

Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

August 28, 2007

Voting Members

Mr. David Sikes, Chairman
Mr. Jon Broadway
Mr. Rodger Burnett
Ms. Valerie Harman
Ms. Ruth Ott
Mr. Blair Rehnberg
Mr. Edward Stevens
Ms. Gracie Stroud
Mr. Augustus Townes, Jr.
Mr. Theodore White

Guests

Mr. David B. Bollie, ALDOT
Barbara Hendricks, ALDOT

MPO Staff

Mr. Robert Smith
Mr. James Askew
Mr. Kelvin Miller
Ms. Diana Drummond
Ms. April Delchamps
Mr. Kindell Anderson

At the special called meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) on August 28, 2007, at 2:00 p.m. at the City of Montgomery Personnel Board Room in Montgomery, Alabama, the aforementioned members were present.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. David Sikes, Chairman. Mr. Sikes recognized guests who were in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. The Chairman made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 28, 2007 meeting and Mr. Jon Broadway made a correction to the minutes of June 19, 2007. Mr. Broadway wanted to make the MPO staff aware of the spelling errors within the minutes on page 7 and on page 8. Mr. Edward Stevens made note of the misspelling of his last name and the corrections were noted. After the noted corrections to the minutes, a motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the June 19, 2007 meeting and the minutes were adopted.

Mr. Sikes then referenced the portion of the agenda that referred to the Final FY-2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Public Involvement Summary Document. Mr. Sikes asked Mr. Smith to present the Draft FY-2008 UPWP and Public Summary Document, Mr. Smith stated that the Public Involvement Summary Document was a detail of the activities that the MPO staff had done for the purposes of involving the public in the process of developing the UPWP. He said that MPO's are required to publish the UPWP in general circulation newspapers and that it also is put out at centralized locations within the three county MPO study area where the general public can access, read and comment on the document. He also said that the document does not require a public hearing. He then went to the final draft FY-2008 UPWP and said that it was a basic document that outlined the work activities for the MPO staff for the new Fiscal Year of 2008. Chairman Sikes asked if any official action needed to be taken on the Final FY-2008 UPWP. Mr. Smith stated yes action to approve would be needed and Mr. Smith noted that the only changes made from the Draft to the Final was 1) the addition of the \$150,000 for the Auburn University Integrated Land Use Transportation Modeling project and 2) added additional available carry over from FY-2007 money for next fiscal year. Dollar amounts increased to \$744,741 in planning with a local match of \$186,185 totaling \$930,926. Mr. Smith stated that more than likely all of the funds will not be used but it is there just in case it needs to be used for planning studies and other items. Mr. Edward Stevens interjected to ask whether this was subject to some adjustments from the fiscal years 2008-2011. Mr. Smith explained that they were currently just discussing the FY-2008 UPWP and had not began discussing the TIP as of yet. But basically the document outlines the MPO staff activities of day to day, week to week, and month to month basis throughout the fiscal year. Mr. Sikes stated that he would entertain a motion to approve the final draft of the Fiscal Year 2008 draft. Motion was made, seconded and approved by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Sikes then moved to agenda item #6, which was the Fiscal year 2008-2011 TIP and Environmental Justice report. Mr. Smith stated that this was the draft 2008-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and before discussing that he would like to discuss the environmental justice report for each one of the roadway projects and even some transit projects and details roughly some of the environmental impacts if any. Mr. Smith continued to state that for the most part there were not many impacts from most of the proposed projects, but that a more detailed look at impacts would be taken during the environmental work done on most of the projects with the exception of transit, but roadway projects do have their own separate detailed environmental documents. He said that this was just a broad brushed look at whether any environmental justice issues were present. He also gave a brief definition of what environmental justice was, by saying that it was making sure that ethnic minority and low income populations don't bare majority of the burden from transportation projects and share in the benefits from projects.

Mr. Augustus Townes, Jr. asked why the material was distributed so late because this was something that he would have liked to review earlier than he did. He said that he picked his package up out of his mailbox before coming to the meeting, and he would have liked to have the chance to have it at least a week in advance to review. Several other members stated that they received theirs last week. Mr. Smith stated that he apologized for that because normally the draft would have been done by June but there have been many holdups from the State (ALDOT) trying to balance its own document which put all of the MPO's in the state behind the 8 ball as far as trying to get a document prepared and distributed in a timely manner. Mr. Jon Broadway stated that the CAC committee has been on record as asking on several occasions to receive the material at least two weeks in advance. Mr. Broadway stated that he received his packet on Friday afternoon or Saturday and there was no way in the world to go through the entire document and have an intelligent response based on the timeline. He said that the CAC was being forced to do something that they really can't do and it's not fair to the process. Mr. Broadway continued to state that he agreed with Mr. Townes and cannot vote to approve the draft due to having no time to review the document. He said that it is not their fault the process is not working. Mr. Sikes stated that both Mr. Broadway's and Mr. Townes' comment were noted.

Mr. Stevens noted that he received his packet on Saturday and stayed up until 11:30 Monday night reviewing the packet, but did have 3 questions because he was familiar with the document. 1). Zelda Rd at Ann St at Carter Hill- going in and out of various locations are there going to make any changes to the entrances and exits when you resurface that area. Mr. Smith stated I would say so and asked Mr. David Bollie from ALDOT if that was indeed correct. Mr. Bollie stated that they (ALDOT) had only seen a rough set of plans so far, not enough details right now to give a firm answer. Mr. Stevens stated that there are several entrances and exits as your coming out there is traffic coming around the curve and that the driver has to peek around from an awkward angle. Cars also scrap trying to come onto Ann St. Ms. Ott noted that it is somewhat like the Talladega 500 coming around the curve. Mr. Smith stated that there is some right of way acquisition on that project. Mr. Bollie stated that as of yet he has not seen any this project and it is at the preliminary stages and he has not seen design. Mr. Smith explained that in order to fix the problem, a significant amount of right of way would be needed to fix all driveways and really manage access. Mr. Stevens noted that the right of way seems to be there it seems to be as simple as putting a bulldozer in and doing it. Ms. Ott stated to build up the back end so the cars would not scrap as coming onto the street. Mr. Smith noted that the #1 thing to happen on Zelda was a center turn lane (universal turn lane) to be put in. Ms. Ott noted that when Zelda Road was first designed it was not done properly. Mr. Smith stated that he knows the City of Montgomery is going to do everything possible to improve, but as to what and how is not known yet. Mr. Stevens then went to the next project. 2). The next project is High St (from Hall to Court St.), improvements (resurface), Mr. Stevens asked if they were going to maintain the 2 lanes but they are narrow and if you notice the markings on the streets if you ride down it, you have to be careful because you have sidewalks but its not the standard lane width. Mr. Smith stated that he has noticed that Montgomery has quite a few streets that are too narrow to handle the traffic. Mr. Smith noted that more right of way would need to be purchased while Mr. Stevens noted that there are several dilapidated buildings on the road. Mr. Smith noted that while they may be dilapidated it would be more costly to purchase them and might be easier for the City of Montgomery to have a taking declared on them if needed, but said that as far as he knew that the resurfacing would only occur on the existing roadway as it is. Ms. Ott noted that they should just go back and make it a two lane street.

Ms. Stroud asked if the project Woodley Road from Spring road to McGinnis road would be widened because it only said resurfacing. Mr. Smith stated that it would be widened from

10 ft to 12ft lane width. Ms. Stroud stated that it only said resurfacing and nothing about widening and other projects said both. Mr. Smith ensured her that it would be widened and that it was a typo. Mr. Stevens also had a question about that project because he is currently on the Board of Directors for Community Action Agency and down in the lower end they are building Community Village and he was wondering whether or not, while he was sure bus service goes through there, they would put additional bus shelters there. Mr. Smith asked for clarification of the site was notified by Ms. Stroud that it was on McGinnis road. Mr. Stevens noted that it was nearly complete and would be bigger than before with more homes to be built within the area. Mr. Smith noted that there is a bus route through that area (MATS route 9 Virginia Loop Road). Mr. Stevens stated that he had spoken with transportation and that they appreciated them bringing that to their notice of the need for more shelters. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Kelvin Miller of Montgomery Area Transit was making a note of that.

Mr. Sikes asked were there anymore discussions or questions. Then Mr. Sikes himself asked what would be the implications on the whole process if this committee did not approve or voted to table the consideration of this document to the next meeting for further study? Mr. Smith stated that since the CAC along with the TCC are only both advisory to the MPO which will view it on Thursday and they will only vote for or against, it is only as a draft and nothing is final, the MPO policy committee would only vote on it as a draft. Mr. Smith said that no action could be taken by the CAC if that was wanted. Ms. Ott asked to speak, she stated that while there may be some objections, on not having time to study the document, there is time to study it now, we (CAC) can still take the document home and study it. It has been my experience that most of these projects will take 3 years to happen and there will be plenty of time to discuss these projects at the next meeting even if the draft is approved today. Mr. Smith stated that indeed the CAC would only be approving the draft and not the final which would be taking place some weeks from now. There will be more time to convene again to review the draft more on your on and then comeback to approve the draft and then the final. Ms. Ott stated that we could make a list of anything that we have a problem with and email it to Mr. Smith he will be glad to respond to you on it and if it needs to be brought up on the next meeting before the committee, we are flexible on this and further said that she didn't think that the objections should be noted on our minutes, but she didn't think that we should turn down this draft, that might be a little bit extreme when we know that we have plenty of time on our hands to make any corrections.

Mr. Smith explained that the next step after this would be the 14 day comment period, plus a public hearing that will take place for more of the general public. Public Notices will be placed in all the general circulation newspapers and the draft would be placed in all the public libraries in the City and County along with libraries and other public places in the other two counties and will be available for public consumption, then there will be one public hearing where we will hear the public's comments about this draft in terms of yea or nay and what they like or don't like and then MPO Staff would compile a summary of all public comments just like the UPWP and everyone if anyone has comments, those will be included in the public summary document and the public summary document just like the UPWP budget for next year will be given to the MPO and the MPO will consider it before they make a final decision, that's the usual process. Ms. Ott noted that one other thing that she would like to note as she has previously noted in past years is that we are the Citizens Advisory Committee and it is up to each of us to reach out into our part of the area to ask people for their comments and one good way is through a neighborhood association and if there is a project in the TIP that would affect their neighborhood that the project be presented to the officer of the association. They mostly have an email that they get out notices to members and we could tell them that there will be a comment period on this document and if they have comments on a project and they should watch the newspaper or we (CAC) can notify the members of the comment period. This is the way we can get more information fed up to the top and this committee is a channel for those trying to comment. So we need to reach out to the people around us, we are not the only ones who are responsible, we are just their representatives. Mr. Sikes thanked Ms. Ott for her comments and then asked Robert when the comment period would begin. Mr. Smith stated that it would be the day after the Labor Day holiday for 14 days through Sept 17th. Ms. Ott and Mr. Sikes confirmed those dates and Mr. Smith agreed. Mr. Sikes then asked about the next meeting of the CAC scheduled for September 19th at 2:00 p.m., and stated so we will have another meeting after the public comment period. Mr. Smith stated that if action was not taken at this meeting, it could be taken on the meeting on September 19th by approving the draft and then the final or if no action was taken today then could take action on the final.

Ms. Ott stated that she would like to move that the draft TIP be approved but would like to challenge everyone on the committee to be active in the next few weeks in advertising the draft and public comment period. Mr. Sikes recognized the motion and asked if there was a second. Mr. Smith interjected by saying that they (CAC) had not gone over the document as

of yet. Mr. Smith stated that we can go thru the document project by project or funding source by funding source, he said that we just finished the environmental justice report and my next step was just to do a run through of the TIP project document itself. Mr. Smith noted for those in the room who were unfamiliar with the process, the two ladies near the window that this was a three county transportation study area process and there is a map on page 4(iv) it just shows the map and areas involved, the next couple of pages show the committee structure of the each committee. Mr Smith further went over and explained all projects in the draft TIP and fielded questions from the CAC.

Mr. Sikes re-recognized Ms. Ott motion to approve the draft TIP. Mr. Rodger Burnett seconded the motion. Mr. Sikes asked for any further discussion. Mr. Broadway stated that he would like to restate his previous statement and have it on record that he cannot vote for this document due to receiving the materials late. He said that the CAC's purpose is to come and vote on a document but not having had the time to look on a document that they are to approve is something that he couldn't do. The vote to approve the draft FY 2008-2011 TIP document was approved by an 8-2 decision.

Before moving to Agenda item #7 Mr. Stevens asked that it be made clear that there is still opportunity to register any objections. Mr. Smith stated that was indeed correct and because they are the CAC it will be part of the record for the TIP document itself. Mr. Townes stated that usually it's a rule that if you vote for the draft then you vote for the final so it doesn't even matter what happens because the MPO is going to do what they want anyway and that is obvious to me based upon the correspondence from you guys. Mr. Townes further stated that he could tell that it really wasn't meant for the CAC to go through the draft. Mr. Smith stated that is not the case. Mr. Townes stated anytime you pick up a package on the way to the meeting red flags go up. There is no way in the world I can sit here and vote on this document.

Mr. Sikes stated that he understood there to be a 14 day public comment period prior to the next meeting where everyone in the CAC and the public will have the opportunity to study this document and give public comments. I also understood that this information on the website and comments can be made at their leisure prior to the public comment period beginning. This is a great deal of information and it does take time to digest it all. Mr. Sikes continued to say that he understood that Mr. Smith mentioned earlier that there were

some deadlines and constraints pushed with the State DOT being able to get the information to the MPO. Mr. Smith stated that the staff was not able to take action within reasonable time frame, they were originally supposed to have a draft by late June, but due to the state being in a money crunch, they (ALDOT) had to send back \$69 million dollars to the federal government plus another 15-17 million due to the War which is causing other delays. Ms. Ott asked how long ago it was on the computer? Mr. Smith stated that nothing was due to not being able to finalize anything as a draft as the state stipulates. Mr. Sikes stated that it should be duly noted that the CAC is gaining additional frustration in the lack of timeliness in receiving information. Mr. Broadway echoed his previous comments on information timeliness and stated that there has been a motion passed previously for a minimum of two week notice and that this has happened continuously. Mr. Smith stated that other times they have come close if not met the deadline but this was the one hold up time and Mr. Broadway disputed this saying that his mail has not come any faster than a couple of days before and they (CAC) cannot do their jobs. Mr. Broadway said we are being asked to take the brunt of the process. Ms. Ott said let me ask a question. Did the other committees get it any sooner? Mr. Smith stated they get it about the same time that the CAC gets it. He reiterated that I think over the course of this year everybody has gotten everything at least, about two weeks before. Mr. Townes stated that he has never received his packet more than a few days before a meeting. Mr. Smith said well you might be the only one. Ms. Ott asked do you go to your mailbox everyday? Mr. Townes said yes, I do. Ms. Ott suggested that he talk with the postal worker. Mr. Bollie stated that if it makes anyone feel better that he just received his package the day before yesterday. Mr. Broadway stated that we don't have to approve something that we have not read, we are asked to do a job and we cannot do it if not given time to review the necessary materials. Mr. Stevens asked will the minutes reflect the frustration of the committee? Mr. Smith said yes.

Mr. Sikes then moved to Agenda item #7 – Transportation Project Status report. Mr. Bollie stated that there was not much change from the last status report from the last minutes. He highlighted a few priority projects that were previously discussed. The I65 project at the river has gotten underway and has been barricaded and is very complicated and is expected to be completed in October 2009. Along with that is the I65 bridge widening on the Alabama River which is scheduled to be completed in December of this year. They will not open the expanded lane to in an attempt prevent a bottleneck. The I85 from East Bypass and Perry Hill road widening the south bound/coming into town section to be completed in

January is moving along fairly well. The next project is Bell Street is in the process of getting environmental clearance approved it will widen both sides of the road, it is planned to be a parkway type facility with a large median in the center and two lanes on each side leading to Maxwell. The US 231 from Charles Ave to Main Street in Wetumpka which is right near the casino, right now they are working on the right of way and the environmental should be completed soon within the next 4 months. Perry Hill from Harrison to Atl. Highway is about 30% complete with the plans. Madison Ave if you look in your documents it is labeled as various streets due to construction costs it has turned into only Madison Ave. Ann St. widening and resurfacing and High St. widening Mr. Sikes asked for any questions. There were none.

Mr. Sikes moved to the General Session. Mr. Broadway and a guest both asked question. Mr. Broadway asked the status of the City of Montgomery compliance with the ADA Act for the City of Montgomery. Mr. Smith stated as far as the question that it really relates to the City's transition plan in its old form. He said that the Mayor had an advisory committee named the Mayor's Advisory Committee For Improved Accessibility (MACIA). MACIA is a committee made up of disabled persons that actually meet and discuss accessibility issues with the City. MACIA had requested a copy of the City of Montgomery transition plan dated back in the 1990 to review it to see if repairs to City of Montgomery buildings had been completed and all City of Montgomery buildings made accessible. He said that their mission was to make sue that all public city facilities accessible. The City of Montgomery had an old transition plan dating back to the mid 1990's, it was missing some information on completion dates on particular buildings that the City of Montgomery had inspected and made modifications to make them accessible. He said that the MACIA had taken on the project of reviewing all City of Montgomery buildings including all municipal facilities, and to date he thought that the MACIA is about 90% complete with their review of the buildings and this involves them personally going in and manually inspecting. He said that it looked like over 90% of the buildings that they have inspected have been corrected based on the actual transition plan itself that documented deficiencies. When MACIA finishes their review, we (transportation planning staff) will compile a report and update that transition plan to show that those items were fixed and possible document anything else that needed repair. Mr. Sikes asked in terms of a timetable when do you think that report will be ready? Mr. Smith stated that it would be next fiscal year either October or November 2007 showing what was done. Mr. Broadway stated that with all due respect the motion was to get the

state of compliance with ADA the fact that this committee is working on reviewing buildings does not address whether the City is compliant with ADA. The issue is whether the City is complaint if you are state you are if not then state you are not. The fact that this City is looking at a transition plan that was done in the late '90's and has not been updated is a problem. That is not a problem for the Mayor's committee it is a problem for the City because every year the MPO signs a document that says it complies with the ADA and the question is are we in fact complaint. In fact it is included in our handout on page 31 of the minutes and is signed by the mayor that is the reason the question was asked. Are we compliant with the law or not? Mr. Smith stated that he just gave the answer, the City of Montgomery had a transition that was not documented on some completion dates on when actual work was completed to comply with the ADA act. In good faith the City of Montgomery touched base with the MACIA, the committee itself had taken on the project to go out and look at all the buildings and to date they have just about gone through every building and found next to nothing in the way of problems. Mr. Smith said that you only have an ADA problem when you have a deficiency; if you have a deficiency then you're not in compliance with ADA. If a doorway or part of a structure is not compliant then the City has to fix in order to come into compliance and that's what has been done. Mr. Broadway asked so are you saying that you are compliant? Mr. Smith stated yes as far as the old transition plan is concerned. Mr. Broadway stated that is not what he was referencing that document. Mr. Smith stated that the old transition plan is the only thing that he was talking about for the record. The old transition plan and the Mayors disability committee has gone out to review almost every single city facility and found next to nothing in the way of deficiencies that were not noted as being completed or fixed when the plan was last done, that plan predates me. Now they have gone and review that and all buildings and found no problem how is that not in compliance? You are only not in compliance with ADA when there is a deficiency, such as proper width or height. Mr. Broadway again asked so you saying as far as I know you are in compliance? Mr. Smith stated as far as I know as it relates to the old transition plan document that the City of Montgomery is in compliance. Mr. Broadway stated that was not the question he was asking. Mr. Smith stated that he would not walk into his question with a blind eye, the old transition plan is a thick document and the Mayors committee has gone through and noted all problems and if they needed to be fixed then the City has or is working to fixing them. Mr. Townes asked when does the plan date back to? Mr. Smith stated the mid to late 1990's. Mr. Smith stated that the law states that you have to make a good faith effort to fix problems. Mr. Townes states that you have

to be in compliance with what the law says today and not what it said in 1996. Mr. Smith stated that the City is doing what the current law says in looking at the past but also looking at future things too such as sidewalks. Matter of fact, Mr. Broadway has a cohort at the incubator that went out to do his own survey work on the sidewalks that he saw were not passable and submitted that report to the City and we are currently working on fixing that to come into compliance with ADA. You don't have a problem with the ADA unless you have a deficiency when those deficiencies are noted then the City is compelled to fix them. Mr. Smith said that the City of Montgomery is about solving and fixing problems that it has and moving on, not going out waving lawsuits saying the City is not in compliance. The intermodal transfer facility has been pushed back 2 -3 years. Mr. Townes stated that it should have. Mr. Smith continued to state that because of this being pushed back we currently still have people standing on Dexter Ave. in the heat and cold when they could be in a heat and cooled facility. Are you fine with people standing on Dexter Ave. Mr. Townes asked how much did you change the plans? Mr. Smith stated not much if any. Mr. Townes stated then it should have. Mr. Townes stated that he understood there were \$900,000 dollars in change orders. Mr. Smith stated sure. Mr. Broadway stated that he did not want to open that can of worms but only asked the question of the City of Montgomery compliance with ADA. Mr. Smith stated you have received my response based on what I said.

Mr. Sikes asked for any other comments. Ms. Karla Kruger stood and asked are each of the members a representative of council districts and who was the representative for district one? Mr. Smith informed them that the CAC is comprised of 25 persons and we are currently down to 10. Ms. Karla Kruger asked where do they find who represents them. Mr. Smith stated that he would get them that information. Ms. Kruger stated that she is concerned about the Perry Hill road project and she is located 268 Perry Hill Rd across from the VA hospital and they have been coming to these meetings to see what's going on with the plans. The main issue today is that the environmental impact while understanding that is for minority and low income, but looking at the community impact assessment page I know you haven't had the chance to look at all of this but if you look at it there is a certain type of language that is the answer to the question. I think the answers to the questions on Perry Hill road are wrong, I would like to know who prepares this document where do they get the information to answer these questions is it DOT or City. Mr. Smith stated that the MPO Staff prepares that document and as far as the actual environmental document the City

contracts it out to a firm. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Bollie who is doing the environmental on the Perry Hill project. Mr. Bollie stated that Dunson and Associates was the main consultant but not sure who is handling the environmental on this project. Ms. Kruger stated that I don't think that they put correct answers in this document. A question like will the project change the communities' aesthetic characters. I believe that taking a 3 lane residential and turning it into a 5 lane highway does change the aesthetic and the answer in the document states will relieve congestion along Perry Hill road. That does not answer the question will it cause dust, odor, or shadowing affect. Yes. Will it cause increased noise and vibration? The answer is traffic will increase as area develops. We also have an issue with development because there is no area to develop, its all houses. Mr. Smith stated that there is a mix of housing and commercial uses. Harrison Road to Atlanta Highway its all houses and a couple of churches. Mr. Smith stated that there is a restaurant on the corner, then there is a CVS, the other segment has Dollar general. Ms. Kruger states that this is a different project, she is only addressing Harrison to Atl. Hwy. I have no problem with Harrison to the interstate and the interstate widening project. We have a petition from the Perry Hill Association saying that please do the I65 interchange project first then do another traffic study because we believe that all the congestion from school traffic is a result of the interstate. Speaking of school traffic, I don't know the reason for the project in the beginning but it sounds like people are frustrated by traffic. You wait in traffic everywhere so is that good enough reason to make my property value go down, make my quality of life go down to accommodate people who are impatient in traffic. I don't think that is a fair judgment. That's all I wanted to say, don't believe what is in here (referring to the Environmental Justice Document) because it's not right, what is the likely effect on property value? None, please are you going to buy a house on a five lane highway no, of course the property value will go down. So everyone just needs to be aware it's more than just the engineer's assessment.

Mr. Greta Duckett stated that she would always ask that you consider residents on a road before widening it. I live on Perry Hill road across the from the Veterans Hospital. The road is going to come in adding one more lane and 3 or 5 foot sidewalk and green space which adds up to about 12 more feet at least into yards. People have lived on this street for 40 years and now they get to come out side to a 5 lane road. We have been trying since last year to understand this process we still don't understand it and every time we call someone that state I don't know and when we ask who does they don't know that. We finally figured

out that there is a staff that handles this. Here is someone at the DOT that I have never heard before and believe me I have talked to everyone. I would like to find out who represents me and how we make our concerns known to this committee. I have a job and cannot come to every meeting but would like to get my concerns to every committee. Perhaps I need to speak with the staff. I would like to find out how to make changes to these plans, we have a petition with 92 signatures asking this be stopped from being widened but apparently it is going forward because he just said that it is at 30%. The recommendation from the DOT after the public comment period was to go forth with the overpass on I-85 and then to restudy the impact on Harrison on Perry Hill. Ms. Kruger stated that Mr. Bollie stated that the project was 30% complete when we were told time and time again that Ann St would be done first before our project. Mr. Bollie stated that the plans are at that stage and that does not mean one project is set to let before another not sure where it stands after the last shuffling of projects, when I say the plans are at 30% there is a lot more work to be completed such as utilities, right of way before actual work can be done. Ms. Duckett asked who is in charge of a project once it gets to this stage, who is in charge of this particular project? Mr. Bollie stated that the City of Montgomery is the under on this project while the DOT has the oversight on make sure the project is being done right. Ms. Duckett stated that persons she has spoken with at the City have told her that this is a state project thus giving her the run around as citizens who are very interested in this project. We are very concerned, my sister has signed up to receive notices about meetings and has not received anything. There was a public comment period that we would have loved to take part in but did not know, but we will participate in this next one now that we know about it. But this process shuts out the community, its all filmy, smoky, and can't understand what is going on. Mr. Bollie stated to clarify that the City applied for federal funds and the DOT acts on the federal governments' behalf to ensure the funds are spent within all rules. Ms. Kruger asked so is Chris Conway in charge? Because he sent us to speak with Division 6. Mr. Bollie stated that you can call Div. 6 there is only one person above me and you can call Randy Estes and he will clarify. Ms. Duckett stated that she has talked to everyone that she can and it seems like to agree with the gentlemen earlier that the MPO is going to do whatever they want to do, but we are still going to fight it although it seems like a lost cause.

Mr. Stevens asked if public hearings were held in the initial stages. Mr. Smith answered yes. Ms. Duckett stated that 90% of the public does not know what an MPO or TIP is. Ms. Kruger stated that there was an informational meeting where they presented maps of the

proposed projects that is when we had our group and they did ask for comments. So they have had it but we would not have known about it other than my boss is my public official. Mr. Smith asked when this meeting was. Ms. Duckett stated April or March. Mr. Smith stated that this was the right of way meeting. She stated yes it was and that the nomenclature is very hard for the general public to understand and excludes regular citizens. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Bollie how many people were but that preceded Mr. Bollie. Mr. Smith stated that he recalled that the numbers for the meeting were high and because of that the number of people in favor of the Perry Hill project outnumbered those not in favor of it. Ms. Duckett asked Mr. Smith whether or not he read the comments. Mr. Smith stated that he had. Ms Duckett stated that she has the comment pages and the people who wanted want to be able to get to Market street onto Perry Hill road or wanted a new driveway and I don't think that widening a road to allow people out of the neighborhoods seems a little like overkill. Ms. Kruger stated that also when they summarized the comments they said 43 for and 32 against, and a petition of 97 persons. Mr. Smith asked do all of the 97 live on Perry Hill road. Ms Kruger stated that no they did not. Ms Duckett stated that all of the comments need to be reviewed and not to excluded for those who don't live on Perry Hill. Ms. Kruger stated that some of the elderly citizens at this meeting may have been confused and checked the wrong box on the comment form. Also, if the project goes forward it would be nice to see smart growth included rather than a normal street if it goes forward. Mr. Smith stated that smart growth principles would be applied if possible. Ms Duckett stated that it does need to be accessible to bike pedestrians and walk able except without going onto Atlanta Highway.

Mr. Sikes stated that he appreciated the ladies for their comment and would like to find spots on the committee for them to serve. Ms. Duckett asked who appoints to the CAC and Mr. Smith stated that there is a nominating committee. Ms. Duckett asked who is representing all these other roads as shown in the Long Range Transportation Plan because some of the projects such as this one on Carter Hill will impact residents the same way it will our. Mr. Smith informed her that the LRTP that she had was an older draft version of the plan and that project is no longer in the plan due to the resistance that was met. Ms. Duckett stated that well then we could have gotten Perry Hill taken out of that plan. Both ladies stated that they would love to serve on the committee. Mr. Sikes stated that they would love to have more members.

Finally, there being no further business, the chairman made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:30 p.m. The motion was seconded and approved to adjourn.