



*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 • www.bhammpo.org*

December 15, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Technical Committee

FROM: Mr. David Hunke, Chairman /s/

**SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes
December 15, 2010**

A meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) was held on Wednesday, December 15, 2010, 10:00 a.m., RPC 1st Floor Conference Room, 1731 1st Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Matthew Cobb, City of Homewood Engineer
Mr. Phillip Garratt, P.E., At-Large
Mr. Doug Hale, Bicycle / Pedestrian Representative
Mr. Tom Magee, City of Birmingham Chief Planner
Mr. Al Folcher, At-Large
Mr. Lance Taylor, ALDOT Preconstruction Engineer – Birmingham
Ms. Kim Fort, UAB Parking Services Dir. of Auxiliary Services
Mr. Randy Kemp, City of Birmingham
Ms. Denise Hornbuckle, Traffic Safety Representative
Mr. John Tally, CLASTRAN Transportation Mobility Manager
Mr. Jason Howanitz, Jeff. County Dept. of Health Chief Meteorologist - Air Division
Mr. Richard Caudle, At-Large
Ms. Mary Margaret Nicholson, At-Large
Mr. Scott Holladay, Shelby County Highway Department Representative
Mr. Wallace McCord, At-Large
Mr. Scott Cothron, Sain Associates
Ms. Wytangy Peak, BJCTA Representative

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTED BY PROXY

Mr. Fred Hawkins, EDT
 Represented by Mr. Cale Smith
Mr. Fenn Church, Trucking Representative
 Represented by Mr. John Tally
Mr. Charles Malone, ALDOT Maintenance Representative-Birmingham
 Represented by Mr. Lionel Harbin
Ms. Sheila Chaffin, UAB Exec. Dir. Campus Planning and Facilities Programming
 Represented by Ms. Kim Fort

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Mr. David Hunke, Chairman, At-Large
Mr. Greg Dawkins, Vice-Chairman, City of Birmingham Traffic Engineer
Mr. Eric Womack, Shelby County Development Services Representative
Mr. Chris Hatcher, Operation New Birmingham
Mr. Rod Long, City of Hoover Engineer
Mr. Robert Portera, At-Large
Mr. Chris Reeves, At-Large
Mr. Richard Darden, At-Large
Ms. Alfredo Acoff, ALDOT Environmental Coordinator – Montgomery
Mr. Ken Boozer, Jefferson County Dept. of Roads and Transportation Representative
Mr. Andrew Sullivan, At-Large
Mr. John Stewart, At-Large
Ms. Virginia Williams, At-Large
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. Cissy Crowe, RPC
Mr. Scott Rumble, PBS&J
Ms. Ouida Fritschi, TCC

Due to inclement weather, Chairman Hunke was unable to attend. In light of his absence and that of the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Bill Foisy called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. The meeting proceeded with the scheduled agenda items.

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

Attendees introduced themselves. Mr. Tom Magee made a motion to approve the November 17, 2010 meeting minutes. Mr. Randy Kemp seconded the motion that passed on a voice vote.

Mr. Bill Foisy presented a report on Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) actions. The MPO approved the Transportation Improvement Program modification for the projects recommended by the TTC at the November meeting, including three demolition projects, one revitalization project along SR 75, Homewood Broadway Street Sidewalk project and the \$52 million stimulus portion of the Norfolk Southern intermodal facility. The MPO also approved funding the three recommended Jobs Access Reverse Commute and New Freedom grant requests.

I-65 / U.S. 31 MOBILITY MATTERS

Mr. Mike Kaczorowski gave a presentation on the I-65 / U.S. 31 Highway and Transit Alternatives Analysis results that were previously presented to the I-65 / U.S. 31 Steering Committee. Mr. Kaczorowski reviewed the alternatives, including:

Alternative 1: *No-Build* - Include projects in the 2035 RTP except for projects within the MMP Corridor

Alternative 2: *Transportation System Management (TSM)* - No-Build + I-65 Operational Improvements in 2035 RTP + Build alternative bus routes and stations / centers / Park and Ride lots but with just local bus service on these routes (lower speeds)

Alternative 3: General Purpose (GP) Lanes + Operational Improvements + BRT Routes / Service on I-65 and Surface Streets

Alternative 4: High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes + Operational Improvements + BRT Routes / Service on I-65 and Surface Streets

Alternative 5: Managed Lanes (ML) + Operational Improvements + BRT Routes / Service on I-65 and Surface Streets

A series of maps were reviewed outlining the highway elements of each alternative, the toll system, the 2035 daily traffic volume estimates, the transit element for BRT for the entire study area, individual BRT routes, enhanced local service route, and express routes.

Mr. Kaczorowski showed examples of “Centers” for the transit element, Park and Ride lots, “Stations” for the transit element, “Stops” for the transit element, as well as aerial views of a

proposed “Center” at Valley Avenue, a proposed “Center” and Park and Ride lot at SR 119, and a proposed “Center” and Park and Ride lot at CR 52. For the transit element, Mr. Kaczorowski reviewed a summary of daily boarding of passengers for each alternative, including:

	No-Build Alternative 1	TSM Alternative 2	GP Alternative 3	HOV Alternative 4	ML Alternative 5
ITP Subtotal	4,287	4,292	3,733	3,763	3,841
TOTALS	13,310	20,951	23,348	24,009	24,839

Mr. Kaczorowski also presented information on the following:

- Conceptual Total and Annualized Capital Cost Estimate for Highway Element Only, Transit Element Only, for Combined Highway and Transit Element
- Conceptual Total and Annualized Operating & Maintenance (O&M) Cost Estimate for Highway Element Only, Transit Element Only, for Combined Highway and Transit Elements
- Conceptual Total and Annualized Revenue Estimate for Highway Element Only (Managed Lane Tolls), Transit Element Only (Farebox Revenue), for Combined Highway and Transit Elements
- Conceptual Net Total and Annualized Cost Estimates for Highway Element Only
- Conceptual Net Total and Annualized Cost Estimates for Transit Element Only
- Conceptual Net Total and Annualized Cost Estimates for Combined Highway and Transit Elements
- Peak Hour Person Level of Service on I-65
- Average Peak Hour Travel Time on I-65
- Average Peak Hour Travel Time per Passenger Mile on I-65
- Optimum Peak Hour Travel Time on I-65

The I-65 / U.S. 31 Steering Committee will select a Locally Preferred Alternative from the Tier 2 Alternatives. Then there will need to be Environmental Assessment (EA) Documentation as well as identifying Funding (Highway and Transit).

The following evaluation factors were used to evaluate the alternatives.

Goal 1: Improve transportation mobility and reduce congestion through and within the study corridor.

- Objective 1A: Enhance corridor trip capacity and service quality.
- Objective 1B: Enhance corridor non-SOV mobility choices.
- Objective 1C: Addresses identified corridor transportation needs.

Goal 2: Minimize adverse impacts to the human/built and natural environments, and foster positive environmental impacts.

- Objective 2A: Minimize environmental impacts.
- Objective 2B: Minimize air quality degradation.
- Objective 2C: Minimize impacts to the human built environment.

Goal 3: Support local and regional land use and transportation vision and plans.

- Objective 3A: Maintain compatibility with adjacent land uses.
- Objective 3B: Maintain consistency with local and regional land use and transportation plans.

Goal 4: Provide a cost effective and efficient transportation investment strategy.

- Objective 4A: Minimize capital and operating cost requirement (effectiveness).
- Objective 4B: Minimize investment cost per project benefits (efficiency).

Mr. Kaczorowski reviewed a summary of how each alternative ranked in relation to the set goals; (lower ranking = higher rating). Rankings included:

Goal	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
1. Increases Mobility and Reduces Congestion	3.53	2.21	1.53	1.89
2. Minimizes Impacts	1.43	2.00	2.03	2.63
3. Supports Land Use and transportation Plans	1.75	1.75	1.50	1.75
4. Cost Effective	3.00	2.47	2.11	2.47
Overall Average Ranking – All Goals	2.43	2.11	1.79	2.19

Conclusions from the I-65 / U.S. 31 Steering Committee included:

- HOV Lanes with BRT (Alternative 4) has the best overall Tier 2 ranking
- HOV Lanes versus TSM
 - Better highway and transit performance
- HOV Lanes versus General Purpose Lanes
 - Better average peak hour travel times for people traveling on I-65
 - Better utilization of new lanes in terms of more person trips on I-65
 - Better transit performance
 - HOV Lanes versus Managed Lanes
 - Better utilization of new lanes in terms of more person trips on I-65
 - Lower cost and less impact
 - HOV Lanes can be retrofitted to become Managed Lanes in future

Mr. Kaczorowski noted that an alternative needs to be finalized and asked the TTC for any comments / suggestions / questions in relation to the project. UAB had previously expressed concern to the Steering Committee over the proposed flyover ramps at I-65 and University Boulevard. Mr. Don Arkle of ALDOT made a suggestion to the Steering Committee to let science and analysis do the talking – plan for a potential future managed lane on the HOV lane instead of a General Purpose lane.

Questions and comments included:

- Will HOV lane occupancy be enforced and if so will the collected funds go to Highway Safety?
- Why are there were no ramp improvements for the HOV alternative at the I-459 interchange?

- There could be some difficulty getting back out into traffic from the HOV lanes once in the HOV lane.
- Building the HOV lanes does not necessarily mean they will be used
- I-65 is the only feasible corridor for this type of project.
- Computer models were used for this study and are sensitive to the concerns of getting in and out of HOV lanes.

Mr. Foisy asked that any additional comments or questions be submitted to staff.

Additional information presented to the I-65 / U.S. 31 Steering Committee can be viewed and downloaded at: http://www.i65-us31mobilitymatters.com/project_information.htm.

OTHER

Mr. Bill Foisy reviewed the list of meetings of interest to the committee that included:

- MPO TIP Subcommittee Meeting, Wednesday December 16, 2010, 1:30 p.m., RPC.
- Announcement of next Technical Committee meeting for **Tuesday**, January 25, 10:00 a.m., RPC.

Ms. Cissy Crowe announced the RPC Annual Meeting, to be held Wednesday January 26, 2011, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., The Club. Registration forms will be mailed out the first week of January, 2011.

A copy of the CommuteSmart newsletter, *The Route*, was included in the meeting packet for review.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

DH:cb
K:\TRA\Production\01-Clt-Adm\Adm-TEC\TTC Minutes Dec10.doc

APPROVED:

Mr. David Hunke, Chairman
Transportation Technical Committee

Date