

**Montgomery Area Technical Coordinating Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**September 19, 2007**

**Members**

Mr. Robert Smith (MPO Staff)  
Mr. Richie Beyer (Elmore County)  
Mr. Chris Conway (City of Montgomery)  
Mr. Kelvin Miller (MATS)  
Mr. David Bollie (ALDOT)  
Mr. Jerry Peters (City of Millbrook)  
Mr. James Kelley (Montgomery County)  
Ms. Janice Whorton (City of Wetumpka)  
Mr. George Speak (Montgomery County)  
Mr. David Bufkin (Autauga County)  
Mr. Chris Christensen for Mr. John Morris (Montgomery Association for Retarded Citizens)  
Mr. Tommy Tyson (City of Montgomery)  
Mr. Greg Clark (CARPDC)  
Mr. Sam Clifton (Town of Elmore)  
Mr. Dave Harris (FHWA)  
Dr. Emmanuel Oranika (ALDOT)

**Guests**

Mr. Kevin Boone (Elmore County)  
Ms. Barbara Hendrix (ALDOT)  
Ms. Greta Duckett (City of Montgomery)  
Mr. Stuart Peters (Landmark Engineering)

**MPO Staff**

Mr. James Askew  
Ms. April Delchamps  
Mr. Kindell Anderson

---

At the specially scheduled meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) on September 19, 2007 at 10 a.m. at the Alabama Department of Transportation, 1409 Coliseum Blvd, Conference Room Number 7, Montgomery, AL, the aforementioned members were present.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Robert Smith. Mr. Smith announced that a quorum was present. The meeting was called to order at 10:12 a.m. He asked for an introduction of guests, He introduced Mr. Cornell Tatum, the Title VI coordinator for ALDOT. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the August 28, 2007 meeting and the minutes were adopted. Mr. Richie Beyer stated his belief that we should condense the meeting minutes a little bit. Some of the statements from the meeting are incomplete sentences and other grammatical issues. I know it is hard recording the minutes from tapes and from notes. Instead of trying to get the minutes word for word, maybe we should condense them to make them easier to review. Mr. Smith responded that we have been considering summarizing the minutes. Mr. Beyer said I do not remember them being that detailed, word for word. It is tough to go back and read through the minutes. Mr. Smith said we will take that comment seriously. We have thought of condensing it down without getting into all the details of what everybody says and starting with this fiscal year we will start summarizing the minutes. Getting that approved by the Citizen's Committee is the hard part, but maybe we can go ahead and do the MPO and TCC.

Mr. Smith moved on to agenda item number 5, the proposed FY 2008 – 2011 Transportation Improvement Program, Public Involvement Summary and Environmental Justice Report documents. Mr. Smith said we will start with the public involvement summary. Everybody has received the final public involvement summary. The public comment period closed out on Monday, September 17, 2007 at 5 p.m. We had a total of 39 comments received. The majority of them are opposing the Perry Hill Road widening from Harrison Road to Atlanta Highway. Mr. Smith asked if anybody had any comments. Ms. Greta Duckett requested to address the committee. My name is Greta Duckett, and I am one of the residents on Perry Hill Road. Mr. Smith asked if she lived on Perry Hill Road. Ms. Duckett replied my house is situated directly on Perry Hill Road. Mr. Smith asked what is your address? Ms. Duckett replied my address is 3821 Robbins Road. It is at the corner of Perry Hill Road and Robbins Road, directly in front of the Veterans Administration Hospital at the light. I am here today on behalf of 24 of the residents of this portion of the road that this project covers, that we are opposing, from the 200 block through to the 900 block including the 800 block, not the 900 block. The public involvement summary that was mailed had 14, but the summary handed out today had 39 comments. I would urge you to read those comments. The citizens of this road are opposed to this project, and we request that you recommend removing this project from the TIP. Mr. Smith

said thank you. The Environmental Justice Report had no big changes. As for the TIP document, there were a couple of items changed at ALDOT's and FHWA's recommendations. The first one is the list of Authorized projects. There were two state projects that were not federally funded that were removed at ALDOT and FHWA's recommendation. The list of authorized projects now only reflects federally funded projects. Another change involved slight changes in the financial plan in several funding categories. There was one change made at the MPO meeting. There was a \$100,000 increase in the Elmore County project, resurfacing County Road 23 from Cobbs Ford Road to State Route 143. The project is on page 26 in the TIP. We were unable to get it corrected in the document. A corrected project location and TIP page was distributed, and it will be corrected in the final document. The mileage should have been 2.2 miles, and the project limits should have started at Cobbs Ford Road and ended at State Route 143. We are still financially constrained. Mr. David Bollie asked is that the project that we looked at the other day? Mr. Richie Beyer said the MPO board voted to put the city portion in the TIP. Mr. Bollie said okay, I was just making sure, so we need to go out and do another scope. Mr. Smith said also there were two corridor studies that received comments from FHWA. FHWA determined both corridor studies needed to be removed because they were not in the Long Range Transportation Plan. One of them actually was located in the Long Range on the financially constrained list. We left that one in the TIP, but we removed the Redland Road project. Those are the last changes that we made. Mr. Richie Beyer said on page 23, I think the sponsor is wrong. It shows us being the sponsor, and I think that is a City of Prattville project. I am not sure if that will affect the summary sheet that you gave us. The project is all in Autauga County. Mr. Smith responded that it will be fixed. Are there any other changes? Mr. Dave Harris said I just have one comment. I think you have an old certification on page 131. Jim Doolin prepared a new one based on SAFETEA-LU. There are about 10 things now, and this only has about 5. Mr. Smith said I will go back and recheck it. I believe this is the one he sent me by e-mail. If it is wrong, I will get it changed. Mr. Harris said if not, I can get you a listing of the certification. Mr. Jerry Peters said I am probably in the extreme minority in this room, but I am interested in transit and enhancement projects. We spend a lot of time reviewing road projects. I would like to suggest that when we do a massive update, we spend some time with the transit projects and all these other projects that get thrown in the TIP at the last minute. The MPO has the authority to kill any of these projects. Mr. Smith said on page xii of the TIP, the explanation of Level of Effort, it is explained that no action is required on these types of projects

unless the MPO opposes the project, otherwise they are automatically approved. Mr. Peters said the MPO still gets a chance? Is that right Mr. Harris? Mr. Harris said the MPO board approves them, but this streamlines the process and allows the MPO to take no action. They only take action if they do not want the project. Mr. Smith said we still get the letters. Mr. Harris said the MPO has to endorse the project. Mr. Peters said this committee should do a better job. We are supposed to look at all modes of transportation. I think it would behoove this committee to be aware of these things especially the transit projects, even though the system currently only serves the City of Montgomery. Mr. Smith said Autauga County has transit as well. The only county that does not have transit is Elmore County. Mr. Peters said it seems that the transit and enhancement projects come to this committee and without even talking about them, we vote for them. Mr. Smith said we will take that under consideration. We do have a congestion management system plan update that we are just now getting started, and transit will be a part of it. That may be the more appropriate time to address what some of the transit needs might be for the entire area.

Mr. Richie Beyer said I have a question, I guess directed towards Chris (Conway). Since we have somebody here about Perry Hill Road and have received comments, could you address some of these concerns before we adopt this TIP. A lot of the comments pertain to the proximity of the road and the houses, the affect on property values, and the affect on safety. Have ways to address these issues been included in your project? Mr. Chris Conway said right now we are in the process of doing the environmental assessment for the project. The PE is authorized. We are in the preliminary design phase and environmental assessment. All of these comments will be addressed in this phase. Ms. Duckett asked if the environmental assessment is just for how the project affects minorities and low income population. Mr. Smith said no that is the Environmental Justice. The environmental assessment is a separate document with a lot more detail than the environmental justice. Ms. Duckett asked how is that different from the community impact assessment? Mr. Smith said it is a lot more detailed. The environmental engineer, I believe Bearrentine Environmental Services, will determine the actual impacts, if any. Mr. Conway said I do not know who the NEPA expert is in the room, Dave maybe you are since Federal Highway is the overseer of the EA. The EA process is where you look at all cultural, social and economic impacts of the project that you are doing. It encompasses everything from historical resources to archeological resources to wetlands to endangered species to noise/air and

everything else that would be an impact of a road project. All those environmental concerns are addressed. The decision is made of what those impacts are or there is a finding of no significant impact. Mr. Harris said one part of the analysis is right-of-way and what are the adjacent land uses. How close are buildings to the proposed improvement? Whether land will need to be acquired or mitigated? Mr. Richie Beyer asked that is all project specific, not this environmental justice document that we are talking about? I think she is getting them confused. Ms. Duckett said is the community assessment complete? I believe it is part of this document. I would urge all the members to please look at the one specific to the Perry Hill Road project. Also, see the recent comments on page 13 that address the community impact statement. It addresses some of the questions in the assessments and the answers or lack of answers. Mr. Conway said I have its on page 7 and 9. Ms. Duckett said it is in the September 17 updated summary. It is a total of 32 pages, and it was distributed this morning. Since you were provided it this morning, I would urge you to please review it before you vote to get a better understanding. Mr. Conway asked is the page 13 you are referring to the same as on page 7 and 8. Ms. Duckett said I do not know. I have not read it all. I just know there was an updated one e-mailed. Ms. April Delchamps said page 7 and page 13 are the same. A couple of the comments that came were actually the same sheet and various people signed there name for their comments. We did have that one in the original summary. Ms. Duckett said I think that one was e-mailed. Ms. Delchamps said I am not positive on that ma'am; I do not have the originals with me. Mr. Richie Beyer asked when they go through the environmental assessment, they still have to go back out and do public involvement, do they not? Mr. Harris said yes, there is another set of requirements with the environmental process. Mr. Conway said there is a public involvement meeting in conjunction with the Environmental Assessment. Once the Environmental Assessment is signed by FHWA, then you usually go to a corridor hearing to present the document so that you can receive comments. Mr. Smith said the Perry Hill Road specific public hearing based on the summary that that he saw had a total of 73 comments. I think 43 for and 28 or 29 against. Ms. Duckett said also a petition with 92 signatures opposing was also included depending on how you interpret it. Mr. Smith said a signature is not a comment. I believe that is how it was interpreted. Mr. Conway said the comments referred to supporting other projects even the project on Perry Hill Road from I-85 to Harrison. The comments touch on the order in which the projects should be addressed and that is exactly what the City of Montgomery is planning. They want to address these projects in the order that the citizens suggested. I do not think there is anything that we

have seen that is inconsistent with what the City of Montgomery plans. This is a planning body and as we move forward, there are areas of our city that have a congestion problem. We need to plan to address the congestion and that is what I feel like we are doing. Ms. Duckett said I would respectfully disagree with that comment, the city is going to interpret the comments how they wish. The spirit as they are intended by the citizens may be different from the city interpretation. I would say you interpret them how you read them, not how the City of Montgomery reads them. Mr. Smith asked if there were any further comments or discussion. A motion was made and seconded to approve the FY 2008 – 2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), public involvement summary, and Environmental Justice Report documents and they were unanimously adopted.

Mr. Smith moved to agenda item number six, the Transportation Projects Status Report. Mr. Bollie said as soon as we get new plans on Madison Avenue, we are going to do a 30% review in October. On Perry Hill Road from I-85 to Harrison, we are going to do a 30% review in October. We are resurfacing Fort Toulouse Road now. We are about to start resurfacing Coosada Parkway in Elmore County.

Mr. Smith moved on to agenda item seven, the General Session. Mr. Beyer said I know we have talked about this at the board meeting and I talked a little bit with Jim Doolin and Dave Harris. The project that was pulled out of the TIP for us takes an update of the Long Range Plan. I know that is a bunch of work, but I would like to see us make a recommendation to the MPO that an update be done for the Long Range Plan and maybe we can put a time frame on it. As you mentioned, there are a couple of other projects that other municipalities wanted added to the LRTP. I think Montgomery County had one and Millbrook is working on one. Mr. Smith stated I said Montgomery County, but I believe it is an ALDOT and city project. Mr. Beyer said I will make a motion that we update the Long Range Transportation Plan and accept project requests until maybe November 15, 2007. Mr. Smith asked do you mean amend? Mr. Beyer said whichever one Dave Harris determines. I will make that motion. Mr. Peters seconded. Mr. Smith said we have a motion on the table to amend the 2030 LRTP to add a couple of projects and it has been properly seconded, any discussion. Motion was unanimously adopted.

All in favor of adjournment please rise. The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.