

Technical Coordinating Committee
Meeting Minutes

April 17, 2007

Members

Mr. Ken Groves, Chairman
Mr. Robert Smith (MPO Staff)
Mr. Richie Beyer (Elmore County)
Mr. Bubba Bowden (City of Montgomery)
Mr. David Bufkin (Autauga County)
Mr. Kindell Anderson (CARPDC)
Mr. Chris Christensen (MARC)
Mr. Joel Duke (City of Prattville)
Mr. Patrick Dunson (City of Montgomery)
Mr. Dave Harris (FWHA)
Mr. James Kelley (Montgomery County)
Mr. Stuart Manson (City of Montgomery)
Mr. Kelvin Miller (MATS)
Dr. Emmanuel Oranika (ALDOT)
Mr. Jerry Peters (City of Millbrook)
Mr. Tommy Tyson (City of Montgomery)
Ms. Janice Whorton (City of Wetumpka)
Ms. Carol Hall (ALDOT)

Guests

Mr. Kevin Boone (Elmore County)
Ms. Barbara Hendricks (ALDOT)
Mr. Trent Deason (ALDOT)

MPO Staff

Mr. James Askew (MPO Staff)
Ms. Diana Drummond (MPO Staff)
Ms. Allison Settles (MPO Staff)

At the regularly scheduled meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) on April 17, 2007 at 10:12 a.m. at ALDOT Conference Room 7, 1409 Coliseum Blvd., Montgomery, Alabama, the aforementioned members were present.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Ken Groves, Chairman. He apologized for having to meet in a different place and said we would try to meet in a friendlier location for the next meeting. The Chairman announced that a quorum was present. He also asked each person to introduce themselves. Mr. Groves said he wanted to correct something that was written in the newspaper. It said staff of the MPO is shared with the city. They are not. They're entirely separate and funded entirely with Transportation Planning funds. He then asked Dave Harris (FHWA) if he wanted to correct anything written. Mr. Harris said if anyone saw the newspaper article a couple of weeks ago where maybe Mayor Byard suggested rotating the Chairmanship. I don't know who wrote that and I didn't see the byline, but I think there are some other inaccuracies in that article. One statement was that by virtue of his office, Mayor Bright is Chairman. Really, the planning agreement just says the MPO elects a chairman and a vice-chairman and things like that. To me that is something that would be, you know, if the MPO members wanted to bring that up, that's a valid topic for the MPO meeting. So, I think that's probably the only other thing I would say. Mr. Groves said that particular reporter is not known for getting things straight. Mr. Harris added that anytime he's been quoted, it's usually been the opposite of what he said.

Mr. Groves moved to agenda item four (4) and the approval of the minutes from the last meeting and if anyone had any objection to the way they stand. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the February 13, 2007 meeting and the minutes were approved.

Mr. Groves moved to agenda item five (5) and asked Mr. Robert Smith to explain the proposed amendments to the TIP. Mr. Robert Smith, of the MPO staff, asked if everyone had the correct document: Fiscal Years 2006-2008 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Projects (Meeting # 4 in FY-2007). The first project is on page number one. He said that this was an Elmore County Commission project (EC-12-AM). It is an old project. It is for the widening, leveling, and resurfacing of Fort Toulouse Rd. Mr. Smith asked the Elmore County engineer to explain the project changes. Mr. Richie Beyer explained that the P.E. funds of \$20,000 would be combined with those for construction (CN). Then there's a \$34,500 cost increase for this project. Mr. Smith said the cost increase is due to the office engineer's most recent current estimate. Mr. Harris asked if when we amended this the first time, Richie (Beyer), didn't it say it was to have a

bike trail or something as well. Yes, it does, and the widening will accommodate the bike trail, said Mr. Beyer. Mr. Smith added that it won't be a striped facility but will be wide enough roadway to accommodate it. Mr. Beyer said it will have a symbol, and be a stripped to say bike lane.

Mr. Smith went to page number 2. This is a State of Alabama (ST-1-AM) and it is to widen to a four lane, median divided parkway facility on Bell St (CR-235) from Washington Ferry Rd. to the CSXT Railroad Bridge. This is for utility relocation on .6 miles. The total cost is \$500,000 and is sponsored by the State of Alabama. This project is in relation to Maxwell Air Force Base corridor project and improvements.

Page number 3 is another state project which is for PE and CN for the widening of SR-110 from CR-137 (Vaughn Rd.) to Bridlebrook Blvd. The total estimated cost is \$2,860,000 and it is a State of Alabama project to widen and resurface. Mr. Harris commented that he had a couple of questions. One is on the project description of "widen to five lanes." I guess, to me, it would be a widen to four lanes at the PE phase and then determine what the appropriate treatment is. Is it a five lane or is it a divided or what. I mean, I think you kind of lock yourself in when you say five lanes. Mr. Groves commented that there is no extension of the existing configuration. No, there's no five there now, not stopping at Chantilly, replied Mr. Harris. Its two lanes there. You have to go another two-three miles to get to it. It stops right past Deer Creek. If you go east of where you're talking about at Chantilly, it widens out to the Lockshire area along in there, stated Mr. Bowden. There are some four and five lanes already existing there. Well, that's what the proposal is for five lanes, said Mr. Smith. Mr. Harris said, yeah, well, all I'm saying is I think you lock yourself in when you say five lanes, Mr. Smith said, well the States description said "additional lanes." I put in five lanes because I knew that's what it eventually would be. I mean, we can just strike this and say "additional lanes." Mr. Harris said he would say it is also an appropriate time to consider, just like on the other projects, sidewalks or bike lanes or anything like that for this project. Getting ready to widen is the time to consider. Yeah, that's federal law, for sure, replied Mr. Smith. But this would be up to the State. Mr. Jerry Peters asked how many lanes are in the long range transportation plan and said that that's what you should be going by. Five, replied Mr. Smith. So, do we also need to put in a recommendation to the state to consider

bicycle lanes just to be sure they are doing it for this project? Mr. Bowden said you would leave it up to the State, I would think. Mr. Harris said well, if you leave it up to the State I think the MPO is in a perfect position to say the towns growing this way. I'm saying if that is something the MPO would want to recommend then that's a valid recommendation.

Mr. Smith moved to page number 4. This is a City of Montgomery project and is for the city's ITS Acquisition and Implementation (TR-9-AM). This is for year FY-07 and FY-08 with FTA section 5309 earmarks from Congress. It has a total cost of \$2,483,750. The existing project for FY-06 is pretty much under construction and now under design for the infrastructure of the ITS project. Mr. Bowden was asked if he wanted to elaborate on the subject. He commented that the FY-06 project was underway and it's going to take about eighteen to twenty four months to complete. The total project cost for the first three phases, though, is around two million dollars. And then the FY-08 is fully implementing the other items such as, dynamic message signs, cameras, signal controllers and whatever else is needed complete the ITS project.

Page number 5, Mr. Smith announced, is a Montgomery Regional Airport project (TR-10-AM). It is for the construction of the airport intermodal facility using FTA 5309 funds and is for FY-07 and FY-08 funding allocations. The airport authority has not applied for their FY-06 allocation but they've been in conversation with us (MPO Staff) and potentially want to go ahead and take advantage of the funding. The Senator put out about a 4 million dollar allocation with about one million going to the airport each year towards the project. This is a much needed project for the airport as they grow and expand and parking becomes more and more of a problem.

Page number 6 is a City of Montgomery project and is for the installation of overhead street signs at major intersections mostly in the downtown. The city has requested that this project be deleted because it has been completed by the city's traffic engineering department. Mr. Bowden commented that they are going to use the funds from this to do the camera installations. Mr. Smith continued by saying as we get to that project we'll explain it but this one is to be deleted because it has been completed.

Page number 7 is the same sort of situation to install overhead street signs at major intersections. It is another City of Montgomery project. The city requested to delete this project also. Mr. Harris asked if this one hadn't been completed. Mr. Bowden replied no, that they were just deleting it to put in the cameras and use the money in a more usable fashion.

Mr. Smith moved on to page number 8. The money from the two previous projects on pages 6 and 7 will go to fund this one. This is a brand new project for PE and CN to purchase and install traffic cameras or CCTV cameras at various intersections in the City of Montgomery and I don't think the intersections have been determined yet. Mr. Bowden commented that they have done the preliminary scope of where they want to put them. It is various intersections and most of them are around the bypass and some of the interchanges along the interstate system. We've kind of made the decision that it will go to contract and we'll come up with a design and all that. Mr. Duke asked if this was a new project. Mr. Smith said that it is a new project using old money from the two previous projects on pages 6 and 7. Plus some additional funds, asked Mr. Duke. No, no additional funds, came the reply. No additional for PE asked Mr. Beyers. You've got \$190,000 once the projects deleted. It looks like you've got \$20,000 for PE. I'm sorry; yes that is correct, said Mr. Smith. Mr. Bowden said it should be the same amount of money that we're getting. Mr. Smith corrected his statement and said yes, ALDOT required the PE be set up for this project and the extra funds for this project was going to be the \$16,000 for the P.E., mostly for the Sixth Division to review plans and other items related to the project.

Page 9 is a City of Montgomery project. The City has requested that the PE description be expanded to include the section of roadway from I-85 on/off-ramps to Harrison Rd. The new description would be to widen Perry Hill Rd. to 5 lanes and resurface from the I-85 on/off-ramps to Atlanta Highway. The cost increase is proposed to go from \$500,000 total dollars to \$625,000 total dollars. This is just for PE. A request has been sent to Dave's office at FHWA. I don't know what the latest is on that because there was a separate PE already authorized for Perry Hill Rd. from I-85 to Harrison Rd. and the City wanted to expand the scope of that. Mr. Smith asked Patrick Dunson if he would elaborate on that. Mr. Dunson said that the City of Montgomery had engaged Johnson & Associates to do the section from Atlanta Hwy. to Harrison Rd. It really only made sense just to make it one long, congruent project and handle it all at one time rather

than splitting it up in phases. Mr. Duke asked if they were recaptured funds or were they taken from the STP fund pot. They're recaptured funds, said Mr. Smith. Mr. Duke rephrased the question and asked if you're giving up an existing project to create these additional funds or is this taking from STP funds. Mr. Smith replied that it was taking what's remaining in the PE from the Perry Hill Rd., Harrison Rd to I-85 on/off-ramps; that particular PE project and the PE for Harrison Rd to Atlanta Hwy. So, the PE project was already \$625,000, asked Mr. Duke. Mr. Dunson said the original dollar amount set up was higher but it came in lower. It gets a little bit confusing. I got confused by that a little bit, too, said Mr. Smith. Mr. Harris said he would just make the same comment on that one. On the five lanes, I know the City has access management efforts on other facilities. On the five lanes you're basically saying there is no access management; no access management and safety is irrelevant. I mean to continue to build five lanes. I think you need to look at, of course this is probably going to be pretty constrained. You know, you probably can't do it but you need to at least look and have that as a decision that right-of-way is a constraint to any other alternative. Mr. Smith replied that he thinks that is what Johnson has been doing. Mr. Dunson commented that at the last public involvement meeting and on the report from Perry Hill Road- from Atlanta Hwy. to Harrison Rd. they looked at a lot of alternatives and it just came back that the most cost effective measure was to widen to five lanes and take a couple of feet of peoples yards and businesses to get the project done.

I think going this route we won't have to buy anybody's house Mr. Smith stated. Taking the five lane option and giving them the minimum amount of right-of-way to do the project. That's just the bottom line. Will construction be divided into separate phases, though, or will it all be in one project, asked Mr. Bowden. It will be one project, came the answer.

Page number 10 is another City of Montgomery project (M-14-AM), Mr. Smith stated. It is to widen, resurface, realign and improve Ann St. from Highland Av. to Federal Dr. The City is requesting the increase for the PE due to the underestimated complexity of the PE for the project. It is proposed to go from \$100,000 to \$332,813 total dollars. The increase in federal is \$186,250 with the local matching increase of \$36,563. PE work has been authorized by ALDOT. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Dunson if he had anything he needed to add on that one. There were no further

remarks on this project. Ok, that's it on the amendments to the FY 06-FY 08 TIP. Even after all that we are still in balance. We are still financially constrained based on the constraint table.

Mr. Groves announced that all of these could be voted on in one motion unless someone desired to consider one separately. A motion was made and seconded. Mr. Groves said considering these as recommendations to the MPO, altogether. The vote was taken and they passed unanimously.

Mr. Groves moved on to agenda item number six (6) and asked Mr. Robert Smith to explain. Item number 6 is the FY 2008-2011 TIP Kick-Off. Mr. Smith said a lot of people have been asking when we would get the next TIP started. Now is the time for us to begin developing the new TIP for fiscal years 2008 through 2011. This will be a four year document as in past years it has been three years. Of course, based on the new SAFETEA-LU requirements, it is required to be a four year document and also carries the same requirements of being financially constrained. I think everyone in here has seen a TIP and it will be the same typical type document. It'll have programs and projects. It'll have everything from local projects that the MPO gets to control that we manage through the constraint table. It'll also include State projects and other modes such as enhancement and bicycle and pedestrian, safety and other categories as they come out. Mr. Smith thought about reading the document due to its importance. However, Mr. Groves said it was pretty clear what was contained in the document and added that everybody knows there will not be enough money to do everything you want. We'll probably take a look at some of the projects that we've been carrying for a long time and re-assess those things. Get your projects in as quickly as possible so we'll not be struggling at the last minute to try to find out if we will be within cost constraint or not. Let's just be smart this time and when you think of your projects think of how you can leverage some money out of ALDOT; State funds, for example and that sort of thing. Look for partnerships on projects and that'll help. We're running out of money. You know, the highway trust fund is going to be in serious trouble, when is it Dave, next year? Mr. Harris replied that it would be in 2009. Unless Congress does something to get some more resources we'll all be struggling. So, think cooperatively, think comprehensively, and think about what you absolutely have to get done versus all of the things that we might otherwise wish we could take on would be the approach I would recommend.

Mr. Groves said that there is a big Statewide conference on the future of transportation in the State of Alabama. The Governor is interested in changing the approach we take to do planning the major highway projects in the State. He wants to consider land use implications along with the transportation facility improvements. That'll be an interesting conference. We've got people coming in from all over the State and key decision makers and political people are involved in this. You know, the road builders are sponsoring it, the Chamber of Commerce Association all over the State and its gotten lots of support form all of the people who can make or break a project in the State. I mean, these are the folks that make phone calls in the middle of the night that get deals done or get deals killed. It'll be interesting to see if we step out as a State and try to become a little more progressive in our approach to planning for transportation projects. With all of that in mind, think about what you need locally and get them into Robert and the staff as quickly as you can. Is that enough on that, asked Mr. Groves. Mr. Smith said he thought that was plenty. Mr. Smith referred to the TIP Project Development Form and said this is the form you fill out and send in. If you have a new project that you want or make changes to an existing project just fill this form out. Get it to me, at least, I would say, two weeks before the next meeting. We don't meet again till June 19. Someone suggested that a date be set and not just say "two weeks before the next meeting." Mr. Smith said he would send an e-mail to everyone with the due date. He added that the document itself doesn't have to be adopted until September 30 and is to take effect October 1, but Federal Highway and ALDOT like to review it and have a nice period of time to review the document and make sure it's in step with all the requirements that we have to meet. We have to go through a 14-day public involvement period where we solicit comments, hold public meetings, maybe have one per county, at least. Mr. Duke suggested that a motion be made that we agree to set the deadline for June 1, 2007. The next meeting is June 19 so that gives everybody about one and a half months to get them into you. Mr. Smith asked for a motion. A motion was made, seconded and passed to make June 1, 2007 the deadline to submit Proposed TIP projects.

Mr. Smith moved on to agenda item number seven (7). This is to consider proposed amendment projects to the Montgomery Study Area Bicycle and Pedestrian. It's due for an update sometime next year. I was called to a meeting with some people in a local bicycle club and I took a project proposal to them to possibly construct a combination, we'll just call it a bicycle, route with lanes

and signs and all that is associated with that. Project number one would be a potential bicycle facility to take you from midtown to downtown and back. It's got a location map on where it would actually go to and from. We start out on Fieldcrest Dr. at Perry Hill Rd. and Vaughn Rd... It would basically make its way to McGehee Rd., Woodley Rd. to Glen Grattan, to Cloverdale, to Felder. Then it will take Perry St. all the way in to Columbus St. and Tallapoosa St. and will eventually wind its way back out all the way to Felder. This is to just to get it on the books and in the plan, it's not to get it funded or anything like that at this time. We would have to set up a Preliminary Engineering (PE) and potentially get this project into the TIP as one that we would potentially like to undertake. This would be a brand new thing. Next to what they are doing on Fort Toulouse Rd., we don't have any existing bicycle lanes or facilities or anything like that in the whole three counties. We figure it was probably about time we started doing that, Mr. Smith concluded. Mr. Groves asked if anybody was against bicycle facilities. There was no response. He then asked for a vote to amend the bicycle plan to include these two projects. The plan amendments passed unanimously.

Mr. Smith moved to agenda item number eight (8): Internet Travel Survey. During some technical difficulty, Mr. Groves said we can go ahead and do our General Session now while we're waiting for our password if anybody has something. Mr. Richie Beyer said the different counties that were involved in the Northern Outer Loop study have already gotten copies but I wanted to give Robert (Smith) a copy of the Northern Outer Loop study in Digital copy. You all have been very kind to put that information on the internet for people to look at. That document's out with a cost estimate in there and preliminary cost estimate I think has been studied. The ALDOT gave their approval of it and FHWA has a copy of it. What's the cost estimate, asked Mr. Smith. 1.1 billion was the answer. Mr. Groves asked if that was 1.1 billion with a "B", as in Baker. Depending on which corridor you take. What are the chances of \$1.1 billion being available, Dave, asked Mr. Groves. Mr. Harris replied that, as he had said, given that the trust fund in 2009 starts to pay out more than it takes in, something's going to happen. And just on a shorter time basis, ALDOT's got until next week to cut \$60 million from the program. Congress keeps doing these corrections like; oops we're paying out too much. So there most recent one is "due next week, ALDOT has to cut \$60 million. It's going to hurt somebody, replied Mr. Groves. Yes, having to send back 69 million, Mr. Smith commented. Mr. Harris said

he thinks it is 60 million; 60 or 70, it doesn't matter, I mean, that's 10% of the program in a year or something. So, I would think, everyone is going to be equally hurt would probably be a safe way to think about it in metropolitan and rural areas.

Mr. Duke said that brings up a question. In your memorandum you've got FY-09 there's a significant jump goes to 5.9 million and your 2010 goes to 9.9 million. Is there some basis for those estimates? I'm sure there is. Mr. Smith said that is what the system shows. ALDOT keeps the accurate account and that's what the Comprehensive Project Management System (CPMS) shows as available balances based on the amendments we made today through 2011. There were no other comments in the General Session.

Mr. Smith asked how many people had done the internet travel survey and whether they had any problems. There was no reply. Mr. Groves recommended that everyone do it. It's good, useful information. It is a Statewide effort, Mr. Smith added.

Mr. Smith commented on the Internet Travel Survey (agenda item 8) again and said he just wanted to demonstrate how to do it for those who have not done it. The State is paying Dr. Michael Anderson, a transportation engineer and professor at the University of Alabama at Huntsville (UAH) to do a statewide internet travel survey. He has set one of these up for all of the MPO areas in the State basically, to get what the typical travel habits are for MPO areas in order to change the outdated model parameters, so that we get a more accurate count in trip generation and traffic assignment. Mr. Smith asked Dr. Oranika how the information that we're running off of was. About twelve years old, was the answer. Mr. Smith proceeded to demonstrate the Travel Survey and steps needed to complete it. The survey is located on the MPO website at www.montgomerympo.org

Mr. Smith stated that if everyone would pass this on to everyone in his/her offices so that the survey recorder could get as many hits as possible. Mr. Smith said that the minimum number Dr. Anderson would like to see is 300-400; the more the better. Is that the only way to get the word out is through asking people to get online and do it, someone asked. Mr. Smith replied, we planned to go through the MPO, TCC and CAC members, doing media announcements and

whatever else that is suggested to get the word out about the survey. Mr. Smith said that Dr. Anderson had a media person that was supposed to contact him to coordinate a media effort so; we'll more than likely hear about it. Mr. Groves told everyone just to go ahead and do it 200-300 times. Robert said he has a list of employers in all three counties that he plans to send the survey information to and have them require their employees to fill out the travel survey. He said that this will give us much more accurate counts on what these travel patterns are so we can update the model and have a more accurate tool to predict future travel demand. That's it, any questions?

There were no further comments and Mr. Groves adjourned the meeting at 11:35 a.m.