

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

**MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting - March 14, 2022 - 5 p.m.**

**Huntsville, Alabama**

**Committee Members:**

Mr. Taron Thorpe	Chairman - Madison County
Mr. Russ McDonald	City of Huntsville
Mr. John Ofenloch	City of Huntsville
Mr. Gary Whitley	City of Huntsville
Mr. Larry Mason	City of Madison

**MPO Staff Members:**

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

**Also Present:**

Mr. John Autry	Manager of Transportation, City of Huntsville
Ms. Erin Tidwell	TARCOG

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

Chairman Thorpe called for a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Mr. Ofenloch moved for approval of the agenda, 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 the first item on the agenda was Approval of Minutes of the meeting of November 29, 2021.

Mr. Mason moved for approval of the minutes of the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee held on November 29, 2021, which motion was duly seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

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 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 that work was ongoing on Hughes Road, that they had run into a snag, concerning the utilities, on widening Hughes Road. He stated that they thought this work would be completed by the end of the year.

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 the next item on the agenda was the Transportation Study, and he recognized Mr. James Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated he would be providing an update on the High-Capacity Transit Study, which was a study that was being funded by the Huntsville-Area MPO, and it was being done by a group called "HDR." He

stated that the leads for this company were out of Arizona, and they were flying in at this time. He stated it was unfortunate that they could not make it to this meeting, but they would be visiting with the MPO Policy Board on the following Wednesday. He stated they had wanted to make sure the CAC was kept up to date on what was going on with this study. He stated they had at this time a more in-depth presentation than what the MPO Policy Board members were going to see because they were aware that this Committee had more involvement in alternative modes, so they wanted to make sure they got a bit more information about this.

Mr. Vandiver stated if there were any questions he could not answer, he would be happy to forward them on to the consultants when they arrived. He stated he was aware that Mr. Mason had already talked with the consultants and had corresponded with them, and if any of the CAC members would rather correspond with them directly, he would be happy to give them their contact information.

Mr. Vandiver stated he was going to talk about existing conditions in the Huntsville-Area MPO, about forecasts for the Huntsville MPO area and what had dictated those forecasts, and he would go into future transit options, identifying the corridors that would make sense for high-capacity transit, and the mode, whether it would be bus or rail, or some other mode of transit. He continued that he would then get into the draft Study recommendations and what would come next for those identified corridors.

Mr. Vandiver stated he would start with why they had started this study. He stated they were all recognizing that the Huntsville area was in the midst of one of the biggest growth spurts they had had since probably the 1960s, and with more growth came more congestion, and they had to keep in mind that the

solution to congestion was not always to widen roads, and that in some cases, that might have a detrimental or negative effect on communities. He stated that transit was a great congestion alternative.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had two really great examples of how not planning for transit would become an issue for a community. He stated that right next door, they had Atlanta and Nashville, two cities that had grown very fast, and widened their roads, and they were still having congestion issues, and now they were looking at transit, and it was almost too late for them to really get into transit because they could not purchase the right-of-way; they could not get their jurisdictions together as to a funding strategy for high-capacity transit. He continued that Huntsville really wanted to keep ahead of the curve, noting that having a quick commute to one's job was something the Huntsville Area MPO jurisdictions had used as a selling point for the Huntsville area, and that was something they wanted to maintain, as far as the high quality of life.

Mr. Vandiver stated that one of the arguments against transit in the Huntsville area was that Huntsville was not dense enough for transit. He stated his argument against this was that transit could work anywhere as long as it was planned right. He continued that another argument was that Huntsville had pockets of density that could be connected via transit.

Mr. Vandiver stated that on the displayed map, the areas that were deeper red had higher jobs and population density. He stated there was this nice corridor, pretty much from downtown to the city of Madison, kind of that western corridor there. He stated that was an area of high density, for jobs and population, that that was where a lot of the activity and job centers were, including UAH, Research Park, Downtown, MidCity, the Village of Providence, and the city of Madison. He stated there were some activity centers outside of

that corridor, such as Mazda Toyota; Redstone Arsenal, which, of course, was the largest employer. He stated that those areas were not as transit supportive and probably would not be ideal candidates for high-capacity transit.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the existing transit network was, of course, Huntsville Transit, through the Orbit service, that it was the primary fixed-route service in the Huntsville area. He stated that currently there were 10 routes, plus a special UAH route that ran every Friday night. He stated there was Monday through Saturday service at this time, and seven routes were operating hourly service, and there were an additional three routes that ran every 30 minutes. He stated that the hours were weekdays from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m., and on Saturday from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. He asked Mr. Autry if that was correct.

Mr. Autry stated they had one route that started at 5 a.m., Monday through Friday, and they ended at 9:00, and on Saturday, it was 7:00 to 7:00. He stated that two of the one-hour routes shared the same corridor, from downtown to Airport Road, 5 and 6. He stated they could look at that, really, as five routes had 30-minute service, versus the three.

Mr. Vandiver stated that Route 4, which was University Drive, was the highest ridership route in the Orbit system. He stated that the most recent five-year transit study had recommended 15-minute service along that corridor, so there would be at least one corridor with 15-minute service in the Orbit system.

Mr. Vandiver stated that in addition to the fixed-route services in the Huntsville MPO area, Huntsville Transit also operated a paratransit service, called "Access," and then outside the city of Huntsville, Madison County had a demand response service called "TRAM," and if you called them, they would

come and pick you up, for a fixed price. He stated that MARS was in the city of Madison, that that was their paratransit service.

Mr. Vandiver stated they would look at the future of the Huntsville MPO area. He stated they were looking at an increase in density, especially in the western corridor, between downtown and Madison. He stated that one area that was highlighted by the consultants was the University Drive/U.S. 72 corridor, as a high-density area. He stated the forecasts were educated by several plans that had been coming out by the different jurisdictions, including the City of Madison's Comprehensive Plan. He continued that Cummings Research Park had a Master Plan that had come out a few years prior, and UAH had a Master Plan, which they had just started to renew, with the new leadership there. He stated that, also, Huntsville Hospital had plans for expansion. He stated that all of these were included in the future forecasts, which went out to 2045, just like the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Vandiver stated that what he was displaying were some of the plans they were using to look at future density, and that Cummings Research Park was a great example. He stated it was considered a suburban office park at this time, and there were just office uses, for the most part, but the Research Park Master Plan showed a massive increase in density in the Park, as well as a diversity of uses, including residential, retail, restaurants. He stated that one area that was actually starting to see that was the Wynn and Bradford intersection, noting that there was the Alabama School of Cyber Technology and Engineering that was being built on the southeast corner, and then across the street the old Catholic High School had just been demolished, and there would be a six-story apartment complex there. He stated there were a lot of new uses, educational and residential, and he thought there was some retail

going into the Catholic High project, coming into the Park. He stated they were seeing the increase in density in the Park that might make transit more supported.

Mr. Vandiver stated that on the northeast corner of that, UAH had purchased the Executive Office Plaza, at the corner of University and Sparkman, and they had plans to expand their campus, with student uses, as well as a multi-purpose facility.

Mr. Vandiver stated they would look at some Future Transit Options. He stated that one of the studies the consultants used was the recently completed Huntsville-Area Commuter Study. He stated that was an MPO-funded Study that looked at 13 counties across North Alabama and Southern Middle Tennessee, and they had looked at where commuters were coming from and where they were going to within the MPO, and if they were coming from Lauderdale County and going to Research Park, they would be able to map that and see how many commuters were coming from Lauderdale County to Research Park, or from Madison to Greenbrier. He stated they split up the area into 50 zones and figured that out.

Mr. Vandiver stated he was missing a map, but he indicated a map that was displayed, and he stated it was a map of Trip Flows between different zones. He stated that the thicker lines and the darker lines indicated higher trips between each zone. He stated there was this cluster of Trip Flows between Madison and Southeast Huntsville, that it was kind of an arc around Redstone Arsenal.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had also looked at Transit Propensity, which included a variety of factors, looking at zero-car households; income levels; age, noting that they were looking at people aged 65 and over, and also

under 18; and also poverty rates, to see where the need-based riders were. He stated they liked to talk about trying to attract choice riders, but they had to recognize that need-based riders were the ones who needed transit the most and depended upon it every day, for things such as shopping, going to school, going to work, going to the doctor's office, so they needed to make sure they kept them in mind when they were looking at the transit corridors.

Mr. Vandiver stated that for Potential Transit Corridors, they had started out with initial identification of, really, just the major corridors within the Huntsville MPO area, that they could name them: Winchester Road, 53, North Parkway and South Parkway, 431 South, 72 East. He stated that a lot of those were, obviously, not good, high-capacity transit corridors, but they wanted to have just kind of a broad-based analysis of which corridors would work for high-capacity transit. He continued that they had then narrowed it down based upon these corridors' activity centers, as well as the density of jobs and population along these corridors, to go with the Tier 1 Corridors. He stated there were eight of these, and one was Madison Boulevard, out to the airport; and another was downtown, the Medical District, and that was Washington and Jefferson streets and Madison Street; the Holmes/Bradford Corridor, out to Research Park; North Parkway, as well as South Parkway; Meridian Street to A&M; and the North-South Railroad Line, the Huntsville/Madison County Railway Line that paralleled South Parkway; and then U.S. 72 West/University Drive, from downtown out to near County Line Road.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the consultant had looked at these Tier 1 corridors and had run them through their Corridor Refinement Criteria and had scored them, based on these four important criteria for high-capacity transit. He stated this included: Support Multimodal activity, Serve Diverse



Travel Market Needs, Sustain Economic Competitiveness and Development, and Provide Speedy Service. He continued that within those were different metrics, including Last-Mile connections, First- and Last-Mile connections within a half mile of those corridors, and population and employment density, service to universities, developable land, and also the directness of the route. He stated they did not want a convoluted, high-capacity transit corridor that took two hours to get somewhere when a car would just take 30 minutes. He stated they wanted to make sure this was competitive with car use.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated that looking at Spectrum of Transit, there was a wide spectrum of transit modes out there. He stated that on the left side of the display, there was Ride Share, which was Lyft and Uber, and those kinds of services; and then on the right side was High Speed Rail. He stated that what the consultants had looked at in this Study were the ones that were highlighted in green on the display, which was Personal Rapid Transit, which was kind of like what they had at the hospital, the little tram they had; and then there was the Light Rail Transit, which was what was seen in a lot of larger cities, places like St. Louis or San Diego. He stated that was a higher capacity transit service.

Mr. Vandiver stated there were pros and cons to each one of these, that rail transit had a greater travel speed with a fixed guideway, having priority over cars. He continued that if they were looking between a streetcar and a bus rapid-transit line, maneuverability was key on this because sometimes with a streetcar line, they could not move around an accident or a FedEx sitting in the lane, that if the streetcar was on a mixed-traffic corridor, the streetcar would just have to sit there and honk its horn until the FedEx truck moved.

Mr. Vandiver stated that buses had greater expandability, and they also

had shorter stop spaces, so buses usually had less distance between different stops, whereas with rail, it was more expensive to have more frequent stops, so there would be longer distances between stops. He stated that rail had higher capacity, but that might not be a good thing in some cases, especially in a city like Huntsville, where they did not need an eight-car train to serve passengers, that they could use a 40 or 60-foot bus to serve customers along the corridor.

Mr. Vandiver stated that land use and developability tended to have a greater chance of transit-oriented development, especially on the private sector side, with rail transit because they knew that corridor was going to be transit, as opposed to buses, where it could change at any time, going back for maneuverability.

Mr. Vandiver stated that then there was Transit Markets Served, and he stated that rail transit attracted more choice riders, although bus rapid transit was starting to make headway into that and attract a mix of choice and need-based riders.

Mr. Vandiver stated that next they would go into Draft Study recommendations. He stated there were two identified corridors, based on the criteria he had shown earlier, and these had the greatest chance for them to be able to successfully get federal funding from the FTA. He stated the one that rose to the top was U.S. 72, the University Drive corridor. He stated this combined the downtown corridor as well, that it started at the hospital, ran through the middle of downtown, and then out U.S. 72 West, toward Madison. He stated there would be two branches on this corridor, a bus rapid-transit corridor, based on the analysis the consultants had made, and one would split out to Providence, and the other would split out to the Walmart past Balch Road, Promenade Point Parkway.

Mr. Vandiver stated this had been chosen based on a variety of factors. He stated this was the highest ridership corridor on the existing Orbit route, so they could show existing ridership there. He continued that they could also expand the transit markets as well, because there was not transit service currently to Madison, and this would introduce service out to Madison.

Mr. Vandiver stated there was a secondary corridor that was identified by the consultants, and this was an express bus to the airport. He stated this would not exactly be a BRT route, but it would be a limited stop bus route, that there would basically be a stop at the airport, a couple along Madison Boulevard, one at Bridge Street, and maybe one at Research Park, maybe one around Stovehouse, and one downtown. He stated this was a connection that had been asked for for years, that there had been a lot of requests for it, at least on the MPO side. He stated they had had in several of their LRTPs about transit service out to the airport.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the problem was, as it had been in the past, that there were not the jobs and population density to support high-capacity transit. He stated that an express bus like this would introduce transit service to this corridor and start to encourage things like transit-oriented development, especially along Madison Boulevard, which was an area that had been identified by the City of Madison as having the potential for redevelopment into more mixed-use. He stated there were a lot of shopping centers and hotels along there that had seen better days, that were looking kind of tired, so they were looking at redeveloping that corridor. He continued that they felt that transit would be great for that area.

Mr. Vandiver stated that one of the things they had to look at here was Land Use and Transportation. He stated that what made University such an

attractive corridor for a bus route and transit, for high-capacity transit in general, was the ability to create transit supportive density along that corridor. He stated there was high density already along that corridor, but they could make it even better. He continued that a lot of this had to do with existing projects that were going on, noting there was MidCity, which he stated was the area in yellow on the display. He stated that on the west side was Research Park Boulevard, and on the right side was Sparkman Drive, and right in the middle was Wynn Drive. He stated there was MidCity in yellow, Cummings Research Park in blue, the UAH expansion in orange, and they had a conceptual TOD project in green, that it was not official, or anything like that, that it was just kind of a concept to see what TODs would look like along University Drive.

Mr. Ofenloch asked what "TOD" was.

Mr. Vandiver stated it was Transit-Oriented Development.

Mr. Vandiver stated that some other things they had to look at, to increase density along the corridor or to improve transit effectiveness along the corridor, were Bike/Ped Connectivity, the First- and Last-Mile connections; Parking Policies, things like restricting parking along U.S. 72, with new developments; and then Partnerships with the stakeholders along there, such as Research Park and UAH.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next display was again the UAH Master Plan. He stated that in this Transit-Oriented Development concept, they were going to incorporate the UAH Master Plan, which had already been introduced, and put it into a grander TOD project.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the next slide was the area between Wynn and Sparkman Drive, along University Drive. He stated that the rectangles in yellow were potential BRT station sites. He stated this was all conceptual, that

this was not a project that was actually going to happen any time soon, that this was just to kind of give them a feel of what could happen with transit along U.S. 72, or University Drive.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that he understood south of 72 was UAH, and he asked who owned that land north of 72.

Mr. Vandiver stated he wanted to be very clear that this was conceptual. He stated there was a fairly large shopping center there at the corner of University and Sparkman.

Mr. Ofenloch stated there were not many stores in it.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was correct, noting that that would make it a good candidate if they were not going to redevelop that site. He continued that if there was bus rapid transit, perhaps that would make them more amenable to a denser redevelopment of the site.

Mr. Vandiver stated he would go over some of the criteria of Transit-Oriented Development, or the checklist they had to have when they were looking at a project like this. He stated that Transit-Oriented Development had to be walkable and connected, that while it was along a transit corridor, they had to make sure they had a comfortable connection for pedestrians between the bus route transit stop and the different amenities in the Transit-Oriented Development site. He stated that in this case, they were looking at a site right next to the UAH Multipurpose Facility, and then getting across University, which was currently not an ideal thing to do. He stated he believed there was a crosswalk there, but he did not know that many people actually crossed there at this time.

Mr. Vandiver stated they also had to be context sensitive, that they wanted to have focal points with their Transit-Oriented Development, and that

in this case, the UAH Multipurpose Facility was the focal point, that it was the central location there, the anchor, so to speak.

Mr. Vandiver stated they wanted a dense and diverse development, that they wanted to increase the density because density was good for transit. He continued that they also wanted to have a diverse mix of usages. He stated they had the Multipurpose facility, and there could be a variety of office, residential, retail, and student housing. He stated that, also, they would have to have the First- and Last-Mile connections, that it would not stop as soon as the rider got off the bus, that they would have to have safe and comfortable bike lanes, and bicycle facilities, as well as sidewalks.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he asked what was next for these two corridors. He stated there were a lot of things they had to do before they got to actually launching these routes, including Funding, Building Ridership, Public Engagement, Corridor Configuration, and having an Operating Plan, and improving the Fleet.

Mr. Vandiver stated that with funding, what they were looking at, and the goal of this whole Study, was to be able to enter a project into what was called the "FTA Capital Investment Grant Program," to put a project in what was called "Project Development." He stated there were three different grants that came out of the CIG program. He stated that one was called "New Starts," and that was for really big projects, things like subways and light rail, and these were for larger cities, which had projects of more than \$400 million. He stated they also had "Core Capacity," which was if they were expanding a station, so they could get 10 car trains instead of 8 car trains in it, on a major line. He stated that would be a project for core capacity.

Mr. Vandiver stated that what they were looking at was what was called

"Small Starts," which he stated was great for smaller cities, such as Huntsville, because it allowed for fixed guideway or corridor-based BRT, which he would explain in just a moment. He stated this was for less than \$400 million and seeking less than \$150 million in CIG funds. He stated that the BRT projects along University would definitely be under \$400 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated there was a lot that had to be done before they could get a full fund grant agreement from the FTA, that they had to complete an Environmental Review process; that they had to select a Locally Preferred Alternative, which was basically a fancy way of saying "This is the route we are going to do;" and they also had to get it into their LRTP and their TIP; and they had to have a local financial commitment, that they were asking for some sort of match, whether it would be from local sources or elsewhere.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the FTA would then rate their project, based on their criteria for funding. He stated they had to have a minimum rating of "Medium" to get funding from the FTA. He stated that if for some reason, the density was really low and the ridership was low, and all that, they might rate them a "Medium Low" or "Low," and they would not get funding. He stated they would have to go through all of this, and, also, they would have to complete sufficient engineering and design work before they would get the small service grant approved.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated that on the funding side, the local match was required, that at least 20 percent was required, of the project funding, for FTA approval. He stated that there was another program, called "RAISE," which had previously been known as "TIGER" and "INFRA." He stated that every administration changed the name. He stated he believed at this time there was approximately \$1.5 billion in discretionary funding for

## RAISE in the current IIJA

Mr. Vandiver stated that partnerships was another great way to increase the local match, to get funding from stakeholders, such as universities, the Chamber of Commerce, and large employers. He stated that something to note, also, was that they had talked to a lot of large employers that were very keen on getting transit service to their employees. He stated they had talked about Mazda Toyota, and for Toyota, both plants, the one in Greenbrier and the one in North Huntsville, had indicated a desire to get transit service because they felt they could expand their employee pool, job pool, by getting transit service.

Mr. Vandiver stated that just focusing on the U.S. 72/University Drive BRT corridor, the average weekday boardings in 2019 were approximately 1300, and they were hoping it was a little bit higher at this time, and by the time they started going into the project development, they were hoping that 15-minute service would have been introduced, and that would increase ridership. He stated that the 3,000 number that was displayed was what was needed for competitiveness with the CIG grant, that if they wanted to get that "Medium" or better rating, they had to have at least 3,000 riders, or average weekday boardings of at least 3,000, along the corridor.

Mr. Vandiver stated improvements to the corridor included increasing the service, and also better lane planning along University Drive. He stated that University Drive had a lot of uses, and it was very dense, but at the same time, it was not very transit supportive. He continued that there was a fairly wide, seven-lane corridor, and the retail and residential was all kind of back from the street, so it was not very walkable and not a very conducive corridor for transit. He stated that, also, there were the side streets, such as Wynn Drive, that had a "Share the Road" sign, but he was not sure how many



people were riding bikes along Wynn Drive at this time, although there might be more than he thought. He stated he would not put his five-year-old on that road at this time.

Mr. Vandiver stated that integrating the land use and transportation planning and getting the First- and Last-Mile connections was an extremely important part of building that ridership.

Mr. Vandiver displayed another slide, and he stated that Public Engagement would be necessary for FTA funding, engaging stakeholders, as well as the public, and identifying that route, as well as making sure they did not forget anybody in this public involvement process, making sure that everyone was included and engaged in the process that wanted to be engaged.

Mr. Vandiver stated he had mentioned earlier about fixed guideway versus corridor-based BRT. He stated these were two different types. He stated that the side lane was more corridor-based, and it usually ran with mixed traffic, that sometimes it could just be a regular lane of traffic. He continued that if they wanted to get something started pretty quickly, they could do something like what he was indicating on the display, and they would have a different branded bus, and they would have a nicer station, but they would not do anything to the streets.

Mr. Vandiver stated they could also do a dedicated lane, which was sometimes called a "bus for right-turn lane," where they would have a dedicated bus lane, where a bus could go straight through an intersection, and the cars could also get in that lane and turn right. He stated that was another option, which kind of moved things along a little bit faster. He stated this was easier to implement, and it was also a little bit cheaper to do, but at the same time, the reliability and efficiency was not as great as if they got a fixed

guideway BRT, which would usually be in the center of a road, all by itself. He stated that with the center running, it would be in a lane all by itself, and they would not have cars coming in and out of the lane, hopefully, and they would have the stations in the median of the road. He stated that one disadvantage of this would be they would not be able to do too many left turns, that left turns would be restricted to certain areas, but the efficiency and reliability would be greater. He stated that this tended to be more expensive, and they would lose a traffic lane, which might be uncomfortable to some people.

Mr. Vandiver stated that once they built the BRT line, they had to talk about operations, funding for the future. He stated that the consultants had looked at different operating plans for the BRT corridor, looking at anything from a 10-minute scenario, buses every 10 minutes, to buses every 15 minutes along the corridor. He continued they had looked at how many buses they would need for each scenario, with six buses for a 10-minute headway and four for 15 minutes. He stated that the annual operating cost would be between \$2 million, for 15 minutes, and \$3.1 million, for 10 minutes.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if the blue line on the displayed map was up to Oakwood.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative. He stated that the blue line would go to Providence, and he thought they had it out to the Publix at Oakwood and Johns Road. He stated this was all subject to change, but the idea was to have a main trunk line through Providence and downtown, because that was where the main density was, and then to have two different services, and to combine the two and have more frequent service right in the middle, with less frequent service farther out, in the more suburban, less dense areas.

Mr. Vandiver asked if anyone else had any questions.

Mr. Whitley asked if this would come back at some point to do the outside or median version, if they did it.

Mr. Vandiver asked if Mr. Whitley was asking if when they decided on that, they would come back to the MPO.

Mr. Whitley replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was part of the FTA grant process, that they would have to include it in their Long-Range Transportation Plan and TIP, and that would be when it would come back to the MPO. He stated that by that point, they would have had a lot of public engagement, and, hopefully, this Committee would be involved in that, in making sure they would get this done right.

Mr. Mason stated he was wondering about the interface between Bike Share and Transit, if there would be a way they could make that more seamless, that one could get a bike when one got to one's destination. He stated it seemed if people had to stop and pay twice during a trip, that would become a bigger inconvenience. He stated he would certainly like to see a little bit more, in terms of being able to coordinate with Bike Share entities, that would make that First- and Last-Mile better.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was an excellent idea, especially for an amenity for a BRT station, because one of the great things about BRT stations was that they could put a lot of amenities in there, that it was not just a regular shelter, that they could have ticket vending machines, where persons could buy tickets right there. He continued that he had seen bike storage and bike share at BRT stations in places he had visited. He stated that they could have stop announcements, and things like that, that it was more ADA accessible.

Mr. Autry stated that at this time, they could have all the different fare

options on a mobile app, so if one needed a Bike Share for the Last-Mile, that would just be another item on the menu that was stored on a phone.

Mr. Vandiver stated they might not even need ticket vending machines by the time this would happen.

Mr. Autry stated that was possible. He stated there was no crystal ball, but they were certainly moving in that direction.

Mr. Mason stated that the other part of that would be they needed more Bike Share in the neighborhood, particularly for those needs riders. He stated that at this time, most of the Bike Share was around hotels and pretty much tourist oriented, where they really needed it to be neighborhood oriented, that it should be near the residences. He stated he believed some of this mixed-use retail, these two and five-podium developments that were going up all over the place at this time, would be a good place to have some of these fancy stops, and Bike Share, so that people who were living in those apartments could think about commuting, with gas prices going up the way they were.

Mr. Mason stated that to switch gears, anything they did should really include either dedicated bus lanes, which he knew they were talking about, or at the very least, some of these jump queue lanes. He stated that if they wanted people to use transit, they had to make the transit trip more convenient and faster than getting in one's car. He continued that once they gave people that choice, study after study after study had shown, and proven, that people would make that choice, but they had to have the choice, and if they got a bus system where buses got stuck in the same traffic the cars were, and with the same congestion, people were going to say they would just sit in their car, that it was more comfortable.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that in Chicago they had an "A" and a "B" tram, that

the "A" stopped at every stop, and the "B," like, at every third stop, so if one was going to the end, they would get on the half express train, as opposed to stopping every block.

Mr. Mason mentioned the dedicated lanes.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that if it was a bus, they could pull around.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was what Mr. Mason was talking about, that it was called "queue jumping." He stated that was where you would have a dedicated bus lane just at intersections, and the bus would kind of pull around the line of cars, and there was a special traffic signal that indicated when the bus could kind of cut the line, so to speak. He stated that was definitely an idea they were considering.

Mr. Mason stated he guessed it was the same kind of thing for lights with bicycles. He stated they really needed to be able to get pedestrians and bikes out into the intersection before the cars went out, particularly right-turn bicycles. He stated he saw the designs of some of the intersections that were displayed had cars going up and making a sharper turn to the right, whereas the bicycles could go on the inside of a safety island. He stated they needed all those kinds of things. He continued that it seemed to him if they coordinated some of this with the newer IIJA Safe Streets, they could develop some of those spur lines like Mr. Vandiver was talking about, like Wynn Drive. He stated if they could improve Wynn Drive and make it more of a bicycle connection to the bus stop, and down to Holmes, that would really be that kind of a demonstration.

Mr. Vandiver asked if there were any other questions.

Chairman Thorpe stated that with no further questions, they would move into their Action Items.

Chairman Thorpe stated that item No. 4 was Resolution No. 01-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 01-22 was the Highway Safety Improvement Program Performance Measures, PM1, as they called it. She stated these were their annual targets they adopted from ALDOT. She stated this was due to ALDOT by February 28th, so they were a little bit late. She continued that considering they were adopted annually, they had given them a grace period, if they adopted this first. She stated that other Performance Measures were adopted either on a two-year or four-year cycle.

Ms. Lowe stated that, as they could see on the display, the number of fatalities had actually gone down from the prior year. She stated she would have to look into their criteria for coming up with their number of fatalities, because it had gone down, from 964 to 961. She stated that her question to ALDOT was "Why," as the Committee's question would be as well. She stated this was something she was looking into.

Ms. Lowe asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Ofenloch recommended approval of Resolution No. 01-22, adopting and supporting the Statewide Safety Performance Measurement (PM1) Targets, as approved by ALDOT.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Mason stated there were a number of states that had adopted a Vision Zero policy, and also the U.S. had come out for the first time this year and said that they were going to make that a high priority. He stated he did not see ALDOT doing very much in terms of facilitating meetings like theirs, and

MPOs in the different jurisdictions in cities around the state. He stated that one of the things that local jurisdictions could do would be to have a Vision Zero task force, where a multi-disciplined group would look at these serious accidents and fatalities and actually go beyond, what was the engineering and what was the fault, if it was because the red light turned green too fast, or something like that, to really look at the environment in which some of these road projects were designed and operated. He stated he thought ALDOT needed to do a lot more in terms of being able to do that, so he would probably be opposed to this.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he would accept an amendment.

Mr. Mason stated he was not sure what the amendment would be. He continued that they could make an amendment that would request that ALDOT develop a plan to look at and share more data about fatalities and serious injuries, but he did not know they could do much more than make a recommendation.

Chairman Thorpe stated that there was a motion on the floor, and they were in discussion. He asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Mason moved to amend the above motion to recommend to ALDOT representatives in the Northern District to take it up with ALDOT State and come up with a plan for better reporting and more engagement in a Vision Zero task force.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion on the amendment.

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

Chairman Thorpe called for the vote on the above motion, recommending approval of Resolution No. 01-22, as amended, adopting and supporting the Statewide Safety Performance Measurement (PM1) Targets, as approved by ALDOT, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Ms. Lowe stated she would take that back to ALDOT and make sure they knew they needed to do more.

Chairman Thorpe stated that item No. 5 on the agenda was Resolution No. 02-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 02-22 was the deletion of various transit projects. She stated this was an ALDOT housekeeping amendment, that they were cleaning up the TIP. She stated this would not change any MPO funding. She stated that some of these projects might be completed, and other projects might be redistributing their funds. She stated that FTA allowed 2 to 3 years for them to utilize their funds, discretionary funds, grant funds, et cetera. She stated this was basically deleting those projects and making sure some of the other various projects got inside the TIP.

Mr. Ofenloch asked, concerning Section 5310, the Arc purchase of a van, if that meant they did not purchase any of those vans.

Ms. Lowe stated that the 5310 was the Arc, and some of this was moving some of their funds to other years, and combining them with newer funds, so that they could make an actual purchase.

Ms. Lowe stated that this resolution was kind of related to the next resolution.



Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 02-22, amending the Transit Section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to delete several transit projects.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any further 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 item 6 on the agenda was Resolution No. 03-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 03-22 was the addition of various transit projects. She stated that as she had mentioned, some funding was moved around.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he saw that the vans were back in.

Ms. Lowe stated that was correct. She stated that the Arc was utilizing their funding to acquire 24 vans from the DOT. She stated their increase in demand had increased what they needed. She stated that, speaking to the Executive Director, Susan Klingel, they needed more than the 24 they were asking for. She stated this was just a couple of different funds to put together and buy vans.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 03-22, amending the Transit Section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to add several transit projects, as approved by ALDOT.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any further 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 item No. 7 was Resolution No. 04-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 04-22 was a change in funding for resurfacing and traffic striping on I-565. She stated that, of course, this project had come to them several different times, in several different ways, but the increase in funding was due to an updated cost estimate. She stated that no MPO funds were used for this particular project, that these were Interstate Maintenance Funds, which meant these were State federal aid pot of funding. She stated that these changes were due to the budget, of course. She stated that from what she understood, there was a bridge striping tape used to restripe, and that tape cost more than what was in the budget, so, therefore, they had to increase, and as with everything else, gas and groceries, inflation, so, therefore, it had gone up \$2.2 million for this particular project.

Ms. Lowe stated she was displaying a location map, so they could orient themselves with the project.

Mr. Ofenloch recommended approval of Resolution No. 04-22, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge Projects section in the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to make funding changes to Project #100068983, "RESURFACING AND TRAFFIC STRIPING ON I-565 FROM .26 MILE EAST OF THE TRIANA BOULEVARD OVERPASS (MP 18.332) TO .45 MILE EAST OF THE SR-2 (US-72) OVERPASS (MP 22.305)."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any further 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 the next item on the agenda was No. 8, Resolution No. 05-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 05-22 was the deletion of a railroad project. She stated that this particular project did not use any MPO funds. She stated that from what she understood, this was a locally funded project that had applied for grant funding, and the local match was utilized for something else, in order to do something else within Madison County's particular things. She stated that local funding was not available for this project, and, therefore, they lost the grant.

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

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 05-22, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge Projects section in the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to delete Project #100073527 "RAILROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS (SIGNALS WITH BELLS, GATES, SIGNS, MARKINGS, AND LEGENDS, AND PRE-EMPTIVE SIGNAL COORDINATION) ON CR-69 (SALTY BOTTOM ROAD) AT NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILROAD, REF 1426 (XVIII-R) NORFOLK SOUTHERN (DOT#731729B) IN GURLEY."

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 item No. 9 was Resolution No. 06-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that this resolution and the next resolution were related. She stated this was a new resurfacing project for the City of Madison, and this was the design phase for that particular project. She stated that State funding would be used. She stated that this STPAA pot of funding was State funding that could be used anywhere in the state, and they had decided to use it in the city of Madison, for resurfacing.

Ms. Lowe stated that what she was displaying was a project location map, so they could orient themselves.

Mr. Whitley asked if the Huntsville portion was excluded, if that was the chunk that was missing, in the orange.

Ms. Lowe stated this was along Madison Boulevard.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that the orange was Madison Boulevard, in the city of Madison, and he thought the gray was the city of Huntsville.

Ms. Lowe stated there was another portion to this project, that there were two different portions of this project. She stated that would be the next resolution on the agenda.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 06-22, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge Projects section in the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to add new project #100074623, "RESURFACING AND TRAFFIC STRIPE ON MADISON BOULEVARD FROM COUNTY LINE ROAD TO PRODUCTION AVENUE AND FROM WESTCHESTER AVENUE TO WALL TRIANA HIGHWAY SOUTHWEST."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Mason stated he was curious. He stated this was a good example of these things that came up, and this was, like, for the Design Phase. He asked how they, as citizens who were supposed to be advising, could look at some of these designs beforehand. He stated the reason he was asking was because there had been several times when these types of projects were stripes for bicycle lanes, and things like that, and the CAC would already have approved it, and it would get done, and then one would go out and measure it, and it would be wrong. He stated that his frustration with some of the CAC meetings was that they approved this money, but they never really got to look at the design, that they never really got a chance to question some of the assumptions that were made on some of these projects. He stated that, again, he imagined it was an ALDOT problem, but they needed to somehow communicate with ALDOT that they wanted a little bit more input. He stated he did not have an amendment, that he just wanted to kind of use this as an example of something that was frustrating to him.

Ms. Lowe stated this was mostly to kind of approve the funding, as Mr. Mason had said, to do the design, so there was not really a design yet to be able to be seen.

Mr. Mason stated if they approved the funding, then they would just go out to a consultant, and it would get done, and then they would come back and say they had gotten it done. He asked how they could say they would give them the funding, but they would certainly like to have a chance to look at the design.

Ms. Lowe stated that there was normally a public involvement piece to this.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if, in this case, the City of Madison would be involved in the approval of the design.

Mr. Mason stated that if they were, they never let him know.

Ms. Lowe stated they had to be involved, because they were giving the local match, the 20 percent match, so at some point they did see the design, that between whoever was Planning in the City of Madison and the ALDOT representative, they were both looking at designs as they were being done, with or without the consultant. She continued that, therefore, Mr. Mason, the public, could go to the City of Madison, the Planning Department, et cetera, and ask for a look at those designs.

Mr. Mason stated he would just add that he would certainly like for ALDOT to make a little bit more effort in terms of letting them know about those types of design projects, whether they would be in the city of Gurley, Madison, Triana, or wherever. He stated it seemed to him that ALDOT could make a little bit more of an effort to let people know there was a design in progress.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that there had to be another committee in here someplace. He stated that by the time the design was done, it was either the City of Madison or it was more of an engineering committee, or a technical committee.

Mr. Mason stated he thought it was the Technical Advisory Committee. He stated he thought those were the traffic engineers from the various jurisdictions. He stated they did that, but they were all traffic engineers. He stated he was trying to say he wished there was more of a way to involve the Committee.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he understood what Mr. Mason was saying.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any further 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 item No. 10 was Resolution No. 07-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 07-22 was the construction funding for that same project. She stated that the construction funding was at \$2.2 million, and as they could see, it was State Anywhere funds, which could be applied anywhere in the state. She stated this was the same project, along Madison Boulevard, and it was the construction phase.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 07-22, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge Projects section in the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to add new project #100074624, "RESURFACING AND TRAFFIC STRIPE ON MADISON BOULEVARD FROM COUNTY LINE ROAD TO PRODUCTION AVENUE AND FROM WESTCHESTER AVENUE TO WALL TRIANA HIGHWAY SOUTHWEST."

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. 08-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated this was a new resurfacing project with the City of

Madison. She stated it was the same concept, where they had the design, and they were also utilizing State Anywhere funds for this project.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next slide being displayed was a location map for the project. She stated this was the in-between phase, where they had seen the gap that was asked about.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if they knew why this was a separate project, what the distinction was with this piece of road.

Ms. Lowe stated she had not received that information.

Mr. Mason recommended approval of Resolution No. 08-22, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge Projects section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to add new project #100074625, "RESURFACING AND TRAFFIC STRIPE ON MADISON BOULEVARD FROM WALL TRIANA HIGHWAY SOUTHWEST TO FLAGSTONE DRIVE."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

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 the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 09-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that this was the construction piece to this same project, for the piece that was missing from the first two they had gone through previously. She stated this was also State Anywhere funds.

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



Mr. Mason recommended approval of Resolution No. 09-22, amending the National Highway System/Interstate Maintenance/Bridge Projects section of the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP, to add new project #100074626, "RESURFACING AND TRAFFIC STRIPE ON MADISON BOULEVARD FROM WALL TRIANA HIGHWAY SOUTHWEST TO FLAGSTONE DRIVE."

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley.

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 the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 10-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 10-22 was the Utility Phase to the already started Winchester Road project. She stated this was at a total cost of \$3 million, with MPO funding behind it.

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

Mr. Ofenloch asked if this was Winchester Road.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative, stating that it was from Dominion Circle to Naugher Road.

Mr. Mason asked if this was one of the projects the MPO Board was hoping to fast-track. He stated there had been something in the news a few weeks ago about how Dale Strong, Mayor Finley, and Mayor Battle had these three special projects they wanted to fast-track.

Ms. Lowe stated she was not sure on that, that she had not seen that.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 10-22, adopting

and supporting new project #100074512 UT phase, as approved by ALDOT, in the FY 2020-2023 TIP.

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 the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 11-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 11-22 was a resolution to carry over funds from the FY 2021 UPWP, Unified Planning Work Program, to the FY 2022 UPWP. She stated there was a total of \$496,707 that the MPO could carry over, and they would utilize \$493,702 in the FY 2022 UPWP, leaving \$3,005 to be utilized in the FY 2023 UPWP budget, making the new total for FY 2022 \$947,222.

Ms. Lowe stated that the Committee might ask what they were doing with all this funding, and she stated they had added approximately \$35,000 to Task 3.5, which was the Transit Planning task; and they had added \$190,000 to Task 3.4.3, compliments of Regional Transit Planning. She stated that HDR was their consultant, as they had heard Mr. Vandiver give a preview of that earlier. She stated they would add a Task, 5.2, Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Development Planning, into the UPWP, to kind of anticipate the electric vehicle that was coming down from IIJA. She stated they would also add a task for Corridor Studies, the first being the Old Big Cove Corridor Study.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 11-22, to amend

the FY 2022 UPWP and adopt carryover funds from Fiscal Year 2021.

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 the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 12-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Lowe.

(Ms. Lowe made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Lowe stated that Resolution No. 12-22 was the Alabama Performance Management for Transportation Performance Data Sharing and Coordination. She stated that this Performance Management agreement was basically between the State, the MPO, and the Transit Agency. She stated that when this was last signed, in June or August of 2018, it did not have any Transit Performance Measures in it, and they were updating it to include PTASP, which was the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, and they had also added TAM, the Transit Asset Management Performance Measures. She continued that they had also updated those already, and therefore they needed to update the management agreement between the entities.

Ms. Lowe displayed another slide, and she stated that something familiar would be some of the Performance Targets that Transit had.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 12-22, adopting and supporting the Joint Agreement between the MPO, the Transit Agency, and the State of Alabama relative to Alabama Performance Management for Transportation Performance Data Sharing and Coordination.

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 Administrative Modifications.

Ms. Lowe stated that these Non-action Items were things ALDOT had already approved, mainly because most of them were level-of-effort projects. She continued that "level of effort" meant they belonged in not one category or another and might or might not include State funding, because of the safety projects the State did.

Ms. Lowe stated the first one was the widening of Zierdt Road. She stated they had looked at this many times. She stated this was the Utility Phase, and they had used some funds and they had converted some ATRIP funding into Other Funding to finish the Utility portion.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was Curb and Ramp Installation projects throughout Madison County. She stated there were various curb and ramp projects, and this was at no cost to the MPO, as they were using State federal aid funding to correct some of the ramps, to comply with ADA. She stated this did not necessarily mean sidewalks, but they were complying with ADA rules of curb ramps throughout the county.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was the Advanced Corridor Management TSMO project on I-565.

Ms. Lowe stated that all of the next projects were, as she had mentioned, Level-of-Effort Projects. She continued that the State did these projects with State aid, federal aid, because of the safety issues on these particular projects. She stated that the next one was repairing some riprap probably, along

Keel Mountain. She stated that the cost of this was \$500, but it was a safety issue, so it must be addressed.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was resurfacing in Madison, from County Line Road to Perimeter Parkway in Huntsville. She stated that this particular project had increased by \$611,000, which was not enough for them to have it as an actual administrative amendment.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if they had resurfaced a road they were going to widen, 72 from Madison to County Line Road.

Ms. Lowe stated she believed that widening was either in FY 2023 or FY 2022.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that evidently they wanted to resurface it before they dug it up.

Ms. Lowe stated the next one was I-565 resurfacing, from County Line to Intergraph Way. She stated she believed this was going out for bid at the end of the month.

Ms. Lowe stated that was all of the Administrative Modifications from ALDOT.

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item on the agenda was Agency Reports, and he asked Ms. Lowe if she wanted to report for ALDOT.

Ms. Lowe replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Lowe stated the first project was Church Street, Phase I, between Pratt Avenue and Monroe Street. She stated it was under construction, approximately 98 percent complete, and the project cost was about \$15.6 million. She stated the projected completion date was the spring of 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was the Northern Bypass from Pulaski

Pike to U.S. Highway 231/431. She stated the plans were 85 percent complete; the right-of-way acquisition was to be completed soon; the Utility relocation design work was under way, and the estimated cost was approximately \$40 million, with an anticipated start date sometime in FY 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was Martin Road between Zierdt Road and Laracy Drive. She stated this was two separate projects that would be built in phases, and the Phase I start date was July 2018, and that was approximately 85 percent complete, with a completion date being sometime in the spring of 2022. She stated that Phase II was scheduled for FY 2023. She stated that the project cost, for both phases, was approximately \$25 million.

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

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was access management on U.S. 231 between Weatherly Road and Hobbs Road. She stated that the plans were 50 percent complete, and the Virtual Public Involvement Process was completed in the fall of 2021. She stated that the estimated cost was approximately \$15 million, and the anticipated start date was FY 2023.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next one was Winchester Road from Dominion Circle to Naugher Road. She stated they had heard about this project earlier. She stated the plans were 90 percent complete; the right-of-way acquisition was ongoing; and the estimated cost was \$15.5 million, with an anticipated start date of FY 2023.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next one was improvements to Balch Road from

south of Brownsferry Road to north of Gooch Road. She stated that the plans were 65 percent complete, and the estimated cost was \$1.7 million, with an anticipated start date of sometime in FY 2023.

Mr. Mason asked if this was a widening project.

Ms. Lowe stated that it just said "improvements," so she was not quite sure, but she would assume so, with that price tag.

Mr. Vandiver stated he believed it was a two-foot safety widening and resurfacing.

Ms. Lowe stated that next was SR255 (Research Park Boulevard) widening from U.S. 72 to south of Old Madison Pike. She stated that work had started in August of 2019, and it was approximately 80 percent complete, at a project cost of \$23.4 million, with an anticipated completion date of summer 2022.

Mr. Mason asked if that included the bridge project.

Ms. Lowe stated she would assume so, but she would definitely ask.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was U.S. 72 West between Providence Main and County Line Road. She stated that the plans were 30 percent complete, that revised intersection concepts were being developed, that there was anticipated additional Public Involvement in FY 2022, and the right-of-way acquisition was anticipated for FY 2023. She stated that the estimated cost was approximately \$60 million, with an anticipated start date of FY 2025.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was Zierdt Road between Madison Boulevard and Martin Road. She stated that this project had four project phases, and that work had started in 2015. She stated that the last phase, Phase IV, was under contract. She stated that the project cost total was

\$27 million. She stated that the work had started in the fall of 2018, and they were substantially complete with that, and the anticipated completion date was early in 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated that the next project was Four Bridge Replacements on Old Highway 431. She stated the project was under construction and approximately 75 percent complete, with a project cost of \$13.5 million, and an anticipated completion date of late summer 2022.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was I-565 Additional Lanes from I-65 to County Line Road. She stated that the project was complete, at a cost of \$18.7 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that next was I-565 Additional Lanes from County Line Road to Wall-Triana Highway. She stated that the design work was under way, and the projected start date was FY 2023, at an estimated cost of \$46.8 million.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was Jeff Road Additional Lanes from south of Capshaw Road to north of Douglass Road. She stated that the plans were 60 percent complete, and Virtual Public Involvement was concluded in April 2021. She stated that the projected start date was FY 2023, at an estimated cost of \$13.5 million.

Ms. Lowe stated the next project was Intersection Improvements on Wall-Triana Highway at Graphics Drive. She stated that bids were accepted January 28, 2022, and work should begin in the spring of 2022, with an estimated cost of \$1.8 million.

Ms. Lowe stated that next was the widening of Blake Bottom Road from Jeff Road to SR 255. She stated that the plans were 90 percent complete; that the right-of-way acquisition was under way; and the projected start date was FY 2022, with an estimated cost of \$8.7 million.



Ms. Lowe stated the next project was Intersection Improvements on SR 53 at Harvest, McKee, and Old Railroad Bed roads. She stated that the preliminary engineering was under way, that the projected start date was FY 2023, with an estimated cost of \$5 million.

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

Ms. Lowe stated this was a total amount of work in design and construction of approximately \$404 million.

Ms. Lowe asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Thorpe thanked Ms. Lowe for the report.

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item on the agenda was a report from TARCOG.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Ms. Erin Tidwell.

(Ms. Tidwell made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Ms. Tidwell stated she was with the Top of Alabama Regional Council of Governments, TARCOG. She stated they served a five-county region, Limestone, Madison, Marshall, Jackson, and DeKalb counties. She stated they were divided into two sections, that they had their Area Agency on Aging, Medicaid Waiver, Alabama Cares, Meals on Wheels, those services, and that was, like, 60 of their employees, and the other five or six of them were in the Economic Development & Planning Department within TARCOG. She continued that within that they actually had the Top of Alabama Rural Planning Organization, which was the counterpart, the rural counterpart, to the MPO. She stated that the RPO actually served the areas that were not in gray on the displayed map, portions of Limestone County, Jackson County,

DeKalb County, and Marshall County.

Ms. Tidwell stated that they got approximately \$75,000 in funding annually, so that was staff. She stated that they provided technical assistance for the four counties she had mentioned, that they were set up very similar to the MPO: a Policy Committee, Technical Committee, and a Citizens Advisory Committee, and they were working to staff those. She stated they had conducted some public outreach for the most recent STIP, the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan, and they were working to conduct public outreach for the upcoming STIP.

Ms. Tidwell stated they served 42 communities within that four-county region. She continued that they did a lot of grant assistance, that they did a Human Services Coordinated Transit Plan, which overlapped with the MPO. She continued that they did some TAP grants, ATRIP-II, RAISE consultation, and they did a lot of Singing River Trail trail development support within that region as well.

Ms. Tidwell stated they had a lot of the same functions as the MPO, and they were working to align themselves more with the MPO. She stated that their staff within the Economic Development & Planning Department was actually very new, and she and Sara James, their Director, were representing the RPO.

Ms. Tidwell stated they had looked throughout the state, and they had seen the places where the RPO functioned best, and where the RPO functioned best was where it was closely aligned with the MPO, so they had talked with Ms. Lowe, Mr. Vandiver, and Mr. Madsen, and they knew what happened in Huntsville, what happened in Madison County, had an impact on their region on a larger scale.

Ms. Tidwell stated they believed if they could align themselves with the MPO, they could better serve the communities in their region. She stated that was what they were trying to do, that as the RPO, they were trying to work with the MPO, to prepare their communities for development and growth.

Ms. Tidwell asked if anyone had any questions. She stated she was displaying her contact information.

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

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item on the agenda was CAC Member Comments.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Mason.

Mr. Mason stated he had two things he would like to bring up.

Mr. Mason stated one of the things he would like for the CAC to consider, as well as the MPO Board to consider, was the addition of another advisory committee. He stated he was aware that sounded bureaucratic, but four of the MPOs in the state of Alabama had pedestrian/bike advisory committees.

Mr. Mason stated he was also a member of the Huntsville Bicycle Advisory and Safety Committee, and they had been kicking around some ideas to get a little bit more influence, one might say, in some of the transportation projects that were going on in the MPO, and they had been trying to figure out the best way to do that.

Mr. Mason stated that one of the problems with BASC at this time was that it was pretty much oriented to Huntsville, that it was a Huntsville thing. He stated they were, of course, bicyclists, or cyclists, amongst other kinds of active transportation, including transit, and were much more concerned with the wider area, like the MPO, and, actually, the RPO was another good avenue,

or venue, for what they were trying to do, particularly with the Singing River Trail, which was going to be much more bicycle, for recreation and commuting and transportation throughout this three- or four-county area. He stated it would be really nice for this MPO to have an active transportation advisory committee. He stated he was not really talking about a bike/ped advisory committee but an active transportation advisory committee.

Mr. Mason stated he had been talking with Ms. Lowe about this, through some email, and she had said it sounded pretty repetitive, and he could see the point, that it was kind of repetitive, to the point of what the CAC was supposed to be doing, but he would interject that what the CAC was pretty much concerned with was the automobile and motorized traffic, and that seemed to be what they generally got comments on, or that kind of thing.

Mr. Mason stated that getting back to what he was saying earlier, a way to look at some of these designs for road projects that were going on in the state of Alabama, that the Alabama Department of Transportation did not have a great reputation of providing or thinking about pedestrians or bicyclists or other active transportation modalities. He continued that they really needed to start looking at that. He stated there were the NATKO standards in the United States, the AASHTO standards, that there were a lot of different design standards, but it was a real mishmash as to how they got incorporated into their transportation projects.

Mr. Mason stated he believed it would behoove the Metropolitan Planning Organization's board to be able to have a different set of eyes on some of these projects, eyes that were not necessarily looking at motorized traffic. He stated there was nothing wrong with cars, that cars had their place, that he had a car, they all had cars, but that should not be the only choice, that they

needed to be able to start looking at how they could provide more transportation choices, and he thought there should be another committee for this.

Mr. Mason stated that at first, he was going to try to have a resolution at this time to do that, but he had wanted to just kind of bring this up in the comment section, and hopefully it would make it onto the agenda for the next meeting, in three months, where they could actually talk about it, and he would invite Ms. Tidwell to join in this, and to maybe talk with Ms. Lowe about what some of the technical issues would be, who would fund the staffing, how it would be funded, and if they had the funds for it. He stated he believed it would need staff, just as this organization had staff, and they could look at the transportation projects from a different view.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if that would come out of the MPO and not this committee. He stated that, first of all, they did not have any money for staff.

Mr. Mason stated that the MPO did.

Mr. Ofenloch stated it would be the MPO that would have to agree to a new committee.

Mr. Mason stated that was correct. He continued that what he was saying was that they would recommend to the MPO board that they establish that kind of committee. He continued that they should have the background and the reason why they would make that suggestion, and that was what he was trying to do, to get a discussion going and to think about it, and to maybe have some concrete ideas, so there could be a resolution. He continued that such a resolution would be that they would recommend to the board.

Mr. Mason stated he talked to Mr. Madsen about this at one time, and he said he thought the MPO was limited to the two committees, the CAC and the

technical advisory committee, by statute, but he could not find any statutory reason for saying that. He stated that the board could make as many committees as they wanted, that they could name them what they wanted, because it was a subcommittee of the MPO board, that they could certainly do it. He continued that he thought there were probably funds available from the federal government at this time because there was a big push for active transportation in the new IIJA.

Mr. Mason stated that was something to think about, and he hoped it made it onto the agenda. He stated he would be willing to spend time with Ms. Lowe, or whoever, that he would like to be actively involved in doing this, that he did not expect them to go out and do it and come back in three months with it. He stated there was a lot to it, to kind of unpack it.

Mr. Mason stated his other comment also involved staff, and he hoped they would not get too mad at him for this. He stated he would really like to be able to track the new programs and the new grants that were in the IIJA. He stated there was the Safe Roads For All, that there were a number of new grant programs for highway safety. He stated he would like to know what the staff was doing and looking at. He stated that Ms. Lowe had mentioned the RAISE grants, which he guessed were going to be pretty much dedicated to the transit program, as they went forward. He stated it looked like it would be a big chunk of what they would apply for in that.

Mr. Mason stated that some of these grants were competitive, which meant they had to write a grant proposal and compete with other MPOs for the money. He stated that others were a formula, which meant that, basically, the grant was given to every MPO based on certain criteria.

Mr. Mason stated he would like to know which were which, that he would

like to have a report. He stated that, to cut to the chase, it would be nice in the next MPO meeting, or CAC meeting, to have a report of what was in the IIJA and how they were looking at utilizing some of that. He stated that, as he had said, some of this was competitive grants and some of it was formula grants. He stated he would like to know where they stood, as their MPO, and he would certainly be interested in the RPO also, as to what grants they might be looking at and proposing, and if there were suggestions from this Committee as to what they should be applying for.

Mr. Mason stated that one more little bit on that was that most of these grants had always gone through ALDOT and then come to the MPO, but this particular us. and this particular jobs act was actually bypassing the state departments of transportation on some of these programs. He continued that he would like to know which ones those were. He stated this meant this was money they could apply for, as a jurisdiction, as an MPO, directly to the federal government for some of these grants, rather than going through the State Department of Transportation, as it had traditionally been done. He stated he believed they had some leeway there, that if ALDOT did not want to do it, they could think about how they might do it.

Mr. Mason stated that those were his comments.

Chairman Thorpe thanked Mr. Mason.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there were any other comments to come before the Committee at this time.

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

**(Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m. on March 14, 2022)**