

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

MINUTES

Regular Meeting - May 15, 2023 - 5 p.m.

Huntsville, Alabama

Committee Members:

Mr. Russ McDonald	Chairman
Mr. Matthew Brown	City of Huntsville
(Not present for entire meeting)	
Mr. Dario Gonzalez	City of Huntsville
Mr. Trent Griffin	City of Huntsville
Mr. John Ofenloch	City of Huntsville
Mr. Gary Whitley	City of Huntsville
Mr. Larry Mason	City of Madison
Mr. Houston Matthews	Madison County

MPO Staff Members:

Mr. Dennis Madsen
Mr. James Vandiver
Mr. James Moore

Also Present:

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

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

The Minutes of the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee on February 13, 2023, were approved as submitted.

Chairman McDonald 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 did not have a long report, but there was a fatality on Wall-Triana near Madison Boulevard the prior Thursday.

Chairman McDonald 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 McDonald stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 05-23, and he recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this resolution adopted the Draft FY 2024-2027 TIP, which stood for Transportation Improvement Program. He stated this was their short-term plan for State/Federal/MPO-funded transportation projects for the MPO area, and it was required by federal law to update this completely every four years and to amend it as necessary.

Mr. Vandiver stated, as to some of the changes they were making in this TIP, the first one was a new Complete Streets narrative, which was something that was required by ALDOT to add to their TIP, so they had added that, and he thanked Ms. Gleason, one of their planners, for helping them out on that.

Mr. Vandiver stated there was some additional funding for Winchester Road widening, the construction phase, for the section between Dominion Circle and Naugher Road, approximately \$12.5 million of additional funding from a previous TIP amount.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had revised a project, based upon discussions with the MPO member jurisdictions. He stated there had been a project on Slaughter Road between Old Madison Pike and Madison Boulevard, a widening

project, which had been on the books many years, and in discussions with the member jurisdictions, the funding allocated for that project was not sufficient for a full-on widening of that road, especially with the railroad crossing and the topography changes, particularly on the northern side of that segment there. He stated they had decided to change the project to targeted intersection improvements, especially at the intersection of Madison Boulevard and Slaughter Road, south of that railroad crossing.

Mr. Vandiver stated there was also one new project using Surface Transportation MPO funds, noting that this was set-aside MPO funding for surface transportation projects. He stated this one was Old Big Cove Road and Terry Drake Road widening, south of Sutton Road and Taylor Road. He stated that was a one-mile road, just that entire road there. He stated he was not sure what the extent of those road widenings would be at this point. He stated they were funding preliminary engineering, right-of-way, and utility relocation on this, and construction would come after the scope of these four years, so that would go into another TIP, later on.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had one new funding category in this TIP, and it was based on a new funding source coming from the most recent Federal Transportation bill, the IIJA. He stated that was structure investment, the Jobs Act. He stated it was called "carbon reduction," and he stated there was a set allocation of funds for carbon reduction for the MPOs, just under \$1 million for the year, set aside for the five years of the IIJA enforcement, so that would be between FY 2022 and FY 2026. He stated they would get a total of approximately \$5 million for carbon reduction funds.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had added one project in here, based on discussions with the member jurisdictions, for a carbon reduction project. He

stated the only rules for carbon reduction were that they did not use it on widening roads, because that would not reduce carbon. He stated they had to justify that something would reduce carbon. He stated that something the feds had been encouraging MPOs in the states to look into for using these carbon reduction funds was something called "TSMO," Transportation Systems Management Operations, a fancy transportation term for signs and cameras. He stated these were the signs, when one was in Birmingham or Nashville, that informed of upcoming construction or accidents, and travel times, and then also the cameras that would be used for monitoring traffic. He stated one could go on line and look at those, on ALDOT's website.

Mr. Vandiver stated they were looking at using at least part of their carbon reduction funds on this TSMO project on US 72 East, over Chapman Mountain; US 431, between the Parkway and Sutton Road, over Monte Sano Mountain; and South Parkway, between I-565 and Airport Road. He stated ALDOT was about to start work on a similar TSMO project on I-565, and they would be adding some signs and cameras along that stretch, so they were not worried about I-565, that this was just kind of expanding that a little bit further.

Mr. Vandiver stated they would have some carbon reduction funds left over after that, and if there was another project that would come out of those carbon reduction funds, that would come to the CAC at a later date, as an amendment to this TIP.

Mr. Vandiver stated there were still some things coming up with the TIP, that they were still waiting on several things from ALDOT, including a financial plan, that they were waiting on some numbers for performance measures, which was an important part of the TIP, and they were waiting on transit

projects as well, some future transit projects. He stated future transit funding had not been programmed into the TIP yet, that it was just the current FY 2023 funding that had not been spent that was currently in that TIP, but it would expand that once the final TIP came out. He stated they were waiting on a few more things, and that would come before the CAC in August.

Chairman McDonald asked if there were any questions concerning this item.

Mr. Mason asked if the carbon reduction funds could be used for biking facilities and pedestrian facilities and for transit projects.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative. He stated what they were looking to do with this was to try to find something with a regional impact, and with \$5 million in carbon reduction funds, they were looking at streetscape projects, and adding bike lanes on a street, and they could not think of a good project that could go for \$5 million, getting a project of regional impact out of that, so that was why they had not done that just yet. He reiterated that there was still some funding left over, and if that was what the MPO board wanted them to do, then they would go for that with the rest of the funding.

Mr. Mason stated that in looking at some of these project improvements, a lot of times, they would get the narrative they were going to improve a section of road, that they were doing an improvement. He asked if there was some way in the process that the CAC could get the design criteria for the improvement, or what they were trying to improve, because some improvements could be one thing with one kind of funding or they could be another thing with another kind of funding, that, for example, if an improvement was just to increase the level of service, they were going to increase speed, and they knew that speed did not relate to increased safety, so those were two things that were opposed to each

other. He stated they, as the Citizens Advisory Committee, never really got a chance to look at the designs, so when they said they wanted to improve this stretch of road, how did they want to improve it, what was the improvement, to explain what the improvement was. He stated that the word "improvement" itself, just the word, was pretty broad and loose, and it did not really tell them.

Mr. Vandiver stated Mr. Mason was absolutely right on that. He stated what the Citizens Advisory Committee was there for was to approve funding, to approve the funding for these projects, and they approved state and federal and MPO funds. He stated the thing was that with any sort of federal funding, they were required to include bicycle and pedestrian improvements and make sure all users were being accommodated in each project. He stated that when the time came, they would probably have another amendment on, say, Slaughter Road, for example, that they would have another amendment, and he would certainly be happy to relay any sort of improvements, that they would go into more detail on that when that project was closer to construction. He stated he did not believe that project would be in construction in this TIP, that he thought it was scheduled for preliminary engineering in 2025, and that was when the design would start, so they did not have any designs at this time, that he could not pull out a map and show them what kind of specific design it would be until that phase started.

Mr. Mason asked if they would get to question the designs.

Mr. Vandiver stated that as the CAC, he did not see why not. He stated they could certainly bring that before them, but that was not the purpose of the CAC, in general, that they were there to approve the funding.

Mr. Matthews stated that in the timeline, the level of detail for the design criteria was going to come, most likely, much later than when the funding was

approved, that they may know a little bit more about which intersections, but the design criteria, or the design process, would be after the PE phase in this case was authorized.

Mr. Mason stated what he was trying to get at was that a lot of times, there were non-engineering things that could be decided within the criteria of what was the improvement, that they wanted to improve a road to make it more safe, and that might not increase the level of service. He stated it took an engineer to actually design the radii of a curve, and all that kind of stuff, that that would be legitimate engineering funding.

Chairman McDonald stated they were not a design review committee, that that would be something else.

Mr. Mason stated he was trying to figure out when the design got decided, that he was not trying to design things at this time, that he was just asking how they could get information about what those criteria were prior to assumptions being made, and them saying they were going to approve it.

Mr. Matthews asked if this committee had an action on when a project moved between phases, if there was an action of the CAC when the PE Phase was authorized or the Right-of-Way Phase was authorized.

Mr. Vandiver stated that would only be if the funding changed.

Mr. Matthews stated that, then, if the funding did not change, it would not come back before this committee.

Mr. Madsen stated that on certain projects, or on any projects that had any public component, ALDOT would conduct a public meeting at some point and share the design, and that was when issues might be raised.

Mr. Vandiver stated they would have a public involvement meeting once the PE Phase began, and they would have designs, and people would be able to

talk with ALDOT engineers and City engineers, whoever would be working on whatever project they were thinking about, and discuss those design criteria. He stated that was not the purpose of this committee. He stated that as he had said, they approved the funding, and they were far ahead of when the design would start on these projects. He stated this committee was probably the first to see these projects, and then they started going into engineering and design.

Mr. Autry stated to Mr. Vandiver that he had mentioned earlier, on the Transit projects, that he just had FY 23, and he was waiting on the other years, and he stated he thought staff had already sent an update on that, a couple of weeks back.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had given them that, that they were waiting on the State to confirm who to send those to, to program them into their STIP. He stated this was all part of a broader, statewide Transportation Improvement Plan, so all those projects had to be placed into their system as well, so they had to wait on that and make sure all of that was in there.

Mr. Griffin asked if this was the document that the final draft would be in August.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was correct, that the final document would be brought before the CAC at their August 14th meeting. He stated they would be making changes, because the public comment period was ongoing, and it would be ending on Thursday; and then after that, he would be sending off this draft to ALDOT, any decisions by the MPO board; and they would make their changes and let them know, as would the feds; and then he would incorporate those changes, along with any public changes he received between this time and July, into the document; and then they would have another public comment period right there at the very end.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that maybe Mr. Vandiver could correct him on the language, and he asked about a project that was deemed not feasible for pedestrian and bicycle use.

Mr. Vandiver asked if Mr. Gonzalez was talking about the federal funding requirement.

Mr. Gonzalez replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Vandiver stated there was a requirement that had been around for about a decade that required some sort of biking and pedestrian facility on federally funded projects.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if it would be depending on if it was feasible, if that was the way it was.

Mr. Vandiver stated he did not have the exact language on that, but, typically, that was the case.

Mr. Gonzalez stated he would like to know on some of these projects where that had been deemed either feasible or budgetwise, that, in other words, there was an intersection improvement, and when would some of that money go to pedestrian on some of these, and when would it not. He asked if there was a way to know that.

Mr. Vandiver stated not at this stage, that that would be part of the Design Phase, so it would be after this committee and the MPO would have any discussion about it.

Mr. Griffin recommended approval of Resolution No. 05-23, adopting the Draft FY 2024-2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item was Resolution No. 06-23, FY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated the Unified Planning Work Program, or UPWP, was their annual budget for MPO Planning Funds, or PL Funds. He stated this funded the day-to-day operations of the MPO, such as staffing, equipment purchases, professional development, et cetera. He stated if they had leftover funding, they spent it on plans, that in recent years, they had used it on the Regional Commuter Study, as well as the High-Capacity Transit Corridor Study. He stated on the next resolution, he would talk about another plan they were working on.

Mr. Vandiver stated that the total budgeted funding for this year, including the federal funding plus any local matches and carryover funding, was \$969,176. He stated this was an increased budget due to the 2022 carryover, that they had about \$211,000 that was carried over to FY 2024 from FY 2022, and they had also had their federal allocation for the MPO adjusted higher, due to the population growth experienced in this area, based on the 2020 Census numbers for the Huntsville urban area.

Mr. Vandiver stated they had increased funding in the UPWP for the Long-Range Transportation Plan, or the LRTP. He stated they would be working on a draft the upcoming fiscal year, and the final LRTP for 2050 would be adopted in the spring of 2025, so they had a good start on that in this fiscal year. He stated that as part of that LRTP update, they had to update their Congestion Management Plan, so they had increased funding there as well, and they had also increased funding in the Transit Planning category, to support

regional transit initiatives. He stated that was something he would be talking about later on with another resolution.

Mr. Vandiver stated that something that had come down from ALDOT was that they were now calling Bike and Pedestrian Planning "Safe and Accessible Transportation Options." He continued that they had increased the funding for that as well. He stated it was now a State requirement that they spend 2.5 percent of their planning funds on Safe and Accessible Transportation Options. He stated they would be happy to know they had gone well beyond that, that approximately 16 percent of their funding would be going to Safe and Accessible Transportation Options.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if that would include buses. He stated that was safe and accessible transportation options.

Mr. Vandiver stated that in their case, they had just brought in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning and renamed it, that all the tasks that were previously under Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning were now under Safe and Accessible Transportation Options, and they had a separate one just for Transit Planning.

Mr. Vandiver stated they would have a final UPWP that would come out in August.

Mr. Mason stated they could also use it to look for integration between transit and bicycle facilities. He asked if that was true.

Mr. Vandiver asked that they go to discussion.

Chairman McDonald asked if there were any questions or discussion concerning this item. He stated this was approval of a draft budget, so they could go in and work on it.

Mr. Vandiver stated to answer Mr. Mason's question, they absolutely

could add as a task to integrate bike and pedestrian with the Transit Plan.

Mr. Matthews asked if it was correct that this was a draft plan, and it would become final upon approval by the MPO body, or if they would come back to the CAC with a final draft.

Mr. Vandiver stated their MPO was kind of funny, in that they had their boards adopt a draft document before they sent it to ALDOT, and then they would send it to ALDOT, and ALDOT would give them their comments and questions, and then they would incorporate those comments into a final UPWP that would be adopted at the next MPO board meetings.

Mr. Griffin asked what the reason was for the name change there, if it was to be able to broaden, or what was included in this, or if it was just a name change because somebody did not like it.

Mr. Vandiver stated he was not entirely sure. He stated they were told by ALDOT, which was how a lot of these things happened, that they were told by ALDOT to change the name, or add a category called "Safe and Accessible Transportation Options," and that Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning could be the category that could be changed, and that at least 2.5 percent had to be incorporated in that category.

Mr. Mason stated that was kind of a trend that was going on across the country, really, that they were getting away from Bike and Pedestrian and talking about Active Transportation Options, meaning that not all transportation had to be car only.

Mr. Ofenloch stated it was not up to them to debate what it was called.

Mr. Mason stated he was just explaining that was the trend that was happening.

Chairman McDonald asked if there was any other discussion.

Mr. Matthews recommended approval of Resolution No. 06-23, adopting the Draft FY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 07-23.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this resolution would amend the current FY 2023 UPWP, to include some carryover funds from FY 2022. He stated they would like to increase the FY 2023 budget by \$200,000, and use that carryover funding from FY 2022 to begin work on an MPO Regional Bike Plan. He stated this bike plan would kind of bring together all the separate plans the jurisdictions had for bike connectivity. He stated that with the Singing River Trail kind of moving along, they thought this was an appropriate time to begin work on that Regional Bike Plan. He stated they would like to get that started in the current summer, and that was why they were amending the current UPWP, to get things going in this fiscal year.

Mr. Vandiver stated that any remaining carryover funds, approximately \$211,000 in remaining FY 2022 carryover funds, would be applied to FY 2024.

Chairman McDonald stated that, then, the money was there, money from the prior year, and they were just asking for approval to use it in 2023.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was correct.

Chairman McDonald asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Mason stated he hoped it did not just come out as the Regional Bike

Plan, that he hoped it would be called "Biking and Pedestrian Plan." He stated he believed it should include "Pedestrian" also.

Mr. Griffin recommended approval of Resolution No. 07-23, amending the FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), to include carryover funds from Fiscal Year 2022, in the amount of \$200,000, to be added to Task 3.3 ("Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning"), to begin work on a Regional Bike Plan.

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Matthews.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 08-23.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this was a TIP amendment, that it was amending the current TIP, which was the 2020-2023 TIP, to increase funding on the Construction Phase of the Northern Bypass, the West section. He stated this was the section from just east of the Toyota plant to Memorial Parkway. He stated this cost increase was going from \$30 million to \$40,282,131. He stated that as many of the veteran CAC members were aware, they revised these estimates fairly close to when a project was about to be let for bidding. He stated this was revising it to update it to current costs of construction.

Mr. Vandiver stated this was a bit of a unique project in that about \$6.3 million of that increase was for remaining Utility projects that needed to be performed, and that would actually be worked on as part of the Construction Phase. He stated that included city and county water lines, as well as city sewer

line relocation.

Mr. Vandiver stated the remaining \$4 million was for construction, engineering, and inspection, or CEI, for this project.

Mr. Vandiver stated that \$30 million of this \$40 million was coming from the State, using some of their CARES funding, the Coronavirus funding, and for the remaining funds, the \$10.3 million, roughly, 80 percent of that would be MPO funds, STP Huntsville funds, Surface Transportation Plan Huntsville funds, and 20 percent would be the City of Huntsville.

Mr. Vandiver stated the City of Huntsville expected to let this project in the current summer, and that was why it was coming before them at this time and not as part of the broader Draft TIP they had discussed earlier.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that, then, before construction started, they had only increased it by 33 percent.

Mr. Vandiver stated that this was really just to update the numbers in ALDOT's system. He stated they knew the funding was there, that they had known the funding had been there for a long time, that this was just making sure that ALDOT had it in their system, that the funding was there before they started letting the project. He stated that this one and the next one were a similar situation.

Mr. Whitley asked about the yellow dots on the displayed map, if that was going off of Bob Wade Lane, or what was happening there.

Mr. Vandiver stated it did not follow Bob Wade exactly, that it ran farther to the south.

Mr. Whitley asked why that was.

Mr. Vandiver stated he believed it concerned a road in the location he was indicating on the map, just south of the Bob Wade/Countess intersection,

and he thought there were some issues over by Countess Road they were trying to avoid as well, that they were trying to route it further south.

Mr. Ofenloch recommended approval of Resolution No. 08-23, amending the Other Surface Transportation Projects section of the TIP, with the total cost change on Project #100061851 CN phase of "HUNTSVILLE NORTHERN BYPASS FROM 1.2 MILES EAST OF CR-86 (PULASKI PIKE) TO 1500 FT EAST OF SR-1 (US 231/431) INTERSECTION."

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Griffin.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item was Resolution No. 09-23.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this was another TIP amendment, and it was a cost increase to the Construction Phase of James Record Road/Martin Road, Phase II. He stated Phase I was the section between Zierdt Road and Old Jim Williams Road, and Phase II would be from Old Jim Williams Road to Laracy Drive, near the airport. He stated this was a cost increase from \$10,749,511.22 to \$30,500,000. He stated this was a new estimate, an adjustment to reflect current costs. He stated ALDOT had not changed their estimate in many years, as they could tell. He stated this funding was also a mix of sources, that it was using STPAA funds, which were STP funds that could be used anywhere in the state, that STPAA meant it was anywhere in the state, and STPHV meant it was only in the Huntsville urban area that it could be used. He stated they were using an STPAA grant that was allocated for the entire Martin Road project, from Zierdt Road to Laracy Drive, that they were using the remaining funds

from that that were not used in Phase I. He stated they were using COVID funds that the MPO had allocated, and the MPO had approved about a year ago to use on this project, of approximately \$2.8 million, and the remaining funds would come from the MPO and the City of Huntsville.

Mr. Vandiver stated they were letting this project in the coming fall, which was, once again, why they were approving this as a separate TIP amendment, for this current TIP, that they wanted to get this authorized before the new TIP.

Mr. Vandiver stated this was also concurrent with a gas relocation project, but that was not part of the \$30,500,000, that that was being funded by the State. He stated that was actually in the Administrative Modifications, that gas relocation project, that there was a slight increase in funding in that as well.

Mr. Griffin asked how much of that fund increase was coming from Huntsville dollars.

Mr. Vandiver stated that roughly \$10.3 million or \$10.4 million was STPAA funds, that COVID funding was \$2.8 million, and then there was about a \$17.3 million difference, and the MPO would fund 80 percent of that, and the City of Huntsville would fund 20 percent of it, that it was a typical 80/20 match on that. He stated he would say that about \$14 million would be MPO funds.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that went right into the final approach to the east runway, that it went into the airport property. He stated the circle on the map was the old Dunlop race track, and they could see the railroad tracks. He asked if they had calculated the overpass they were going to need for the railroad tracks.

Mr. Vandiver stated there were some improvements planned for this. He stated they would recall that at the last meeting, there was an Administrative Modification for a \$600,000 railroad improvement project right there, and that would be part of Phase II.

Mr. Ofenloch asked was that planned to be an in-grade crossing.

Mr. Vandiver stated he believed it was.

Mr. Matthews recommended approval of Resolution No. 09-23, amending the Other Surface Transportation Projects section of the 2020-2023 TIP, with the total cost change on Project #100055286 CN phase of "ADDITIONAL LANES ON CR-999 (JAMES RECORD RD) FROM LARACY DRIVE TO TRADEMARK DRIVE AND ON CR-11 (MARTIN RD) FROM TRADEMARK DRIVE TO CR-12 (OLD JIM WILLIAMS RD)."

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Griffin.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 10-23.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this resolution adopted and amended the Long-Range Transportation Plan, to include the University-Medical Bus Rapid Transit Corridor. He stated this corridor was identified by the consultants who worked on the High-Capacity Transit Study, which was done by the MPO the prior year, as the most viable and preferred alternative for high-frequency transit in the Huntsville region. He stated this would start at Huntsville Hospital, run through downtown, and go out along University Drive to the

Village of Providence in the first phase, and a future phase would bring it further west, toward the city of Madison, to service the Madison hospital, and terminate somewhere between Balch Road and County Line Road.

Mr. Vandiver stated this amendment would designate, in the Long-Range Transportation Plan, that this was their Locally Preferred Alternative for the Bus Rapid Transit Corridor. He stated the LRTP already mentioned a Pilot BRT Project in its regional transit goals. He stated they had intentionally left the corridor out of the LRTP because they did not know what that corridor would be until they had finished the High-Capacity Transit Study. He stated the Long-Range Transportation Plan was adopted back in 2020, so before the High-Capacity Transit Study was finished.

Mr. Vandiver stated for those who did not know what Bus Rapid Transit was, that he liked to describe it as rail without the cost. He stated if they went to a big city, they would ride on a subway or a light rail, and a lot of the same features they would see in those transit systems, things like ticket vending machines; next train signs, saying how many more minutes until the next train, would show up; and level door boarding, where you could roll on and off. He stated those kinds of features would be on the BRT line. He stated it was also a unique branding, and as much as he loved the Orbit branding, it was an FTA requirement that they had to have a separate branding for the BRT line, and also its frequency. He stated that was a big advantage of BRT, that they used technological improvements to streamline and make sure buses ran on time; that they used, like, signal prioritization; and they would have to have buses running every 15 minutes or less along the main corridor.

Mr. Vandiver stated the reason they were coming to the CAC at this time about this was that the City of Huntsville had applied to the Federal Transit

Administration for entering into what was called "Project Development" of the BRT corridor, as part of their Small Starts Capital Investment grant program. He stated the reason they were getting in really early on this project was that once they entered project development, they could reimburse costs, of design and any other costs related to getting this corridor implemented. He stated one of the requirements of getting that funding would be for the MPO to designate this as the "Locally Preferred Alternative" for the BRT Corridor.

Mr. Ofenloch stated if they had a bus every 15 minutes, that from 3 to 5 in the afternoon, they would have to have about 30 buses, and traffic would be stopped. He asked if there were some nursing homes or something out in Providence that justified going out there.

Mr. Vandiver stated Providence was a fairly dense development, that it was a transit-oriented development without transit. He stated there were also a lot of apartments just to the north of Providence, that that area was densifying rather quickly.

Mr. Vandiver stated to answer the question about stopping traffic, one of the cool things about Bus Rapid Transit was they built what were called "queue jump lanes," so they could have, like, a "Bus Only" lane right at the intersections that could bypass the traffic, and they would have a special signal.

Chairman McDonald asked if there were any other cities in the area that had this.

Mr. Vandiver stated Birmingham had just implemented it, that they used TIGER Grant funding, or RAISE Grant funding for their project. He stated Jacksonville, Florida, had been building it for years. He continued that Memphis was working on a Small Starts grant; and Charleston, South Carolina, was working on one as well, called "New Starts." He stated he thought they

were spending more than \$400 million on their project, that they were doing a much more substantial project. He stated that other cities were Fort Collins, Colorado; Eugene, Oregon; and Provo, Utah. He stated these were all cities that were fairly similar in size to Huntsville that were working on this. He stated this was a good alternative for a city of Huntsville's size, that it was a good gateway into mass transit.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if the city got the funding to do this, it must make a commitment in terms of the number of years to keep BRT.

Mr. Vandiver stated he would have to check on that. He stated he would think with the cost of BRT, there would have to be a long-term commitment, that it was a pretty substantial project. He stated that for one thing, the Bus Rapid Transit stations were pretty substantial, that they were not like the shelters they would see at this time, that they were fairly large, so there would be substantial improvements to those, and it would be very hard for the City to go and rip those out in a few years.

Mr. Mason asked if there were going to be some kind of improvements to University Drive to accommodate it, besides the stations, if they were going to reconfigure some of the lanes.

Mr. Vandiver stated potentially, but that would be determined in the Design Phase. He stated they had not started looking at that yet, that they had created the map, and they had told FTA the City of Huntsville was going to fund the design.

Mr. Mason recommended approval of Resolution No. 10-23, amending the 2045 LRTP to include the University-Medical Bus Rapid Transit Corridor as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Pilot Bus Rapid Transit project.

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Ofenloch.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item on the agenda was Resolution No. 11-23.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated these were Transit Safety Performance Measurements for Huntsville Transit, that they were updated annually, and they included Fatalities, Injuries, Safety Events, and Major Mechanical Failures, for both Fixed Route Bus and Demand Response.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if it was correct that their goal was eight injuries, and they only had four.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was eight on Demand Response and four on Fixed Route.

Mr. Ofenloch stated that, then, they did not have goals, that they just had measurements.

Mr. Vandiver stated these were targets.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if they had results.

Mr. Autry stated that for the calendar year 2022, there were 2 injuries on Fixed Route Bus and zero on Demand Response, 16 total Safety Events on Fixed Route Bus, and 5 safety events on Paratransit service, and a total of approximately 1.3 million miles traveled. He stated when they said "Safety Events," usually that was a vehicular accident, regardless of preventability, whether it was the bus operator or a motorist.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if someone tripped and fell off the bus, that would be in there.

Mr. Autry replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that, then, that would be injuries to people inside the bus and outside the bus.

Mr. Autry replied in the affirmative. He stated, for example, if there were an accident where one motorist struck another motorist, and the second motorist just barely touched the bus, and two people on the bus asked for an ambulance, to go to the hospital, they would have to report that as an injury, that it would end up being very minor, no injury paid, but an injury nonetheless.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he would say kudos to the bus system, that that was a fantastic record.

Chairman McDonald stated this was just Performance Measurements, and he assumed they would initiate some sort of review or something.

Mr. Autry stated he was not sure he understood the question, but it was a federal requirement that they had a Public Transit Agency Safety Plan, that they not only set the targets but reported the results annually.

Mr. Gonzalez asked how they knew they were doing well, if they had comparisons with other MPOs of similar size that were traveling similar miles.

Mr. Autry stated they measured against their own baseline, that they had a five-year history of their own data, and there was also a National Transit Database all transit agencies reported to. He stated that was available on line to anyone, that they could look at national averages, and they could look at just their peer cities, and make those comparisons. He stated they were a relatively small transit service, and compared nationally, their numbers were very low. He stated they wanted to do better, and that was why they had set aggressive targets. He stated they had a lot of things they could proactively do to try to

improve their safety performance. He stated they reported that to the federal government monthly and once a year.

Mr. Ofenloch recommended approval of Resolution No. 11-23, adopting and supporting the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Performance Measurements and Targets, as approved by Huntsville Transit.

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Griffin.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item was Resolution No. 12-23.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated this resolution adopted and supported updated Transit Asset Management Performance Measurements for Huntsville Transit. He stated these Performance Measurements were updated as needed, and they included the age and condition of the Transit fleet, such as Paratransit and Fixed Route Bus, as well as Transit facilities. He stated they could see the targets on the display, in the middle, and then the 2023 actual numbers for Huntsville Transit.

Mr. Mason asked if there were any targets for replacing gas buses with electric buses.

Mr. Autry stated they had a separate plan that was in a draft final, that it was about 115 pages, and it was a Zero Emissions Transition plan, for the Paratransit fleet, as well as the Fixed Route fleet. He stated they were about to finish that up and present it to the City Council and City Maintenance.

Mr. Autry stated the table displayed represented how well they took care of their federally funded assets. He stated they were required under the

regulations to measure three categories: Paratransit fleet, Fixed Route fleet, and all their facilities, like the downtown transit station, the transit station at Bridge Street Mall, and the maintenance facility on Johnson Road.

Mr. Autry stated that what they saw on the displayed table was as they bought new vehicles and replaced others, their target was to make sure no more than 30 percent of their Paratransit fleet had exceeded 200,000 miles. He stated that in that way, that fleet could be more reliable, with fewer breakdowns, for customers. He stated on the Fixed Route side, they measured in terms of the useful life in years, noting that most of their buses had a 10-year useful life. He stated the target there was no more than 30 percent would be more than the 10-year useful life. He stated the current measurement for this was 22 percent.

Mr. Autry stated that facilities were assessed once a year, through the General Services Department, through Inspections, and they would get a grade of 0 through 5, with "5" being the best rating and "0" being the worst. He stated all of their facilities were at least 3.0 or better.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if they had any issue with vandalism on the buses.

Mr. Autry stated they had a little bit, but he would not say it was pervasive. He stated they had an older vehicle that was already slated for disposal, going to auction, that had a catalytic converter stolen off of it.

Mr. Ofenloch stated he was referring to something like paint or slashed seats.

Mr. Autry stated they sometimes had slashed seats that had to be cleaned or replaced.

Mr. Griffin asked, looking at the 2023 Actual, what period this target was from.

Mr. Autry stated it was calendar year 2022.

Mr. Griffin stated that, then, they were already at 22 percent.

Mr. Autry stated that what that was saying was for the last calendar year, at the end of December, 22 percent of their Fixed Route bus fleet exceeded its useful life in years.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if that chart should say "2022 Actual."

Mr. Autry stated he believed it should.

(Mr. Matthew Brown has joined the meeting.)

Mr. Autry stated they were reporting how their fleet existed as of February of 2023, so as of February 2023, 22 percent of the Fixed Route bus fleet exceeded useful life in years, which was below the target of 30 percent.

Mr. Brown asked what, exactly, was the purpose of these targets. He asked if they did not meet a target, if there was some response triggered, or were they just saying this was generally what they were looking for.

Mr. Autry stated that, first, it was a federal requirement for applying for the grants, both Capital and Operating. He stated that from the FTA audit standpoint, they just wanted to make sure they were setting the targets and performing the measurements. He stated if they saw a consistent pattern of never meeting the target, they could take an extra measure and require them to provide an action plan on how they could get back within that target. He stated that would happen over time, that if there was a transit agency that over time continued to have a problem, then there could be a funding review, and there could actually be a deadline set where funding might be delayed or cut completely. He stated it would take a long time to get through that process. He stated that year to year, the FTA wanted to make sure they were setting the target, and measuring, and inspecting, and evaluating the condition of the fleet

and facilities, to keep everything in safe and good repair.

Mr. Griffin stated he had a comment he just wanted to make sure got into the record. He stated he had a sister who utilized the Paratransit fleet, and it had been life-changing for her, in terms of her quality of life. He stated there had been nothing but praises from both her and his mother about the way the Paratransit fleet was run; and the people who actually operated the buses, how courteous they were; how clean the fleet was kept; and how on time they were.

Mr. Autry stated he appreciated those comments.

Mr. Ofenloch recommended approval of Resolution No. 12-23, adopting and supporting the Transit Asset Management (TAM) Performance Measurements and Targets, as approved by Huntsville Transit.

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Griffin.

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

Chairman McDonald stated the next item on the agenda was FY 2020-2023 TIP Administrative Modifications.

Chairman McDonald recognized Mr. Vandiver.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver stated these Administrative Modifications were for information only, that he would not be asking for any approvals on these, that this was just for information for the CAC. He stated if anyone had any questions, he would try to answer as best he could.

Mr. Vandiver stated that Administrative Modification A was a cost decrease to a level of effort transit project, with "level of effort" meaning it was a project that was going to happen whether they liked it or not. He stated these were typically allocations, based on Federal Transit formulas, or Federal

Transportation formulas, or safety programs.

Mr. Vandiver stated this one was Section 5310, Transit, City of Huntsville Urban, for FY 2021 funds. He stated the old cost estimate was \$164,838, and the new cost estimate was \$152,508. He stated Section 5310 was what FTA called their Paratransit Allocation Funds. He stated several of these he would be mentioning were Administrative Modifications on Transit, that a lot of this was just kind of moving money around right now, to try to make sure either this money was being spent or the money would get moved into future years, in order to be part of the next TIP.

Mr. Vandiver stated Administrative Modification B was a cost increase to a project, that it was an increase to a project that was not higher than \$5 million, that that was why it was an Administrative Modification and not a resolution. He stated this was the Mastin Lake Overpass project. He stated they might recall that at the last meeting, they had a pretty substantial increase in the cost of that project. He stated the old cost estimate seen at the last meeting was \$47,965,282, and the new cost estimate was \$47,968,302, for a total increase of \$3,019.61. He stated this was bid the prior month, so they were doing that final adjustment, just to make sure the bid cost was the same as the estimate in ALDOT's system.

Mr. Vandiver stated Administrative Modification C was a cost increase to several Transit projects in the city of Huntsville. He stated that on Capital Buses funds, the old estimate was \$838,783, and the new estimate was \$1,158,335. He stated that on the City of Huntsville Other Capital Projects, the old estimate was \$187,500, and the new estimate was \$287,500. He stated these increases were coming out of another set of funds, Revenue Vehicle funding, that they were removing all funds out of that fund and putting them

into this, for the projects for the City of Huntsville Transit System.

Mr. Vandiver stated Administrative Modification D was a cost decrease to a Transit project, that this was City of Huntsville Capital Rolling Stock, and it was from \$305,361 to \$15,000. He stated this was a 2017 allocation, and a lot of this had to do with moving those funds and making sure they were spent.

Mr. Vandiver stated there were more level of effort Transit projects, that these were actually brand-new ones that had been added to the ALDOT system.

Mr. Vandiver stated Administrative Modification E was Section 5310, City of Huntsville, FY 2022, at a total cost of \$494,480, and a start date of June 1, 2023; Section 5310, Huntsville Urban Apportionment, for the whole Huntsville area, FY 2023, at a total cost of \$397,348, with a start date of October 1, 2023; Section 5310, City of Huntsville, ARPA Apportionment, for FY 2021, noting these were COVID funds, at a total cost of \$44,369, with a start date of June 1, 2023. He stated the last two were apportionments, so they were based on FTA funding formulas.

Mr. Vandiver stated Administrative Modification F was the Utility Phase of the James Record Road/Martin Road Phase II project. He stated that was the gas relocation project he had mentioned earlier, when they were talking about this in the action items portion of the meeting. He stated the old estimate was \$1,339,391, and the new estimate from ALDOT was \$1,621,806. He stated this phase of the project was using all STPAA, or Surface Transportation Program Anywhere funds, so no MPO funds were being used on this phase of the project. He stated this was authorized in April 2023, and the City and ALDOT had agreed to work on this concurrently with the construction of this project.

Mr. Vandiver stated that Administrative Modification G was an increase

in cost on the Northern Bypass, the eastern phase of that. He stated they were talking about the western phase earlier, from the Toyota Engine plant to the Parkway, and this would be from the Parkway to Winchester Road. He stated this was just the PE Phase of the project. He stated the old estimate, which was \$150,000, only covered state support services, so it did not cover the whole cost of the PE Phase. He stated the new estimate would cover the full cost of the PE Phase of this project, of \$2 million. He stated this was a mix of MPO and City of Huntsville funds, that the MPO would cover 80 percent, and the City of Huntsville would cover 20 percent, and they would like to start that in the summer. He stated the reason this was coming before the CAC at this time was that in discussions of the new 2024-2027 TIP, it was indicated to them by the jurisdictions that they would like to prioritize this project, considering the rapid growth of this area, and, frankly, time was running out on this project if they did not do it at this time. He stated that, with that, they were making sure the funds were there for this.

Mr. Vandiver stated Administrative Modification H was a new level of effort safety project, access management. He stated this was a brand-new project, and the reason it was not in a resolution was because it was a safety project, and safety projects got added to the TIP no matter what. He stated this was an access management project along US 72, from Shields Road to just east of Brock Road, in eastern Madison County. He stated they were just looking at the PE Phase for this TIP, that future phases would go in the 2024-2027 TIP, so construction, utilities, right-of-way, and all of that were going in that TIP. He stated the total cost for the PE Phase was \$900,000, that there was no local funding for this project, that it was a highway safety improvement program project, so this was all state and federal funds. He stated the bid date was

June 1, 2023.

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

Mr. Vandiver stated he would give the ALDOT report. He stated this was the project update ALDOT gave to the MPO Policy Board at its Wednesday meetings, and he had asked for it a few days early so he could cover it at this time.

Mr. Vandiver stated the first project was Church Street Phase I, between Pratt Avenue and Monroe Street, and this project had been completed.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was the Northern Bypass, from Pulaski Pike to US Highway 231/431, and the plans were 95 percent complete. He stated that as they had discussed earlier, the project would be let in the summer, hopefully. He stated the anticipated start date was FY 2023.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Martin Road, between Zierdt Road and Laracy Drive, and this was both phases, that Phase I was complete, from Zierdt Road to Old Jim Williams Road, and Phase II, which they had discussed earlier, was Old Jim Williams to Laracy Drive, and they would like to let it in the fall.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was North Parkway at Mastin Lake Road, the overpasses, that the bids were let the prior month, and construction should probably begin in July.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Access Management on US 231 between Weatherly Road and Hobbs Road in South Huntsville, that the plans were 65 percent complete, and the anticipated start for construction was FY 2024.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Winchester Road from

Dominion Circle to Naugher Road, and this was another project that would be in their next TIP, where they increased the funds for that. He stated he believed the Utility relocation work was going to begin the following year, and he stated the start date shown was FY 2024, but it would probably be FY 2025. He stated this was the last gap on Winchester Road, so there would be a five-lane road all the way to just past Riverton Elementary.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was in the city of Madison, improvements to Balch Road. He stated this was a two-foot safety widening from south of Browns Ferry Road to north of Gooch Road. He stated this had actually been adjusted a little bit recently, that it was now between Neldabrook Way, which he believed was just north of Browns Ferry Road, to just south of the Gillespie Road roundabout. He stated they had adjusted the cost to reflect increases in construction. He stated the anticipated start date would be the following year.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Research Park Boulevard widening from US 72 to Old Madison Pike, and he stated that project had been completed.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was US 72 West between Providence Main and County Line Road. He stated this had been broken up into phases by ALDOT, and they were saying FY 2023, and he would just leave it at that.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was SR-43 widening from Taurus Drive to Harvest Road, which was the next segment of Highway 53 widening, that it was about a mile-long section, that the plans were 85 percent complete, and the projected start date was FY 2024.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Madison Boulevard from Westchester Road to Flagstone Drive, that it was a resurfacing project, as well

as an intersection improvement project, at Madison Boulevard and Sullivan Street/Wall-Triana Highway. He stated they were working on plan development, and construction was scheduled to begin the following year.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Four Bridge Replacements on Old Highway 431, and this project had been completed, noting that it was over by Hampton Cove.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was I-565 Additional Lanes from County Line Road to Wall-Triana Highway, that the plans were 85 percent complete, the projected start date was currently FY 2023, and the cost was just under \$50 million. He stated that was that last gap segment there of the six-lane segment just east of Wall-Triana Highway.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Jeff Road Additional Lanes from south of Capshaw Road to north of Douglass Road, that the plans were 70 percent complete, and they anticipated right-of-way acquisition to begin in this fiscal year, with a projected start date of FY 2025 for construction.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Intersection Improvements on Wall-Triana Highway at Graphics Drive, that this construction project was ongoing, and it was approximately 15 percent complete.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Widening Blake Bottom Road from Jeff Road to SR 255, that the plans were complete, that the right-of-way acquisition was underway, and they were expecting construction to start soon.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was Intersection Improvements on SR 53 at Harvest, McKee, and Old Railroad Bed roads, that the plans were almost complete, and the expected start date was the current year. He stated this included left-turn lanes and signal improvements at these three intersections, and the estimated cost was about \$5 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated the next project was the Arsenal East Connector, that preliminary engineering was underway, and they had a public involvement meeting the prior fall. He stated the projected start date was FY 2024, at an estimated cost of \$30 million.

Mr. Vandiver stated the total amount of work in design and construction in the Huntsville-MPO area was \$416,931,760.

Chairman McDonald asked Mr. Vandiver if this report would be on the website after it was formally presented.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was correct, that it would be there in the current week.

Chairman McDonald asked if there was a Huntsville Transit report.

Mr. Autry stated that the Transit Improvement Plan was completed in February 2023, but the implementation date for the first phase had not been set, that they would not set it until the budget discussion that would go through the Mayor and the Council by September 30. He stated the Zero Emissions Transition plan would be completed in the current month, and construction of the downtown bus transfer station was scheduled to be completed in April of 2024.

Chairman McDonald stated the next item was MPO-Regional Development Review.

Mr. Vandiver stated he would comment on this. He stated this was something they had been talking about for a couple of years. He stated some of them might be aware of the Huntsville Development Review, that the City of Huntsville had done this development review for the past 40 years, that it was about residence construction, commercial construction, subdivisions, annexations, zonings, rezonings, that it was a pretty substantial document that

was released annually by the City of Huntsville Planning Department. He stated that in the past couple of years, they had gotten some requests, especially from their major employers, such as Redstone Arsenal and Huntsville Hospital, for a more regional look at the development patterns in the Huntsville MPO area, so they felt this was something they needed to look into, and it would help out the MPO as well because they did a lot of outlooks and housing projections.

Mr. Vandiver stated they did not have a report yet, but when it came out, probably within the next couple of weeks, they would have 2022 data for Huntsville, Madison, Madison County, anywhere in the Huntsville MPO area, so all of Madison County and part of Limestone County, and that would include residential construction, as well as real estate data, and also a tally of all housing units, starting from the Census day, which was 4/1/2220.

Mr. Vandiver stated he would give them a few teasers, and he stated that they had 9,353 housing units permitted in the Huntsville MPO area in 2022, and that was a decrease of 6.2 percent from 2021, that there were 10,000 units permitted in 2021. He stated that was housing units starting construction. He stated when they got to the CO phase, or a Certificate of Occupancy, that would be when a house was ready to occupy. He stated there were 6,251 housing units that were granted Certificates of Occupancy in the Huntsville MPO area in 2022, and that was a 6.4 percent increase over 2021.

Mr. Vandiver stated the total number of housing units in the Huntsville MPO area as of December 31, 2022, was 195,211, and the total population of the MPO area was estimated to be 444,856 as of July 1st of the prior year.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if the School Board had expressed any interest in that document.

Mr. Vandiver stated not on the regional development, but on the Huntsville side, the School Board was aware of that document, that on the Planning Department side, they were very well aware of it.

Mr. Madsen stated they met with them probably at least quarterly for such discussion.

Mr. Mason asked Mr. Vandiver if they were going to share this with Madison and the other jurisdictions that were in the MPO.

Mr. Vandiver stated they absolutely were. He stated that Madison and Madison County had been very helpful in getting them the data that was required.

Chairman McDonald stated the next item was Opportunity for Public Comment.

There was no response.

Chairman McDonald stated the next item was CAC Member Comments.

Mr. Houston Matthews introduced himself and stated this was his first MPO meeting as a member. He stated he worked for Croy Engineering, that he was a civil engineer, and he had been with Croy for four or five years, and he had served in the Madison County Engineer's office for eight years prior to that, that he had worked with Mr. Madsen and Mr. Vandiver for a long time.

The other members of the committee introduced themselves.

Mr. Ofenloch introduced himself, stating he was not certain how long he had served on this committee, and he had served three years on the Huntsville Utilities Water and Gas Board and nine years on the Huntsville Utilities Electric Board, and he dabbled in politics.

Mr. Griffin introduced himself, stating he had served on this committee several years, that he was a physicist with NASA, and he was Assistant Chair of

this committee.

Chairman McDonald stated he was the current Chair of this committee, that this was his first meeting as Chair, and he had been on the committee for eight or ten years, and he represented the Limestone County part of the city of Huntsville.

Mr. Whitley stated he was with Huntsville Utilities, and he was not certain how long he had been on this committee.

Mr. Gonzales stated he had shown up for this committee when the doors were opened, and he worked for Skipper Consulting.

Mr. Mason stated he was from the city of Madison.

Mr. Vandiver stated that Matthew Brown was a new member, that he was appointed by the Huntsville City Council President John Meredith, and he wanted to welcome him as well.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if anything had been done in the last several years on the idea of rapid transit from Bridge Street to the airport and Bridge Street into the Arsenal. He stated he was aware that 9/11 had stopped the plans of going into the Arsenal, but if there was anything going on there or if they had just forgotten about it.

Mr. Autry stated he would just say that in the Huntsville Transit Improvement Plan, there was a new route programmed, in Phase II and Phase III, that they would connect from downtown to employment centers in and around the airport, all the way out to Greenbrier.

Mr. Ofenloch asked if that was a bus plan or rapid transit.

Mr. Autry stated it was a bus plan, not rapid transit. He continued that on the Arsenal, they had Paratransit service, to take individuals with disabilities to and from the base.

Mr. Madsen stated that what preceded the BRT routes on 72, that there were a number of routes looked at, and the second most popular, and where they might need a follow-up, would be from downtown to the airport via Madison Boulevard.

Mr. Madsen stated that with regard to the Arsenal, that during this process and other processes, there were multiple discussions with them, and he would not say they were against the idea of transit, that they just recognized the impracticalities of serving the Arsenal and had said as much as to focus on the areas where it was a little easier, with the low-hanging fruit. He stated they tried to do a study, with these cards to hand out at the gates, of those coming through, to get an idea of the average ridership, and it was 1.00000001 riders per car. He stated their development pattern and traffic pattern did not lend itself to be supportive, but they were optimistic they would get there.

Mr. Ofenloch stated, concerning bicycles, that they had bought some land, and he asked if that was being utilized, if people were parking there and riding their bikes into the Arsenal.

Mr. Vandiver stated that was utilized.

Mr. Mason stated there were some restrictions on actually being able to ride a bike during peak hours, so that would kind of kill commuters.

Mr. Brown asked, concerning routes, if there had been any consideration of from Five Points to downtown to West Huntsville, as far as BRT.

Mr. Madsen stated that some of the routes he and Mr. Vandiver had looked at early on were the University corridor to downtown and to UAH, for a BRT corridor. He stated that because those were local, they might have to be locally funded, by the City of Huntsville.

Mr. Autry stated that part of the Transit Improvement Plan was to

improve the frequency on Route 8 and Route 7 that served the Five Points area.

There was a question concerning service to the universities.

Mr. Autry stated they had just started that conversation with A&M, and they had a small contract with UAH that ran on Friday night, a shopping route for students. He stated this served the on-campus housing, and it connected to Walmart, Target, and Bridge Street.

Upon motion, the meeting was adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m. on May 15, 2023.)