



*Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham • 1731 First Avenue North Suite 200 • Birmingham, Al 35203  
Phone (205) 251-8139 • Fax (205) 328-3304 • [www.rpcgb.org](http://www.rpcgb.org) • [www.bhammpo.org](http://www.bhammpo.org)*

August 25, 2010

## **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Transportation Technical Committee

**FROM:** Mr. David Hunke, Chairman /s/

**SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes  
August 25, 2010**

A meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) was held on Wednesday, August 25, 2010, 10:00 a.m., RPC 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room, 1731 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203.

## **MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mr. David Hunke, Chairman, At-Large  
Mr. Greg Dawkins, Vice-Chairman, City of Birmingham Traffic Engineer  
Mr. Wallace McCord, At-Large  
Mr. Lance Taylor, ALDOT Preconstruction Engineer – Birmingham  
Mr. Chris Reeves, At-Large  
Mr. Randy Kemp, City of Birmingham  
Ms. Rhonda Siserir, BJCTA Representative  
Mr. Eric Womack, Shelby County Development Services Representative  
Mr. Fred Hawkins, EDT  
Mr. Matthew Cobb, City of Homewood Engineer  
Mr. Scott Cothron, Sain Associates  
Mr. Chris Hatcher, Operation New Birmingham  
Ms. Mary Margaret Nicholson, At-Large  
Mr. Richard Caudle, At-Large  
Mr. Rod Long, City of Hoover Engineer  
Mr. John Tally, CLASTRAN Transportation Mobility Manager  
Mr. Doug Hale, Bicycle / Pedestrian Representative  
Mr. Richard Darden, At-Large  
Ms. Virginia Williams, At-Large  
Ms. Sheila Chaffin, UAB Exec. Dir. Campus Planning and Facilities Programming

Ms. Denise Hornbuckle, Traffic Safety Representative  
Mr. John Stewart, At-Large  
Mr. Scott Holladay, Shelby County Highway Department Representative  
Mr. Robert Portera, At-Large

**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY PROXY**

Mr. Tom Magee, City of Birmingham Chief Planner  
    Represented by Ms. Pamela Jones  
Mr. Fenn Church, Trucking Representative  
    Represented by Mr. John Tally  
Ms. Kim Fort, UAB Parking Services Dir. of Auxiliary Services  
    Represented by Ms. Sheila Chaffin  
Mr. Jason Howanitz, Jeff. County Dept. of Health Chief Meteorologist - Air Division  
    Represented by Mr. Matt Lacke  
Mr. Charles Malone, ALDOT Maintenance Representative-Birmingham  
    Represented by Mr. Lionel Harbin

**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT**

Ms. Alfredo Acoff, ALDOT Environmental Coordinator – Montgomery  
Mr. Phillip Garratt, P.E., At-Large  
Mr. Andrew Sullivan, At-Large  
Mr. Al Folcher, At-Large  
Mr. Ron Clement, Railroad Representative  
Mr. Ken Boozer, Jefferson County Dept. of Roads and Transportation Representative  
Dr. Emmanuel Oranika, ALDOT Metropolitan Planning Engineer - Montgomery  
Mr. Ron Gore, ADEM (Non-Voting Member)  
Ms. Holly Peterson, FTA (Non-Voting Member)  
Mr. Dave Harris, FHWA (Non-Voting Member)  
Ms. Nan Baldwin, Birmingham Business Alliance (Non-Voting Member)

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Mr. Bill Foisy, RPC  
Ms. Cynthia Barton, RPC  
Mr. Darrell Howard, RPC  
Mr. Mike Kaczorowski, RPC  
Ms. Ariana Blackwell, RPC  
Mr. Randy Sain, Sain Associates

Chairman David Hunke called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. The meeting proceeded with the scheduled agenda items.

### **INTRODUCTORY ITEMS**

Attendees introduced themselves. With no additions or corrections, the July 28, 2010 minutes were approved as written.

Mr. Bill Foisy presented a report on MPO actions. The MPO approved the TIP and 2010 UPWP modifications recommended by the TCC. The MPO also received a report on the CommuteSmart Rideshare Annual Report and the U.S. 280 Transit Study.

### **TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Mr. Mike Kaczorowski presented a request from ALDOT to modify the 2008-2011 TIP to include the following project:

#### **ALDOT Requests**

BR-10650	100055322	Bridge widening on I-65 over CSX RR & Buxahatchee Creek, South of Exit 228 (Calera Exit)	9/8/2010	PE	6/1/2011	2011	\$674,172	Exempt	Bridge Projects	6
----------	-----------	--	----------	----	----------	------	-----------	--------	-----------------	---

**This project will not add capacity and is exempt from regional emission analysis under 40 CFR 93.126. Table 2.**

Ms. Virginia Williams requested that the Committee be provided information on the prioritization process used by the ALDOT for programming funding for bridges on the state highway system.

Mr. Scott Holladay made a motion to recommend approval of the TIP modification. Mr. Fred Hawkins seconded the motion that passed on a voice vote.

### **UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Mr. Bill Foisy presented the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program for review and adoption. A detailed list of program areas and projects to be conducted in FY 2011 by the RPC and the ALDOT, including third-party contractors was included in the packet.

Mr. Foisy reviewed the seven task areas consistent with the RPC Work Program goals, including:

1. Administration.
2. Data Collection and Analysis.
3. Unified Planning Work Program.
4. Public Involvement.
5. Environmental Mitigation and Streamlining.
6. Transportation Systems.

#### 7. Special Projects and Corridor Management Planning.

The federal funding source for each task area and project was also identified. Total federal funds available for each source are as follows:

1. FHWA PL = \$1,075,273
2. FHWA STP = \$1,593,267
3. FTA 5309 = \$2,332,751
4. FTA 5310, 5316/5317 = \$145,000
5. FHWA CMAQ = \$1,325,000

The MPO is responsible for adoption of the proposed work program including funding sources. The Regional Planning Commission Executive Committee is responsible for programming staff and match dollars in its annual budget for the five funding sources in order to complete the planning projects.

Mr. Chris reeves made a motion to recommend adoption of the FY 2011 UPWP. Ms. Denise Hornbuckle seconded the motion that passed on a voice vote.

#### **NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT**

Mr. Richard Caudle presented a report from the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee met on June 24, 2010 to recommend Mr. Bob Portera for membership as an At-Large member. Mr. Portera introduced himself and discussed his background with ALDOT and Neel-Schaffer. Mr. Richard Caudle made a motion to add Mr. Portera to the TTC as an At-Large member. Mr. John Stewart seconded the motion that passed on a voice vote.

#### **U.S. 280 TRANSIT STUDY**

Mr. Mike Kaczorowski presented a status update on the U.S. 280 Transit Study. Mr. Kaczorowski reviewed the timeline of the study, including the following:

- Confirm existing Corridor Conditions and Needs Analysis: Ongoing to October 2010
- Definition and Evaluation of Land Use and Transportation Alternatives (including public workshop): August 2010 – January 2011
- Identification and Phasing of Proposed Projects: January – March 2011
- Financial Plan: February – March 2011
- Integrated Transportation and Land Use Plan and Final Report (including public workshop): June 2011

The consultant team is currently in data collection mode. The team has met with community leaders along the corridor. Mr. Kaczorowski reviewed the key questions and themes from those meetings. Key questions included:

- How important is having a Quality Community?

- Does your Community have a stated vision for its future?
- Does your Community support transit in the U.S. 280 Corridor?
- Is your Community open to the land use changes needed to make transit work?
- Is your Community seeking to redevelop some areas in the future?

### **Other Perspectives on Transit**

- Transit service is not reliable today because of lack of funding – Can we fix that?
- Traffic congestion is a serious problem and transit needs to be part of the solution.
- We are all working under very difficult fiscal constraints.
- ALDOT's elevated lanes project should be designed to accommodate and provide funding for transit.
- While today's transportation issues are important, we also need to figure out how we accommodate growth in the future, while protecting the quality of our communities.
- Any new transit system and its associated land use concepts must be customized to meet clearly demonstrated needs.
- U.S. 280 Corridor communities are open to examining a range of mobility solutions which includes transit.

### **Data Collection and Current Corridor Conditions**

#### Study Area by Segment

- Segment 1: I-20/I-59 to E. B. Stephens Highway
- Segment 2: E. B. Stephens Highway to I-459
- Segment 3: I-459 to S.R. 119
- Segment 4: S.R. 119 to Shelby/Talladega County Line

#### Corridor Data and Analysis

- Past and Current Plans and Studies
- Historic Demographic and Economic Trends
- Environmental, Cultural, and Historic Assets
- Transportation System and Conditions
- Land Use and Development
- Assessment of Transit-Supportive Land Use and Zoning Provisions in Local Ordinances
- Final Product – U.S. 280 Corridor Needs Analysis

#### Summary of Corridor Conditions

- Very Auto-Dependent Corridor
- Large Percentage of Single Occupant trips
- Few Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Options
- No Continuous Alternative Route for Motorists
- Greatest Increase in Traffic from 2000 – 2008 Occurred Between East of I-459 and Chelsea
- Growing Senior Population in the Corridor
- Most Households Have Access to Vehicle
- Long to Very Long Commute Times Exist for People Living East of SR 119

The goals and strategies presented were voted on by attendees at a stakeholders meeting. Each vote was tallied and recorded.

#### U.S. 280 Corridor Transit Study Goals

- Goal 1: Plan and develop effective, efficient transit services that meet the mobility needs of residents, businesses, and other stakeholders in the U.S. 280 corridor. (10 votes)
- Goal 2: Develop public transit services in the U.S. 280 corridor that are financially sustainable in the short-term and over the next 20 years. (Note: “financially sustainable” means that the combination of the revenue streams supporting the transit services, including federal, state, local, and private funding are reasonably available over time). (17 votes)
- Goal 3: Encourage cooperative efforts by local jurisdictions, the Alabama Department of Transportation, the Regional Planning Commission, the Birmingham-Jefferson County Transit Authority, and key stakeholders to implement effective transit services meeting corridor transportation needs. (18 votes)
- Goal 4: Develop premium transit services that enhance the overall operations of traffic in the U.S. 280 corridor and reduce congestion. (8 votes)
- Goal 5: Coordinate the planning of mixed use developments with planned transit system improvements to create transit-oriented development. (2 votes)
- Goal 6: Create more travel choices for people living and working in the U.S. 280 corridor. (14 votes)
- Goal 7: Create an interconnected network of roadways, transit services, and paths for bicyclists and pedestrians that connect with other transportation facilities, important places, and activity centers in the corridor. (16 votes)
- Goal 8: Expand the land area in the region that is accessible by transit to and from the U.S. 280 corridor. (3 votes)
- Goal 9: Develop new public transportation systems and services that avoid or minimize negative impacts to the natural environment, historic and cultural resources, and other important community places. (15 votes)
- Goal 10: Develop premium transit services that serve the future development and redevelopment needs in the U.S. 280 corridor. (2 votes)

#### Potential Corridor Mobility Strategies

- Strategy # 1: Create new commuter-oriented transit services that operate mostly during commute periods in the U.S. 280 corridor. (12 votes)
- Strategy # 2: Provide new transit services whose primary purpose is to connect the city and town centers in the U.S. 280 corridor. (6 votes)
- Strategy # 3: Create a positive public image and brand for transit services in the U.S. 280 corridor. (6 votes)
- Strategy # 4: Encourage ridesharing activities (carpooling and vanpooling) through financial incentives at work sites in the U.S. 280 corridor to provide a travel option for commuters. (10 votes)
- Strategy # 5: Focus on the management of auto traffic in the corridor through the use of sophisticated traffic signal systems and the elimination of traffic signals and access points at some locations, where feasible. (15 votes)

- Strategy # 6: Construct the proposed ALDOT elevated lanes concept between E. B. Stephens and Oak Mountain, including provisions for public transit. (16 votes)
- Strategy # 7: Preserve existing development, such as neighborhoods, commercial areas, and employment sites. (10 votes)
- Strategy # 8: Create more pedestrian-friendly areas to support the use of public transit services. (1 votes)

Next Steps

- Corridor Needs Analysis
- Development of Transportation and Land Use Scenarios
- Alternatives Evaluation Process

Mr. Kaczorowski noted that the information presented is available on the MPO website.

**OTHER**

Chairman David Hunke reviewed the list of meetings of interest to the committee that included:

- MPO Subcommittee, August 26, 2010, 1:30 p.m., RPC
- TIP Subcommittee, August 27, 2010, 10:00 a.m., RPC.
- MPO, September 8, 2010, 1:30 p.m., RPC.
- Announcement of next Technical Committee meeting for Wednesday September 22, 10:00 a.m., RPC.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

DH:cb

K:\TRA\Production\01-Clt-Adm\Adm-TEC\TTC Minutes Aug10.doc

**APPROVED:**

---

Mr. David Hunke, Chairman  
Transportation Technical Committee

---

Date