

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

**MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting - August 5, 2024 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Huntsville, Alabama**

**Committee Members:**

Mr. Trent Griffin  
Mr. Matthew Brown  
Mr. Todd Slyman

Vice Chairman, City of Huntsville  
City of Huntsville  
City of Huntsville

**MPO Staff Members:**

Mr. James Vandiver  
Mr. Kevin Bernard  
Mr. James Moore

---

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

The first two items on the agenda, Approval of Minutes and Jurisdiction Reports, were not considered at this meeting.

Vice Chairman Griffin said the next item on the agenda was an FY 2024-2027 TIP Amendment.

(Mr. Bernard made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Bernard said Resolution No. 08-24 adopted and supported changes to the "NHS/Interstate Maintenance/NHS Bridge Projects" section of the 2024-2-27 TIP on Projects #100061845, #100061846, and #100061847 for PHASE 1; Projects #100078809, #100078810, #100078811, and #100078812 for PHASE 2; and #100078813, #100078814, #100078815, and #100078816 for PHASE 3.

Mr. Bernard said this project was the widening of US Highway 72 West, from Providence Main to County Line Road. He said this was originally one

project, but in recent months, it had been broken out into three phases. He said there was Phase 1, which was from Providence Main Street to Huntsville Memory Gardens; and Phase 2, from Huntsville Memory Gardens to Walnut Street, which was less than a quarter mile before Wall-Triana Highway; and Phase 3, from Walnut Street to County Line Road.

Mr. Vandiver said this resolution had been brought before the CAC at their prior meeting, but it was just for Phase 1, and the CAC had some concerns, as well as had the MPO Board, about not having all the phases included in one resolution, so they had waited until ALDOT had everything ready to go, with all three phases in their system, so this was now coming back to the Board with all three phases, as a complete project. He said this had not gone before the Board at their prior meeting, so it had not been adopted.

Mr. Slyman asked if they planned on starting Phase 1 in 2024 and completing it in 2025.

Mr. Vandiver said right-of-way would begin in 2024, not construction. He said the construction in Phase 1, the bridge, was scheduled for FY 25.

Mr. Slyman asked if they had any designs on that yet.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the negative. He said that would be an ALDOT question, and they could check with them on that.

Mr. Brown asked if there had been any conversation about including the Indian Creek Greenway as part of the bridge replacement project.

Mr. Vandiver said that was going to be a separate project. He said the bridge would be able to accommodate the greenway underneath, and that was the big obstacle at this time. He said they would have to deal with property owners to the south of 72. He reiterated that it would be a separate project, and he said whenever that happened, if it used federal funding, it would come

before the CAC.

Mr. Bernard said the original project estimate, up until the prior CAC meeting, was \$85 million, and now, with all the phases, it was re-estimated and rounded up to approximately \$92 million.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if that adjustment was just for inflation or if there were other reasons, if things had been added to it.

Mr. Bernard said it was just an estimate, noting that the second and third phases included design and right-of-way acquisition, which from time to time could fluctuate. He said there was also utilities. He said he believed inflation would have been taken into consideration, or as a result of inflation, they had increased prices.

Mr. Brown asked if there was a reason why the right-of-way acquisition for Phase 3 was not beginning at the same time as the right-of-way acquisition for Phases 1 and 2, noting that it seemed like they knew they were going to need the land either way.

Mr. Bernard said he thought it was the allocation of funds for different projects, that they wanted a complete phase and not necessarily to just have the allocation of the right-of-way for all of the phases but could not move forward with the completion of the construction.

Mr. Slyman recommended approval of Resolution No. 08-24, amending the NHS/Interstate Maintenance/NHS Bridge Projects Section of the FY 2024-2027 TIP to modify Projects #100061845, #100061846, and #100061847 for PHASE 1; and add Projects #100078809, #100078810, #100078811, and #100078812 for PHASE 2; and #100078813, #100078814 #100078815, and #100078816 for PHASE 3, " FOR ADDITIONAL LANES ON SR-2 (US-72) FROM COUNTY LINE ROAD TO PROVIDENCE MAIN STREET

IN THE CITY LIMITS OF HUNTSVILLE."

Said motion was seconded by Mr. Brown and was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Vice Chairman Griffin said the next item on the agenda was Final FY 2025 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

(Mr. Bernard made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Bernard said Resolution No. 12-24 would adopt the final FY 2025 UPWP. He said this was a total budget of \$1,329,769 for the next fiscal year, noting this contained a carryover from the previous year, based on the 2020 Census adjustment, and they also had an increase in funding specifically for congestion management, data analysis, and administration management.

Mr. Slyman recommended approval of Resolution No. 12-24, adopting the FINAL FY 2025 Unified Planning Work Program.

Said motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Griffin and was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Vice Chairman Griffin said the next item on the agenda was FY 2024-2027 TIP Amendment.

(Mr. Bernard made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Bernard said Resolution No. 13-24 adopted and supported changes to Projects #100075911, #100078825, #100078826, and #100078827, to the Other State and Federal Projects section of the 2024-2027 TIP.

Mr. Bernard said this particular project was for pedestrian access on a redevelopment corridor. He said this was funded by federal grants, and also funds from the City of Huntsville, via two grants, the first at \$20 million, and the other at \$27 million. He said this was in the Pinhook area. He said this project would remove property from the flood zones, enhance connectivity

between downtown and the Mill Creek and Lowe Mill communities, and improve the transportation grid along Pinhook Creek, via greenways and a suspended pedestrian bridge. He said they had heard about the bridge being funded, and this project would help with drainage improvements, for flood mitigation, and also to accommodate green space, with the addition of the bridge.

Mr. Bernard said this project was broken up into four components, where they would have different project descriptions, or scopes of work. He said the first one would be creek channel improvements; the second would be construction of the cable suspension bridge; the third would be the railroad bridge improvements; and the last component would be the precast pedestrian bridges and hardscape. He said what was displayed were the cost estimates and the target start dates for each component.

Mr. Slyman asked if it was correct that this would connect Lowe Mill to downtown.

Mr. Bernard replied in the affirmative.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if this would all start at the same time.

Mr. Vandiver said that was what was in ALDOT's system currently, and he asked if Mr. Bernard would like to read what they had been given as to the start dates, according to the City of Huntsville,

Mr. Bernard said for Component 1, the anticipated start date for the City of Huntsville was February 2025, and there would be about an 18-month construction period. He said even though ALDOT had it in their system as March 2025, the City anticipated it would begin in February of 2025 and take about 18 months.

Mr. Bernard said for Component 2, ALDOT was saying the start would be

around 9-15, but for the City of Huntsville, it would be six months after the completion of Component 1, so six months after that 18-month period, they would start with the process. He said it was estimated to be a 24-month construction period.

Mr. Bernard said, concerning Component 3, the City of Huntsville estimated it would be two months after Component 1 completion, with a 12-month construction duration, so they were going to have some work that would be going on concurrently.

Mr. Bernard said, concerning Component 4, the City of Huntsville was estimating that one year after Component 1, they would start bidding on Component 4. He said Component 4 was estimated as a 12-month construction period.

Vice Chairman Griffin said, then, there would be staggered starts, but there would be some overlaps in their efforts.

Mr. Vandiver said it would all depend on that creek channel, Component 1, when that would start.

Mr. Brown said if he was understanding this correctly, the end date would be, like, the beginning of 2027, or 2026.

Mr. Bernard said that was correct.

Mr. Slyman inquired as to the total length of the project.

Mr. Bernard said it would depend on the completion of the first component.

Mr. Slyman asked, from the yellow line on the display, what the total length would be.

Vice Chairman Griffin said Mr. Slyman was talking about the actual physical length of the bridge there.

Mr. Bernard said he did not have that information at this time, as to the total length of it.

Mr. Vandiver said he believed it was a little over a mile, but he did not have the exact number. He said it was a little over a mile from Holmes Avenue to the north to Lowe Mill to the South.

Mr. Brown recommended approval of Resolution No. 13-24, amending the Other Federal and State Aid Projects section of the FY 2024-2027 TIP to add (4 CN Phases) projects #100075911 - CREEK CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, #100078825 - CABLE SUSPENSION BRIDGE, #100078826 - RAILROAD BRIDGE, #100078827 - PRECAST PEDESTRIAN BRIDGES & HARDSCAPE ."

Said motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Griffin and was unanimously approved by the Citizens Advisory Committee members present.

Vice Chairman Griffin said the next item on the agenda was Non-Action Items, FY 2024-2027 TIP Administrative Modifications.

(Mr. Bernard made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Bernard said these were Fiscal Year 2024-2027 Administrative Modifications.

Mr. Bernard said the first one was New level of effort sign replacement, projects #100077779 and #100077780. He said this was sign replacement in Limestone County, from I-65 to the Madison County Line, and the project was estimated at \$50,000. He said the second project was estimated at \$404,000.

Mr. Slyman asked what signs these were.

Mr. Bernard said it was signage on I-65.

Mr. Vandiver said it was replacing the green signs, the exit signs.

Mr. Slyman asked if it was going from I-65 and getting onto County Line

Road.

Mr. Vandiver replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Slyman asked if this was because something was changing on the signs or if it was just time to replace them.

Mr. Vandiver said this was an interstate maintenance project, so it would be just routine maintenance, every 20 years or so.

Mr. Bernard said the next item was New Recreational Trails Grant Project #100078993. He said this was a Recreational Trails Grant for Madison County, and it included the construction of a 10-foot-wide, 4,750 linear feet, paved trail along an abandoned railroad right-of-way between Smokey Hills Court and County Lake Road. He said this project was estimated at \$515,940, with a target start date of July 3, 2024.

Mr. Slyman asked where this was, exactly.

Mr. Vandiver said it was up by Riverton. He said they were getting MPO TAP funds for Madison County for the first phase of this project, and the second phase would go to County Line Road.

Mr. Bernard said the next one was New Transit Projects, #100078943, #100079102, #100077426, and #100079166.

Mr. Bernard said the next two items were resurfacing projects, that item (d) was Project #100077252, and item (e), also a resurfacing project, was #100077254. He said the next item was a cost adjustment, a decrease in a project. He said these were pretty much negligible, that in item (d), they were going from \$4,199,371 to \$4,241,364; and for item (e), the original project estimate was \$4,922,520, and the new project estimate was \$4,971,745.

Mr. Slyman asked where these two projects were.

Mr. Bernard said item (e) was the resurfacing of State Road 2, US 72,

from Shields Road to east of the Flint River. He said item (d) was State Road 255 from US 72 to State Road 53.

Mr. Bernard said the last item was (f), and it was a decrease in cost to TAP project #100077908. He said this was for sidewalks along Miller Branch, from Wall-Triana Highway to Beadle Lane, and then along Beadle Lane to Swancott, Miller Branch Greenway, Phase 1. He said this was all within the city of Huntsville city limits. He said the old project cost was \$96,250, and the new project estimate was \$87,499.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if this was for sidewalks.

Mr. Vandiver said this was actually a greenway. He said in the description, they had put "sidewalks," but it was a greenway, a 12-foot greenway.

Vice Chairman Griffin said the next item was Agency Reports.

(Mr. Vandiver made a PowerPoint presentation.)

Mr. Vandiver said the first item on the ALDOT project update was the Northern Bypass from Pulaski Pike to US Highway 231/431, that the project was 10 percent complete, utility work was ongoing, that they were working on grading, and the project cost was \$43 million.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was Martin Road between Zierdt Road and Laracy Drive, that the first phase of the project, from Zierdt to Old Jim Williams Road, was complete, and the second phase had just begun, that it was approximately 5 percent complete. He said the utility relocation was under way, and the total project cost was \$42 million.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was North Parkway at Mastin Lake Road, that the project was 20 percent complete, and the total project cost was \$44,200,000.

Mr. Vandiver said next was Access Management on US 231 between Weatherly Road and Hobbs Road, that the plans were 85 percent complete, and right-of-way acquisition was expected to begin soon, and the estimated cost was \$15 million, with an anticipated start date of FY 2025.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was Winchester Road from Dominion Circle to Naugher Road, that the plans were 90 percent complete, the right-of-way acquisition was ongoing, and utility relocation design work was to begin soon. He said the estimated cost was \$28 million, with an anticipated start date of FY 2026, although they were going to try to get it in FY 2025, if the funding worked out.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was US 72 West, between Providence Main and County Line Road. He said he would go through this one quickly since Mr. Bernard had already gone through it. He said they had broken this out into three phases, that the first phase was from Huntsville Memory Gardens to Providence Main Street, and Phase 2 was from Walnut Street to Huntsville Memory Gardens, about a two-mile segment, with construction planned for FY 2027; and Phase 3 was from County Line Road to Walnut Street, another two-mile segment, with construction planned for FY 2030. He said the total project cost, for all three phases, was \$92 million.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was SR-53 Widening from Taurus Drive to Harvest Road, that the plans were 90 percent complete, with an estimated cost of \$10 million, and an anticipated start date of FY 2025. He said they anticipated construction to start early in 2025 on this project.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was Madison Boulevard from Westchester Road to Flagstone Drive, that the bids were let in June 2024, and construction would probably start in September, at an estimated cost of

\$4.2 million. He said this was a resurfacing project on Madison Boulevard, and they were also doing signal improvements at Wall-Triana Highway.

Mr. Vandiver said next was Four Bridge Replacements on Old Highway 431, in the Hampton Cove area, and the project was complete, at a total project cost of \$13.5 million.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was I-565 Additional Lanes from County Line Road to Wall-Triana Highway, that the bids had been received in May 2024, and work should begin immediately, and the estimated cost was approximately \$41.8 million.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was Jeff Road Additional Lanes from south of Capshaw Road to north of Douglass Road, that the plans were 85 percent complete, environmental documents had been submitted for review, and right-of-way acquisition was anticipated to begin in FY 2025, with a projected start date of FY 2026, at an estimated cost of \$13.5 million.

Mr. Vandiver said next was Widening Blake Bottom Road from Jeff Road to SR 255, that right-of-way acquisition was complete, and utility relocation was under way, and the construction project would be bid by the County in FY 2025, with an estimated cost of a little over \$20 million.

Mr. Vandiver said the next project was Intersection Improvements on SR 53 at Harvest, McKee, and Old Railroad Bed roads, that it was adding turn lanes at these intersections, and, also, a new signal. He said this work was under way, and it was 15 percent complete, at a total project cost of \$3.7 million.

Mr. Vandiver said the last one was the Arsenal East Connector, that preliminary engineering was under way, at an estimated cost of \$30 million, with an anticipated start date of FY 2028.

Mr. Vandiver said the total amount of work in design and construction was \$396,705,000.

Vice Chairman Griffin said the next item on the agenda was Opportunity for Public Comment, and he asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to comment at this time.

Vice Chairman Griffin said the next item on the agenda was CAC Member Comments.

Mr. Slyman asked if there was an update of the Capshaw and Old Monrovia widening.

Mr. Bernard said they were aware this was desperately needed, like so many roads in the city of Huntsville and Madison County, and what they were planning to do was embark on a study, hopefully in the very near future, exploring Capshaw, what it would take to expand the road, in terms of what capacity it would require, current capacity, future capacity, et cetera, how far it would run, and also the phasing of it. He said they were not necessarily doing ALDOT's or anybody else's work, that they just wanted to do a study to make sure they were on the right track, and to see where it needed to be, in terms of the lineup of projects.

Mr. Vandiver said they also wanted to look at the land use along the corridor as well, to make sure they were meeting the needs of whatever cross section they looked at. He said that was a big part of it as well, to make sure they were accommodating that.

Mr. Slyman said he would recommend that that basically be a truck route, for anybody who was trying to get east and west and did not want to stop at stores and stuff, because when they did the work on Highway 72 from Providence Main to County Line Road, Highway 72 was going to be an absolute

parking lot, worse than what it was at this time, and there was no outlet for those people to get east and west.

Mr. Slyman said he would highly recommend to limit the number of signals, that there were already two signals going through there, and they should go to roundabouts, whatever they would have to do to keep the traffic flowing. He said several people had complained about the roundabouts at Old Monrovia and Providence Main and Indian Creek and Oakwood at first, but when they looked at it, it worked. He said it needed to be one lane wider, but traffic moved through there, that they did not have the holdups, and they did not have the accidents they had had. He said he remembered when it was Indian Creek and Old Monrovia, and there were a tremendous number of accidents, and a lot of fatalities, in that area, and he would bet them that if they looked at the numbers at this time, that had all been eliminated, as far as the number of fatalities that occurred, because at this time, they were sideswipes, that they were not head-on collisions or anything of significance, that people might have their cars damaged, with fender benders, but lives were being saved because of this.

Mr. Slyman said he would highly recommend that they would consider limiting the access, limiting the number of lights, and going with the roundabouts, because that would be for people who were trying to get further west after work and had no desire to stop at a restaurant or a store, that that would be their outlet to be able to get there, and then for all the folks who wanted to utilize the restaurants, et cetera, on Highway 72, it would not be a parking lot. He said he refused to go on that road at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, headed west, because it was a parking lot. He said they were losing tax revenue that could be received because of the number of people who were unwilling to

eat and shop at all those places because it was so hard to get there.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if this study they wanted to do was already funded or if it was something that needed funding, and if so, who was going to fund it.

Mr. Vandiver said they were going to fund it through MPO planning funds. He said they had done this in the past with other corridor studies. He said they had just recommended the adoption of the FY 2025 Budget, and he and Mr. Bernard were going to be busy for at least the next six to eight months on the Long-Range Transportation Plan, and they would not have any staff to start working on this at this time, so they were looking at either doing an amended budget for FY 2025 or doing it by 2026. He said they also anticipated recommending Capshaw as one of their high-priority projects.

Mr. Slyman asked who they normally had do these kinds of studies.

Mr. Vandiver said they would probably do an RFP at some point, that he thought Mr. Bernard was going to project manage.

Mr. Bernard said that was correct, noting that he lived out that way, so he had to deal with the parking lot every day, going and coming. He said he and Mr. Vandiver had been talking about this very regularly, as well as Mr. Madsen, and they were going to take that step and see where it fell. He said it was on their priority list, in terms of staff, and they would see how far up the list they could get it, in terms of projects that were viable.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if there were any further comments.

Vice Chairman Griffin adjourned the meeting.

**(Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m. on August 5, 2024.)**