

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

MINUTES

Regular Meeting - November 7, 2022 - 5 p.m.

Huntsville, Alabama

Committee Members:

Mr. Taron Thorpe	Chairman
Mr. Larry Mason	City of Madison
Mr. John Ofenloch	City of Huntsville
Mr. Todd Slyman	City of Huntsville
Mr. Gary Whitley, Jr.	City of Huntsville

MPO Staff Members:

Mr. James Vandiver
Mr. James Moore

Also Present:

Mr. John Autry	Manager of Transportation, City of Huntsville
Ms. Jo Beth Gleason	Planning Department City of Huntsville

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

The minutes of the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee on August 15, 2022, were approved as submitted.

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item on the agenda was Jurisdiction Reports. He asked if there was anything to be reported from Madison County, the city of Huntsville, or the city of Madison.

Mr. Mason stated he just had the usual for the city of Madison. He

stated Hughes Road was getting closer to being finished, although they seemed to have lost an exercise trail on the east side, unless that was going to be added in the next few months, but they appeared to be wrapping it up. He stated he was not aware of any other projects that were going on in Madison.

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

There was no response.

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 27-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated that Resolution No. 27-22 adopted and supported changes to the Transportation Alternatives section of the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), with the addition of Project #100075463. He stated this was a TAP project, a Transportation Alternatives project. He continued that the City of Huntsville had applied for FY 2022 MPO funds and was awarded. He stated they were the only applicant this year, and they had requested the full \$800,000, which was the maximum grant amount for the year, and were awarded that since they were the only applicant.

Mr. Vandiver stated this project was on Pratt Avenue, between Grayson Street and Maysville Road, and it was going to extend the median along Pratt Avenue. He stated that Pratt Avenue in Five Points had a median that went up to Grayson, and they would extend that median three more blocks to Maysville Road. He stated there were also some landscape improvements, sidewalk, ADA improvements, as well as traffic-calming improvements.

Mr. Vandiver stated the total cost of the project was \$1,280,000, and the

City of Huntsville would match the grant with \$200,000, the required 20 percent match, plus an additional \$280,000 coming from the City of Huntsville to complete the project.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if the curb would remain the same distance as the curb where the median existed at this time.

Mr. Vandiver stated there was not a curb on that section, that it was just kind of gravel.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that, then, those people were going to feel they were losing something because they were going to curb that.

Mr. Vandiver stated they were going to curb it, and they would have on-street parking rather than driving off in the gravel, so he thought it would be a much more pleasant experience. He stated the City of Huntsville had been doing public involvement with the neighbors, that they had let them know about this project.

Mr. Whitley recommended approval of Resolution No. 27-22, amending the Transportation Alternatives section in the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP to add an FY 2022 Huntsville Area MPO Transportation Alternatives (TAP) grant project for the City of Huntsville.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Mason stated that Mr. Vandiver had said "they" applied for the grant, and he asked who "they" was.

Mr. Vandiver stated it was the City of Huntsville Engineering Department, and he stated they were the lead on this project.

Mr. Mason asked how others could apply for this.

Mr. Vandiver stated that before Ms. Lowe left, she had sent out an

application to all the jurisdictions within the MPO, the City of Huntsville, the City of Madison, the Town of Triana, the Town of Owens Cross Roads, and Madison County, to get MPO TAP funds. He stated they had about a month for the jurisdictions to apply for the projects, and the City of Huntsville was the only applicant. He stated he believed in the prior year, the funding award had gone to Madison County, that District 6 Commissioner Edwards had requested a sidewalk project along Pulaski Pike, to connect to the Bob Harrison Senior Center. He stated that the City of Madison had also done a TAP project in the past, as well.

Mr. Mason stated this related to Transportation Alternatives Projects, and he belonged to an organization called "The City of Huntsville Bicycle Advisory and Safety Committee," and they were kind of quasi, that they were not really sure of their status within the City hierarchy. He stated that the City did send three representatives to their meetings, and he stated the meetings were monthly, and they kept minutes and notes. He continued that they had been trying to get some funding to do a "Safe Routes to School," and they had also been just kind of hammering around how they could get involved in some of these things, particularly like when they were distributing money for alternative transportation. He reiterated that they were quasi, and he stated that, thus, they did not really come to them as the City of Huntsville.

Mr. Mason stated this would probably require another motion at another time. He stated that at this time, they were called "The City of Huntsville Bicycle Advisory and Safety Committee," and they really should be part of the MPO because bicycles, like cars, like buses, like everything else, tended to go well beyond the city limits.

Mr. Mason stated his question was how organizations like BASC, which

was a quasi City agency, could get notification for some of these kinds of things so they could ask for funds. He continued that they would not ask for the whole \$1.2 million, although it would be nice, but it would be nice to just be able to ask for some funding from either the MPO or the City. He stated they already had staff, in terms of three individuals who came from the City. He stated that the Bicycle Patrol sent a representative, and Jo Beth Gleason came from Planning, or at least she had been, but he did not know whether that would be solidified. He stated that James Moore, of course, had been co-chair of that organization for many years, and, also, they had Traffic Engineering.

Mr. Mason stated his question was if there was a way to apply through the MPO for a certain amount, at least to be considered in the next round of Alternative Transportation Planning funds.

Mr. Vandiver stated that since they were just focusing on TAP grants here, the answer would be "No," because it was just the jurisdictions that could apply, which he noted would be the City of Huntsville, the City of Madison, the Town of Triana, the Town of Owens Cross Roads, and Madison County. He stated it was pretty set in federal law that that was how the MPO designations would be. He continued that unless BASC was a member of the MPO, they could not apply for funding.

Mr. Vandiver stated there might be more general requirements for the statewide funding, noting there was also a state part of funding that was under TAP, and anybody could apply for those. He continued that he was not sure how BASC would run in that, but other jurisdictions, like the City of New Hope, had applied and won a TAP grant, even though they were not part of the MPO. He stated there were other rules for that, and he was not entirely sure about all that. He stated his gut feeling would be "No," but they could absolutely look

into better bike planning and engagement with BASC. He stated that, of course, they had two of their best planners who attended their meetings, and he believed that was a big part of the MPO's commitment to BASC.

Mr. Mason stated that was correct. He continued that there were four MPOs in the state of Alabama that had a Bike/Ped Committee as part of the MPO. He stated there were at least four MPOs that had this in the state of Alabama, and across the country there were a lot more. He stated it was not like the federal government was not trying to actively encourage bicycle/pedestrian committees in the MPO planning and the MPO distribution of funds, particularly in the area of alternative transportation.

Mr. Mason stated he had just wanted to raise this issue, as a way to start thinking about how they could incorporate things other than automobiles into their transportation planning.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had kind of gone into a whole other thing, that they were getting a little bit too far away from TAP, that Mr. Mason was talking about, like the CAC, having a bike safety or bicycle/pedestrian committee.

Mr. Mason stated that would be so they would know when these grant applications were due so they could put in for them.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was correct that Mr. Mason's organization would have to be recognized by the MPO, as an advisory committee.

Mr. Mason stated that it should be, at some point. He stated at this time, like he had said, it was the City of Huntsville, and it was a quasi City organization.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that it was not part of this advisory committee, and it sounded to him like it was not a subset but a level tier that Mr. Mason would have to get the MPO to recognize.

Mr. Mason stated that was correct. He stated he was sort of using this as a platform to say he thought they should think about this. He stated they had talked about it at the BASC meetings, and it had just never seemed like the right time to introduce a resolution they could take to the Policy Committee.

Chairman Thorpe stated they should vote on the resolution under discussion and push this conversation to their open comments.

Chairman Thorpe called for the vote on the motion recommending approval of Resolution No. 27-22, and it was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 28-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this resolution adopted and supported changes to the Other Federal and State Aid Projects section of the Transportation Improvement Plan, with the addition of Project #100075911. He stated this was the PARC project, better known as the Skybridge. He stated that "PARC" stood for "Pedestrian Access and Redevelopment Corridor. He stated this was in the city of Huntsville, along Pinhook Creek, between Holmes Avenue and Lowe Mill. He stated this was awarded a \$20 million RAISE Grant in August by the US DOT. He continued that it would include drainage improvements, landscaping, and a pedestrian bridge from downtown to Lowe Mill. He stated they could kind of see this on the display, although it was rather small.

Mr. Vandiver stated the total cost of this project was expected to be over \$62 million, with the remaining cost not paid for by federal grant to be paid by the City of Huntsville. He stated this was being added to the TIP due to the

federal grant award.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was correct that no MPO funds were involved in this.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Mason recommended approval of Resolution No. 28-22, amending the Other Federal and State Aid Projects section in the Adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP to add the PARC project.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Whitley

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if this was from Clinton to Lowe Mill.

Mr. Vandiver indicated the location on the display, and he noted the railroad, the Von Braun Center, and Constellation, and he stated the bridge everyone was talking about was where he was indicating.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was on top of the railroad tracks.

Mr. Vandiver indicated on the display the railroad tracks, and he stated this was kind of alongside of them.

Mr. Ofenloch stated the skybridge was only a portion of this.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was correct, noting that a lot of it had to do with drainage improvements, that they were trying to do some flood control along Pinhook Creek. He stated the skybridge, the pedestrian bridge, was kind of a signature feature of it.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if mopeds and golf carts would be allowed on the bridge.

Mr. Vandiver stated he was not sure what uses would be on the bridge.

Chairman Thorpe called for the vote on the motion recommending approval of Resolution No. 28-22, and it was unanimously approved by the

Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 29-22.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this resolution adopted and supported Bridge and Pavement Performance Measurement (PM2) Targets, as approved by ALDOT. He stated this was Performance Measurement No. 2, or PM2, and it tracked pavement and bridge conditions on the National Highway System, interstates, US highways, and major roads, such as that. He stated they used different pavement measurements to consider the pavement condition to be Good, Fair, or Poor. He stated these were targets for these different types of roads, as well as the bridge conditions. He stated these were statewide targets, and they were updated every four years, and the last time they had an update was in 2018, so they were due for another one.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was correct that this was just to adopt the statewide standards.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Ofenloch asked who did the measurements, or the analysis.

Mr. Vandiver replied that ALDOT would.

Mr. Slyman recommended approval of Resolution No. 29-22, adopting and supporting the Statewide Bridge and Pavement Performance Measurement (PM2) Measures and Targets, as approved by ALDOT.

Said motion was duly seconded by Mr. Mason.

Mr. Vandiver asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if there was any penalty if they did not do this.

Mr. Vandiver stated he did not know, that he would have to check on that. He stated that would be up to ALDOT.

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 items on the agenda were nonaction items, for informational purposes only, that they were Administrative Modifications.

Chairman Thorpe recognized Mr. Vandiver.

Mr. Vandiver stated the first modification was a new level of effort project, meaning it was something that was going to be done whether or not it was approved. He stated this was a resurfacing project on US-231/US-431 in Hazel Green, from Walker Lane to the Tennessee State Line. He stated the cost was estimated to be \$5.3 million, that no local MPO funds would be used in this project, and the target start date was the following spring.

Mr. Ofenloch asked who would be paying for this.

Mr. Vandiver stated it would be federal and state. He stated it was a federal maintenance project, that federal maintenance was usually a level of effort.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had done a revised cost estimate on another segment of resurfacing on 231/431, and this one was from Cedarama Drive to Grimwood Road/Walker Lane, that it was the southern section of 231/431, in Meridianville. He stated this was a revised cost estimate, and he stated it was introduced at the prior meeting. He stated the old cost estimate was \$3,684,103, and the new cost estimate was \$5,732,743.35. He stated no Local of MPO funds would be used for this.

Mr. Vandiver stated that Administrative Modification C was a Support

Letter for Reconnecting Communities that the Chairman had signed the prior month. He stated this was for the PARC project they had previously discussed, that the City was applying for another grant to supplement the RAISE Grant funding. He stated they had gotten \$20 million from the RAISE Grant, and the total cost was \$62 million, and they were trying to close the gap a little bit with the Reconnecting Communities funding, so the MPO had submitted a Support Letter for that grant.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next Administrative Modification was a Support Letter for the Huntsville-Madison County Railroad Authority, that they were doing a Consolidated Railroad Infrastructure Study Improvement, or a CRISI. He stated this was for a grant for rebuilding a bridge over Aldridge Creek, noting that on the Aldridge Creek Greenway, there was a trestle bridge just north of Ditto Landing, and he thought they were looking at rebuilding that bridge. He stated the Chairman had also signed a letter for that the prior month.

Mr. Vandiver stated that next was another resurfacing project, and it was on State Route 53, from Blake Bottom Road to north of State Route 255, or Research Park Boulevard. He stated the old cost estimate was \$1,951,372, and the new cost estimate was \$2.2 million, and there were no local or MPO funds on this one as well.

Mr. Vandiver stated the last Administrative Modification was another cost increase. He stated this was an Advanced Corridor TSMO, or Transportation Systems Management and Operations project, on I-565 from Mooresville Road to US 72, almost the entire length of Interstate-565. He stated the old cost estimate was \$5,619,879, and the new cost estimate was \$5,690,992.24, and there were no local or MPO funds on this project as well.

He stated that this was for traffic cameras and message signs along the interstate, such as the ones seen in Birmingham and Montgomery, where it said the travel times, and he believed they would be starting on this in the following year.

Mr. Slyman asked if they also gave out tickets.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the negative, stating that these were not speed cameras.

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

Mr. Vandiver stated he would provide that report.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated the first project was Church Street, Phase I, between Pratt Avenue and Monroe Street, and it was expected to be completed very soon, that they were just working on some punch list items.

Mr. Vandiver stated that next was the Northern Bypass, from Pulaski Pike to US Highway 231/431, that the plans were 95 percent complete, the right-of-way acquisition was to be completed soon, and they were working on design work for utility relocation. He stated the utility relocation would occur at the same time as the construction on this project, that the estimated cost was \$40 million, and the anticipated start date was scheduled for the spring of 2023.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Martin Road between Zierdt Road and Laracy Drive, and there were two phases on this project, and Phase I was substantially complete, which was the section between Zierdt Road and Old Jim Williams Road, and then from Old Jim Williams Road to Laracy Drive, which was Phase II, was expected to start in the fall of 2023.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was North Parkway at Mastin Lake Road, and he stated the plans were complete, the right-of-way acquisition was complete, structure removal was complete, and they were working on utility relocation, with an anticipated start date of the spring of 2023. He stated this was the overpass at Mastin Lake Road, along with some improvements farther north, to Winchester Road.

Mr. Vandiver stated that next was Access Management on US 231 between Weatherly Road and Hobbs Road. He stated the plans on this project were 65 percent complete, that there had been a public involvement process approximately a year prior, and the estimated cost was \$15 million, with an anticipated start date of the summer of 2024.

Mr. Ofenloch asked Mr. Vandiver if he could expand on that, concerning access management, what they were going to do.

Mr. Vandiver stated they were going to eliminate some of the median cuts, and they were going to have some U-turns. He stated that a lot of times, "access management" meant they were going to eliminate some driveways, such as businesses that had three driveways and could really use just one or two, that they would eliminate some of those, work on that. He stated they were going to try to keep people from turning left all over the place, that they would eliminate more of the left turns, which could be very dangerous. He stated it was more of a safety project. He stated there would also be some intersection improvements as well, that he believed they were going to eliminate one of the traffic lights along this section, but he could not recall which one, and they might add another one, at Magna Carta Place.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Winchester Road from Dominion Circle to Naugher Road, and he stated the plans were 90 percent

complete, the right-of-way acquisition was ongoing, and they were going to be working on utility relocation soon, with an anticipated start date of the fall of 2024.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was improvements to Balch Road from south of Browns Ferry Road to north of Gooch Road in the city of Madison. He stated plans were 65 percent complete, the estimated cost was \$1.7 million, and the anticipated start date was the fall of 2023.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was SR 255 (Research Park Boulevard) Widening from US 72 to south of Old Madison Pike. He stated this was 98 percent complete, that all the lanes were open, that the project cost was just over \$23 million, and the anticipated completion date was the current winter.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was US 72 West between Providence Main and County Line Road. He stated they were 30 percent complete on the plans, that a public involvement meeting had been held the previous spring, and the current plans were to break this project up into multiple phases, and Phase I would go from Providence Main Street to Nance Road, and then from Nance Road to County Line Road might be broken up into other phases. He stated that at this time, they were trying to work out where those phases would be. He stated they did not have an exact Phase I start date at this time, but on this slide it showed FY 2023. He stated the total cost was at \$85 million.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if that was \$85 million just for Phase I.

Mr. Vandiver stated he was not sure about that, that he would have to check if that was the total cost.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Four Bridge Replacements on

Old Highway 431. He stated this was pretty much complete, that the road was opened on Halloween, and the project cost was \$13.5 million. He stated this should be completed fairly soon, that they had a few more things to be done before completely wrapping up this project.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was I-565 Additional Lanes from County Line Road to Wall-Triana Highway. He stated the 30 percent plan review was held in July of 2022, that the projected start date was the fall of 2023, and the estimated cost was \$46.8 million.

Mr. Ofenloch asked who was paying for it.

Mr. Vandiver stated that would be federal and state, that it was Rebuild Alabama funds.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Jeff Road, Additional Lanes from south of Capshaw Road to north of Douglass Road. He stated the plans were 65 percent complete, that they had a virtual public involvement in the spring of 2021, that the projected start date was 2025, and the estimated cost was \$13.5 million.

Mr. Slyman asked if there was right-of-way acquisition on it.

Mr. Vandiver stated he could check on that.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Intersection Improvements at Wall-Triana Highway at Graphics Drive. He stated this project had just been started, and the estimated cost was \$1,879,600.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Widening Blake Bottom Road from Jeff Road to SR 255. He stated the right-of-way acquisition was under way on this project, and he believed it should be started fairly soon, with an estimated cost of \$8,784,500.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Intersection Improvements on

State Route 53 at Harvest, McKee, and Old Railroad Bed roads. He stated the plans were 90 percent complete, and the projected start date was the following summer, at an estimated cost of \$5 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated the last project was the Arsenal East Connector, and he stated the preliminary engineering was under way, that the public involvement had been a little over a month prior, and the projected start date was late 2024, at an estimated cost of \$30 million.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if that was inside the Arsenal gates.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the negative. He stated it would run along the back side of the Botanical Garden, along McDonald Creek, and then along Patton Road, down to close to Gate 10, staying outside the gate. He stated they were looking at three different alternatives for that project, that one was a surface street alternative, and that would be Bob Wallace and Patton, just widening those roads; and another would be having an at-grade, new road which would go along that path, along McDonald Creek; or an elevated road. He stated they were getting public comments on that about six weeks prior, that they were trying to get public opinion as to the options. He stated he did not know which one had won out, but those were the three options.

Mr. Vandiver stated the total amount of work in design and construction was \$383,306,760.

Chairman Thorpe stated the floor was open for public comments.

Chairman Thorpe stated that hearing none, they would move to the next item, CAC Member Comments.

Mr. Mason stated he had previously had his say. He stated he would go back to the BASC group and work with them in the next couple of months to get a resolution drafted that he would try to bring to the CAC. He stated the

procedure he saw was trying to get the Citizens Advisory Committee to approve it, and if they approved it, then they could pass it up to the Policy Board and see what would happen.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if the proper procedure would be to go straight to the MPO. He asked what jurisdiction the Citizens Advisory Committee would have to add this in.

Mr. Mason stated the way he would look at it, it would be a citizens initiative, and they could come together and introduce the resolution to the Citizens Advisory Committee, and the Citizens Advisory Committee would decide yea or nay.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he did not believe it was up to the Citizens Advisory Committee to decide. He stated that Mr. Mason was saying he wanted their recommendation, but it was not up to the Citizens Advisory Committee to decide on this, that there was a conflict there.

Mr. Mason stated it would be nice to have a resolution this Committee would recommend, just like if they read the resolutions, the TCC often said, "Okay, we have looked at this, we have discussed it, and we recommend it to the Policy Committee," that that was what he would foresee them doing.

Mr. Slyman asked if it was correct that Mr. Mason was looking for support for the MPO to create another committee.

Mr. Mason replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Moore asked if it would perhaps be possible for the bicycle groups in the MPO area, Madison and all over the county, or wherever, to get together as a group and discuss these things, and then come before the body and talk about it, and talk about other ideas, as to what they wanted.

Mr. Mason asked if Mr. Moore was saying at BASC.

Mr. Moore replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Mason stated they had been discussing this for, like, four months, that this was an ongoing thing. He stated they had recognized there were pros and cons to this, that they were in the City at this time, so they got some City involvement, and they questioned if they became MPO, if the City would still send people, if they would have any staff at all. He stated that was the kind of thing they had to decide. He continued that to Mr. Ofenloch's point, he could take it straight to the Policy Committee, but it seemed to him that if he could get other citizens and the Citizens Advisory Committee to agree, it would be good.

Mr. Mason stated that as BASC, they really needed to look at this and decide as a group. He stated that at this time, they had people from the north, from the county, and they had people like himself, from Madison, that they had people who represented a greater area than just the city. He stated they were growing in terms of recognition, he guessed, basically. He stated that with some of the things that had happened in the last six or seven months, they had started to get a lot more people looking at what they did, but they needed to encourage them to come to meetings. He stated it would be nice if they had the MPO, and they could have a staff member who could actually liaison with the Planning Department not only of the City of Huntsville but the Planning Department in Madison, and in Triana, and et cetera, et cetera, the other jurisdictions, so that it really would be more of an MPO affair than it was at this time.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he thought it would give them more validity if the Committee, rather than just being whoever wanted to join, would have somebody from Triana, and so on, so they would be more committed and more

organized before it would go to the MPO. He stated that at this time, it just sounded like a bunch of people who were interested in bikeways who wanted to get together and have a big say.

Mr. Mason stated this had come up for discussion at BASC meetings, and it was a pros and cons kind of thing. He stated that at this time, it was a fairly loose organization, and they did not need to take notes quite so meticulously, that they did not have meticulous minutes, and they did not necessarily have a roll call. He stated if they were to become a formal committee of the MPO, then they would need to think about having all those things, and then it would be if they wanted that or they did not want it. H stated that, like he had said, it was a pros and cons kind of thing, but it needed to come to a head at some point, that they needed to decide which way they wanted to go.

Mr. Vandiver stated there was something else they needed to think about. He stated it would probably have to be a bylaws amendment because currently the bylaws stated that they had the three committees, the CAC, the TCC, and the MPO Policy Board, and creating a fourth committee would probably require an amendment, which would come before the CAC as well as the TCC and the MPO Policy Board.

Mr. Mason stated his understanding was that the TCC and the CAC were really subcommittees of the MPO Policy Committee. He stated he would assume they would want to put it in their bylaws, but it would, in fact, just be them enabling yet another committee.

Mr. Vandiver stated the staff would talk about it with Mr. Madsen and see what they could come up with.

Chairman Thorpe stated the next item was that the CAC members should have their 2023 schedule, that that information had been sent out by

Mr. Vandiver. He stated that, however, they needed to determine if they wanted to keep their meeting in this space since the Council Chambers were no longer available for them, or if they wanted to find a more convenient location, a first floor location. He stated that was up for discussion at this time, if there was a better location for this committee.

Mr. Vandiver stated the dates for the CAC meetings were running into conflict with the Historic Preservation Commission meetings, and they were required to be downstairs on the first floor, in the Council Chambers, so the CAC was going to have to move in the following year for most of their meetings. He stated that what he was going to suggest, and especially since construction had made this area a big mess, was that they go to a building on the corner, 320 Fountain Circle, the Engineering Building, as they called it. He stated it had a really nice conference room, and it was fairly close to the parking garage, and they could just walk right in that building, that it would be a lot closer to parking than the City Hall currently was. He stated that after the following year, they would be in the new City Hall, and there would not be any problems.

Mr. Vandiver stated they were just wanting to hear what the CAC members' thoughts were on this, if they wanted to stay in this room or if they wanted to go to the other building. He stated if the CAC members wanted to talk about this, that would be fine, and they would be happy to entertain suggestions.

After further discussion, Chairman Thorpe suggested that for the next meeting, they would meet in the conference room in the Engineering Building.

Mr. Vandiver stated they could certainly do that.

Chairman Thorpe asked if there was any further business to come before the Committee.

There was no response.

Upon motion, duly seconded, the meeting was adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m. on November 7, 2022.)