which would require action to be taken. He asked if anyone had any questions or comments, they please state their name so that could be entered into the record, and, also, if they were making a motion or providing a second, to state their name as well.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Madsen.

(Mr. Madsen made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Madsen stated he was going to talk real briefly about the TMA Certification Review, which was a Transit Management Area Certification Review. He stated this was done every four years, that basically it was the feds, FHWA and FTA, coming in to make sure the MPO was doing what it was supposed to be doing, by federal charter. He stated that ALDOT, the State DOT, would kind of come along for the ride because a lot of what the MPO was doing obviously rested a good bit with ALDOT's policy.

Mr. Madsen stated this happened every four years, and they had just had their most recent one completed. He stated that they basically broke their recommendations down into three sections, that they had Commendations, which were gold star; Recommendations, which were things they really wanted them to do; and Corrective Actions, which were things they said they should have been doing and they were not doing, and they wanted them to correct that.

Mr. Madsen stated they had only had one corrective action, which, as far as he was concerned, was one too many, but he thought some of them who were on some of the calls might be aware that part of the reason that was a corrective action was that it was a federally mandated, or federally driven, recommendation to include a System Performance Report in their Long-Range Transportation Plan, but that recommendation had not actually at the time been passed through the State DOT, so they found it kind of difficult to do something they had not yet received instructions on how to do, but they understood it, really, as kind of an imperative. He stated that the feds thought this was a really important piece to add, so in the next LRTP to make sure it was getting done.

Mr. Madsen stated, concerning the two recommendations, that one was incorporating CMP strategies that were low-cost alternatives on local and ALDOT projects. He stated that some of these they were doing already. He continued that strategies might include things like adaptive signals, improvements of turn lanes, system operations. He stated that, as a matter of fact, one of the MPO agenda items was exactly that, that it was a set of TSMO upgrades on 565. He stated they actually had a few other recommendations he had to give credit to staff concerning, noting that they had actually answered and addressed those recommendations before they could be included in the

report, so FHWA had just taken those recommendations out of the report. He stated that the other one they had, which was also on the agenda for this meeting, was that the MPO should work closely with local governments on their ADA transition plans. He stated they would see that on the agenda for this meeting.

Mr. Madsen stated he wanted to mention the commendations, noting they had gotten almost a dozen, which was really good for an MPO. He stated he would like to mention them because they reflected a lot of the hard work staff had done, and MPO partners. He stated that even though the Huntsville area was not listed as an attainment area, meaning they were not struggling with air quality issues, the MPO continually monitored and tried to stay ahead of that, and the feds really appreciated the fact that they were actually trying to keep an eye on this before it would become a problem. He stated that FHWA gave HUBS a shout-out, that they were quite excited about the fact that they had a Huntsville Urban Bikeshare program and a staff that served area residents. He stated they had said that with HUBS' assistance, the MPO had demonstrated exemplary standards in bicycle and pedestrian planning in the state of Alabama. He stated he was aware that HUBS and other bike advocates would like to see that become more exemplary, but they had thought that was a really good sign and a really good direction.

Mr. Madsen stated that FHWA had also recognized another one of their partners, Huntsville Area Transit, for the quick and efficient way they had responded to ridership needs during COVID. He stated that they also really liked the way Transit had dealt with promotion and public/private partnerships, Commute with Enterprise, the idea of giving folks more options for navigating the area. He continued that they really liked the ongoing

coordination and support of Alabama A&M's electric bus program. He stated they were going to have something concerning their electric bus program on the agenda for the December meeting.

Mr. Madsen stated that FHWA liked the way they had put together the creation and maintenance of an annual list of obligated projects, that, in fact, they had said, "This document is among the most detailed, readable, and organized in the state." He stated that was all credited to a lot of the folks sitting behind him.

Mr. Madsen stated that FHWA would also benchmark them against their previous certification review, and they said they had made significant improvements in sharing information with the public, using the MPO website and newsletters, and they also commended the MPO on efforts to merge bicycle technology and ridership trends, in addition to bike storage on local public transportation. He continued that they really liked a lot of what Mr. Vandiver had just mentioned, talking about being very aggressive in research and data collection for tracking commuter movements. He continued that second to that was talking about doing their corridor analysis using that commuter study.

Mr. Madsen stated they were very pleased, and no small part of that had been the support of the Board and the CAC in green lighting these projects.

Mr. Madsen stated that was, in summary, what was in the TMA Certification. He stated he would be more than happy to take questions at this time.

Mr. Ofenloch recommended approval of Resolution No. 19-21, adopting the 2021 TMA Certification and Review Final Report.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

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. 20-21, concerning the ADA Transition Plan.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that the MPO was required to have an ADA Transition Plan of their own, and all of their jurisdictions were required to have those plans as well. She stated that since the MPO did not have its own facilities and public right-of-way, they could only evaluate those programs and services that dealt with barriers to having their meetings, and things of that nature. She stated that they had taken a look at the seating here, the ADA seating here, the ramps, the restrooms, opening doors, the signs to tell them if there was such, and they had packed that into a plan, and they were asking for approval of it.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 20-21, adopting the 2021 ADA Transition Plan.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Griffin.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Slyman asked if they could have the Plan.

Ms. Lowe stated it was on line, and she asked if they had not read it.

Ms. Lowe stated the Plan was on line at [huntsvillempo.org](http://huntsvillempo.org), and she asked that they please take a look at it.

Mr. Slyman asked if this included what the cities had to do to upgrade handicap ramps throughout the city.

Ms. Lowe stated this was just the MPO.

Mr. Slyman stated that, then, it was just for the way the MPO worked.

Ms. Lowe stated that was correct. She stated that, of course, the MPO was housed within the City of Huntsville. She stated they were getting a new City Hall pretty soon, and a lot of the barriers they might or might not have would be included in the new City Hall. She stated they had a couple of people who were taking a really close look at that.

Mr. Slyman stated that, then, this was just ADA as it went to the MPO itself and not the whole area, the handicap ramps and all that sort of thing, throughout the city.

Ms. Lowe stated that was correct. She stated that each jurisdiction should have their own, and she stated that would be the next phase of the requirements, to update those particular plans for each jurisdiction.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Griffin asked if there was anybody who coordinated with all the other agencies, or groups.

Ms. Lowe stated that was the next phase of the plan, the requirements from ALDOT and FHWA to get with those jurisdictions and update their particular plans, to go one by one and say, "Are all your sidewalks ADA compliant?" "Do you have any Section 504 requirements for reasonable accommodations?" She stated they would be taking a look at that in the next phase of this whole requirement thing.

Chairman Thorpe stated they had a motion and a second, and he stated, to clarify, that this was for the ADA transition of the MPO, not the MPO full area.

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. 21-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 21-21 was for the final adoption of the FY22 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which was the MPO's annual transportation planning budget for the upcoming year. She stated they took this budget into consideration when they were looking at tasks such as administrative tasks, looking at their financials. She stated that Task II looked at the data development, so they were looking at all the socioeconomic forecasts and the travel demand modeling, et cetera, they did there. She continued that there were Tasks III and IV, which were their short-range and long-range planning, doing things such as updating the TIP and the Long-Range Transportation Plan; creating the MPO Bike Plan, which James Moore had done a great job on with BASC; taking that into consideration; looking at the budget for the next year. She stated the apportionment was all they could budget for the next year, noting that this was about \$453,000. She stated this included their FTA 5303 Planning Funds, so they helped out with Transit with these particular funds.

Ms. Lowe stated these funds extended from October 1, 2021, to September 30, 2022. She stated that the current task of the Comprehensive Regional Transit/Rail Planning Study would be included in there; updating and adopting the ADA Transition Plan at this time; and also working with the jurisdictions in Phase II, as she had mentioned, would be included in this; and also taking a look at updating their Public Participation Plan because of COVID and the measures they had then.

Mr. Ofenloch asked Ms. Lowe if she would go back to the original slide



on this.

Mr. Ofenloch stated there was the term "within a financially constrained budget," and he did not know how to take that, that he did not know whether that was tongue-in-cheek or message stated, or what. He asked if that had any significance in this adoption.

Ms. Lowe stated it was to work within the apportionment that was given.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that obviously they would have to work within the apportionment. He stated he did not know whether it was a jab or sarcasm, or what, "within a financially constrained budget." He stated that was the way he would take it, and if he was off base, that was fine.

Mr. Madsen stated he thought it was ALDOT language, basically, that it was, "We give them one set budget every year, and they have to work within it." He stated that was the language they got from them.

Mr. Mason asked if there was any room in the budget to talk about some financial help, in terms of the Last Mile. He stated he had noticed that Bike Share and Transit so far were kind of separated locationally, and it seemed like it would make a lot of sense if they could have more Bike Share at bus stations and bus stops so when people got off the bus, they could get a Bike Share. He stated he knew they had done some good work, particularly with having the bikes on the buses, but there were only a couple of racks, so only two or three people with a bike could get on a bus. He stated that so far that had been sufficient, but if more people started using bicycles, it might not be sufficient. He stated he was wondering if there was money in the way USDOT and ALDOT were budgeting for transit, if there was any talk or any way to talk about those issues.

Ms. Lowe stated that she would say to take a look at page 47 of the UPWP

online. She stated that was an itemized portion of the budget. She stated that there was a line item for Bicycle/Pedestrian activities, and there was also a line item for Transit activities. She stated there was a funding task page that kind of listed those particular activities, and that was something they could do throughout the year. She stated they were working within this apportionment, this fiscal-year apportionment, but they would probably come back before them, say, maybe in December, or February of the following year, to take into account the funding they may or may not have spent this past year. She stated there might or might not be more funding coming available to help.

Mr. Mason stated that his understanding was that pretty much ALDOT passed through money that came from USDOT, in terms of transit. He asked if that was correct.

Ms. Lowe stated she believed that was correct.

Mr. Mason asked if there might be more money coming from USDOT toward transit.

Ms. Lowe stated she was not exactly sure. She stated that these were basically funds to do planning studies and planning work, for either Transit, Bike/Ped, long range.

Mr. Whitley asked Mr. Mason if he was talking about implementation.

Mr. Mason replied in the negative, stating he was talking about planning efforts.

Mr. Mason recommended approval of Resolution No. 21-21, adopting the Final Unified Planning Work Program for Fiscal Year 2022.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

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. 22-21, a TIP Amendment.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 22-21 was the deletion of a TAP project, the Transportation Alternatives Program, Dry Creek Greenway, from the Transportation Improvement Plan. She stated that the Dry Creek Greenway had gone through a series of realignments, and a lot of environmental work, and she believed it was agreed upon to call it quits, so they had to go through the paperwork at the MPO to delete it from their Transportation Improvement Program. She stated that this was what Resolution No. 22-21 was asking of them.

Mr. Slyman asked if Ms. Lowe was sure this was going through a deletion process, stating that it was supposed to be going through an adjustment process because the alignment along what he believed was Park Street had come all the way up into the right-of-way and not down into the floodway like the rest.

Mr. Madsen stated that this had actually come from the Land Trust and the City of Huntsville's Engineering Department. He stated he thought they had gone back and forth on a number of construction issues in the development around there, and there was just so much going on around there, and they had been asked to do a series of redesigns. He stated he believed Kathy Martin may have contacted Mr. Slyman, or contacted someone out there, to say they were going to have to pull this. He stated this did not mean the funds would go away forever, that they would just get kicked back to ALDOT, to go back into their

TAP account, and if there would come sort of a new understanding between the City of Huntsville's Engineering Department, the Land Trust, and the developer, they could actually revisit that application, but at this time their understanding from the City and the folks who were overseeing the greenway development was there was too much current uncertainty to keep sort of updating those plans.

Mr. Slyman stated that the last conversation they had was that the plan was being updated for that one issue along Arch Street, and then it was going to move forward.

Mr. Madsen reiterated that this was basically at the request of the City and the Land Trust.

Mr. Slyman stated he would have to make some phone calls.

Mr. Griffin recommended approval of Resolution No. 22-21, amending the Transportation Alternatives Projects Section of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), with the deletion of Project #100067267 (CN Phase) "DRY CREEK GREENWAY FROM INDIAN CREEK GREENWAY/GATES MILL ROAD TO THE INTERSECTION OF ARCH STREET AND BILTMORE DRIVE IN NORTHWEST HUNTSVILLE."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

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

AYES: Griffin, Ofenloch, Whitley, Mason, Thorpe

NAYS: Slyman

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 23-21, which was another TIP amendment.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 23-21 was a new project entered into the TIP. She stated that it was a Transit project. She stated that, basically, this was federal funds for the driver simulation on the University of Alabama Huntsville's campus. She stated that this simulation helped out the entire state with their travel demand process when it came to transit. She stated that the total cost for this project was \$1.3 million.

Mr. Ofenloch asked Ms. Lowe if she could go into a little more detail as to what this was.

Ms. Lowe stated they were purchasing transit software with these funds that would allow the Transit folks to take into account or become fully aware of what it was they were doing across the state as far as transit.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was a package that collected data from around the state and projected something.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Autry stated he thought this supported the Department of Public Transit at UAH, supported ALDOT as they administered all the federal dollars for the rural transit systems across the state. He stated he could not say for certain, but this was probably a software package to help them administer all their oversight responsibilities as it pertained to all the federal transit dollars that went to the 5311s, 5310s, and other rural programs. He stated this would not apply to the urban systems that received 5307 dollars.

Ms. Lowe stated that Mr. Autry was a lifesaver, because that was about what it was.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that, then, it was \$1.3 million for a software

package.

Ms. Lowe stated that was taking care of the whole state.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was correct that it was a software package that was going to be run at UAH. He stated he was not against it, but he would just feel more comfortable knowing more about it.

Ms. Lowe stated it was all federal funds.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he had been through that, that he had been on this Committee for many years. He stated, "It's federal money, so let's spend it." He stated that it was that it did not matter, that it was not them, but it was him.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it would hurt to defer this and get some further information and then vote on it, via email.

Ms. Lowe stated she could definitely do that. She stated that, in fact, she had received a good amount of information, and she had to study it to kind of understand what she had just pulled out for this. She stated she would pass that on.

Mr. Ofenloch asked how much for the software package, and how much every two years or so for maintenance, et cetera.

Ms. Lowe stated she would pass on all of that information.

Mr. Ofenloch moved to table consideration of Resolution No. 23-21.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Slyman.

Chairman Thorpe stated that once the item was tabled, there would not be an opportunity for discussion.

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

AYES: Griffin, Ofenloch, Slyman, Whitley, Thorpe

NAYS: Mason

(Note: It was agreed that the information requested would be furnished to the CAC members on the following day and the matter could be handled via email with Ms. Lowe. The requested information was furnished on September 21, 2021, and the minutes are updated as follows:

(Mr. Ofenloch, via email, removed Resolution No. 22-21 from the table.

Mr. Whitley, via email, recommended approval of Resolution No. 23-21, amending the Transit section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP to add Project #100073656, "SECTION 5311 TRANSIT UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IN HUNTSVILLE - ATOMIC (State Admin)."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason, via email.

The votes were forwarded to Ms. Lowe, via email, and are as follows:

AYES: Whitley, Ofenloch, Mason, Thorpe, and  
Chris Robinson

NAYS: None.)

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 24-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 24-21 had been on the agenda for the last meeting, that it had actually come in as a new project. She stated this was an increase in project cost, for resurfacing and traffic striping on I-565. She stated, basically, when it came in as a new project, it was an estimated cost, and the increase was with the actual cost, so they had the increase for this particular project.

Mr. Ofenloch recommended approval of Resolution No. 24-21, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge section of the

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the increase in cost for Project #100068983 (CN Phase), "RESURFACING AND TRAFFIC STRIPING ON I-565 FROM .26 MILE EAST OF THE TRIANA BOULEVARD OVERPASS (MP18.332) TO .45 MILE EAST OF THE SR-2 (US-72) OVERPASS (MP 22.305)."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Griffin.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Slyman asked if what was displayed was the increase in cost for each of those items or the total cost for each of the items.

Ms. Lowe stated it was the total cost. She stated that the increase, or the difference between the figures, was approximately \$1.4 million.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

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. 25-21.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 25-21 was about the same as the previous one. She stated that at the prior meeting, this had come in as a new project, and it was on their list at this time as an increase in project cost. She stated that this was the design phase for the corridor management of TSMO projects on I-565. She stated they had the old total cost of \$400,000, and now they had the new total cost of \$550,000, an increase of \$150,000 in the project cost.

Mr. Ofenloch asked what a corridor management did.



Ms. Lowe stated that this was a TSMO project, noting that Mr. Madsen had alluded to it earlier. She stated that, basically, there were some of the overhead traffic signs, all of the infrastructure inputs for that, et cetera, along the corridor.

Mr. Mason recommended approval of Resolution No. 25-21, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge section of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), with the increase in costs for Project #100073190, (PE), "ADVANCED CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT TSMO ON I-565 FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE ROUTE (NEAR I-65) TO THE END OF ROUTE."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

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 Administrative Modifications.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that the first Administrative Modification was Zierdt Road information, that the CE&I cost with Garver to finish the Zierdt Road project had increased a little bit, so to match the actual construction deadline, somewhere in between the prior meeting and this meeting, they had made those changes, and she just wanted to inform the CAC members of this.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next Administrative Modification was the Ryland Pike project. She stated that there was a decrease in funds, that as

ALDOT had closed out this particular phase, they had noticed the decrease in the funding, in what was actually spent.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next Administrative Modification was the turn lanes on 53. She stated she believed it was Old Railroad Bed Road, McKee Road, and Harvest Road all getting left-turn lanes. She stated this was a level-of-effort project, and these were state funds, and they increased. She stated this was just one of those things that happened in between the prior meeting and this meeting, so this was an update as well.

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

Ms. Lowe stated that she would act as Rod Ellis for the ALDOT update.

Ms. Lowe stated that the first project was Church Street, Phase I, between Pratt Avenue and Monroe Street, and it was under construction, approximately 85 percent complete, and the projected cost was approximately \$15.6 million, and the projected completion date was the fall of 2021.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was the Northern Bypass, from Pulaski Pike to US Hwy 231/431. She stated that the plans were 85 percent complete, with the right-of-way acquisition to be completed in the current year. She stated that the estimated cost was approximately \$40 million, and the anticipated start date was sometime in FY 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Martin Road, between Zierdt Road and Laracy Drive, and there were two separate projects that would be built in phases. She stated that the Phase I start date was July 2018, and it was approximately 75 percent complete, with the completion date being sometime in the spring of 2022. She stated that Phase II was scheduled for FY2023. She stated that the total project cost, for both phases, was

approximately \$25 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was North Parkway at Mastin Lake Road. She stated that plans were 90 percent complete, that the right-of-way acquisition was complete, the structure removal was complete, and the utility relocation was under way. She stated that the anticipated start date was sometime in FY 2022, and the estimated cost was \$42.6 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Access Management on US 231 between Weatherly Road and Hobbs Road. She stated that the plans were 50 percent complete, that they anticipated a virtual public involvement process, due to COVID, for the fall of 2021. She stated that the estimated cost was approximately \$15 million, and the anticipated start date was the fall of 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Winchester Road, from Dominion Circle to Naugher Road. She stated that the plans were 90 percent complete, and the right-of-way acquisition was ongoing. She stated that the estimated cost was \$15.5 million, and the anticipated start date was FY 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next item on the agenda was improvements to Balch Road, from south of Browns Ferry Road to north of Gooch Road. She stated that the plans were 65 percent complete, the estimated cost was approximately \$1.7 million, and the anticipated start date was FY 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Research Park Boulevard widening from US 72 to south of Old Madison Pike. She stated that work had started in August of 2019, and it was approximately 70 percent complete. She stated that the cost was approximately \$23.4 million, and the anticipated completion date was early 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was US 72 West, between

Providence Main and County Line Road. She stated that the plans were 30 percent complete. She stated there were multiple funding sources, and they were considering project phases due to the budget. She stated that the right-of-way acquisition was anticipated for FY 2022. She stated this was a \$60 million-plus estimated project cost, and the anticipated start date was sometime in FY 2025.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Zierdt Road, between Madison Boulevard and Martin Road. She stated this was a four-phase project, and work had started in 2015, and the last phase, Phase IV, was under contract. She stated that the total project cost was approximately \$27 million. She stated the work had started in the fall of 2018, and it was approximately 75 percent complete, and the anticipated completion date was the fall of 2021.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Four Bridge Replacements on Old Hwy 431. She stated that the project was under construction and approximately 65 percent complete. She stated that the project cost was approximately \$13.5 million, and the anticipated completion date was the summer of 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was the I-565 Additional Lanes from I-65 to County Line Road. She stated that it was under construction and was approximately 80 percent complete, and the project cost was approximately \$18.7 million, with a projected completion date of sometime in the fall of 2021.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was I-565 Additional Lanes from County Line Road to Wall-Triana Highway. She stated that the survey was complete, and the design work was under way. She stated that the projected start date was in FY 2024, and the estimated cost was approximately

\$46.8 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Jeff Road Additional Lanes from south of Capshaw Road to north of Douglass Road. She stated that the plans were 40 percent complete, and there had been a virtual public involvement session in April of 2021. She stated there was a projected start date in FY 2023, and the estimated cost was approximately \$13.5 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was intersection improvements on Wall-Triana Highway at Graphics Drive. She stated that the plans were 95 percent complete, and the projected start date was FY 2022, with an estimated cost of \$1.8 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was the widening of Blake Bottom Road from Jeff Road to Research Park Boulevard. She stated that the plans were 90 percent complete, the estimated start date was sometime in FY 2022, and the estimated cost was approximately \$8.7 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Intersection Improvements on SR53 at Harvest, Mckee, and Old Railroad Bed roads. She stated that the preliminary engineering was under way, the projected start date was sometime in FY 2023, and the estimated cost was approximately \$5 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was the Arsenal East Connector. She stated that the preliminary engineering was under way, and the projected start date was FY 2024, with an estimated cost of approximately \$30 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that for the region, there was a total amount of work in design and construction of approximately \$404 million.

Ms. Lowe asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Huntsville Public Transit.

Mr. John Autry, Public Transit Manager of the City of Huntsville, stated that this report updated changes to Huntsville Transit's Asset Management Plan, otherwise known as the Asset Management Maintenance Plan, as well as the current year's Safety Metrics, which were updated annually in their Safety Plan. He stated that this was provided as a report only, that a resolution was not requested at this time.

Mr. Autry stated that based on low annual mileage and the actual performance of the paratransit fleet over the last three years, the performance target for the paratransit vehicles was changed from 20 percent, not exceeding a four-year useful life, to 30 percent, not exceeding 200,000 miles. He stated that service interruptions with this fleet were very low, and the maintenance data justified the new target as more appropriate. He stated that on the larger buses, based on rising cost to purchase or lease and longer lead times for the buses, they had found that purchasing new engines and keeping older buses longer helped to maintain service standards and stay on track with Huntsville's five-phase Transit Expansion Plan. He stated that within the last two years, Huntsville Transit had replaced engines in six of its older fixed-route buses, and at the same time, manufacture and delivery on orders of new buses had been slower, or delayed, due to the 2020 pandemic and other delays by the vendor.

Mr. Autry stated that for all these reasons, the performance target for the fixed-route bus fleet was changed from 20 percent to 30 percent, not exceeding its useful life.

Mr. Autry stated that switching over to the Calendar Year Safety Performance data, year-to-date preventable accidents, 11; non-preventable accidents, 8; for a total of 19. He stated that fatalities were 0, and injuries 2.

He stated that total miles operated to date was 1,051,072.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if the miles were year-to-date.

Mr. Autry replied in the affirmative, stating that it was January through September 19.

Chairman Thorpe thanked Mr. Autry for the report.

Chairman Thorpe stated that the next item on the agenda was Opportunity for Public Comment.

Chairman Thorpe stated that hearing no public comment, they would move to the next item on the agenda, CAC Member Comments.

He asked if there was anything anyone on the Committee would like to address or comment on.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that even though they had not gotten to see the results of the inspection before they negotiated out some of the things, he wanted to commend the staff and everyone for the great job they had done. He stated that it was fantastic that they had gotten the 11 compliments, and they had found only one thing sort of wrong. He stated that he congratulated them all for that.

Mr. Griffin asked who he would need to talk to about greenway improvements.

Ms. Lowe stated that would be James Moore, that Mr. Griffin could just send him an email.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he had one other comment, noting that he had parked up by the bank to come down to City Hall, and from the street, the overhang on the east end of City Hall looked like the homeless had been living in there. He stated that somebody needed to clean that place out, that there were a lot of leaves, a lot of scrap paper, et cetera.

Mr. Eddie Hoff stated he just wanted to introduce himself, stating that he was involved with the Town of Gurley Planning Commission. He stated this was the first meeting he had attended, and he appreciated being able to participate. He stated that he worked in downtown Huntsville.

Mr. Richard Meyers stated he was from the Town of Gurley, and he served in Council Place 1.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any other comments.

Chairman Thorpe thanked the MPO staff for all they did, noting that they made these meetings go very smoothly.

Mr. Mason moved for adjournment, which motion was duly seconded by Mr. Slyman, and unanimously approved.

Chairman Thorpe stated that they would see everyone at the meeting in November.

**(Meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m. on September 20, 2021.)**