

CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON COUNTY/NORTH
 GEORGIA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
 (CHCNGA TPO)



MINUTES

MARCH 6, 2012

1:30 PM EASTERN

DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE CENTER
 1250 MARKET STREET
 CHATTANOOGA, TN 37402

MEETING CALLED BY	Chairman John Bridger
TYPE OF MEETING	Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)
FACILITATOR	Ms. Karen Rennich, Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency (RPA)
NOTE TAKER	Ms. Rozanne Brown, RPA
	Present
ATTENDEES	See Attachment

ANNOUCEMENTS	The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Bridger.
PUBLIC COMMENTS	
OTHER ITEMS OF IMPORTANCE	Handouts: (1) TDOT SafeRoutes to School 2011-2012 Program Guidelines and Application, (2) Bike Chattanooga / Bicycle Transit System, (3) Draft (2/27/12) LRTP 2035 Volume 2, Conformity Determination Report, (4) UPWP Development Recap Sheet, and (5) TPO Executive Board Designee Letter form.

Agenda Topics

ITEM #1. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 31, 2012 TPO TCC MEETING MINUTES

**CHAIRMAN JOHN BRIDGER
 RPA**

DISCUSSION	There being no discussion and no changes submitted, motion which was made to approve as presented, seconded, and the motion carried.	
CONCLUSIONS		
TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
Approval of the January 31, 2012 TCC Meeting minutes.	Mr. Steve Leach City of Chattanooga	Mr. Todd Leamon Hamilton County
STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

**ITEM #2. APPROVE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATION
TO APPROVE BY RESOLUTION AMENDED CONFORMITY
DETERMINATION REPORT (CDR)**

**MS. BETSY EVANS
RPA STAFF**

DISCUSSION		
<p>Ms. Betsy Evans said that, during the adoption of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), it was decided that there would be offered a biennial amendment cycle (call for projects) to make any necessary updates to programmed projects or to add newly funded projects. During the November 4, 2011 call for projects, three projects were received; two were pulled due to fiscal constraint issues, and the countywide ITS signalization project remained (which is already in the LRTP requiring only a new conformity determination for the timing portion of the project to be amended into the TIP). To clarify the various phasing and funding of this project, an adjustment to the LRTP is being processed adding this detail to the project page. The CDR Amendment, LRTP Adjustment language, and accompanying TIP Amendment were approved by the Interagency Air Quality Committee (IAC - formerly ICC) on February 10, 2012. The amendment to the CDR includes: The TPO's transition from MOBILE 6 model to MOVES 2010a model, and New emissions analysis for countywide ITS Signalization System (timing/construction). This amended CDR was approved by the IAC on February 10, 2012. Copies of the DRAFT (2/27/12) LRTP 2035, Volume 2, Conformity Determination Report were available at the meeting.</p> <p>Detailed pages were included in the meeting packet (see Item #2 and Staff Report sections) and additional information is available at Project Website: http://www.chcrpa.org/TPO_reorganized/Plans_and_Programs/Transportation_Improvement_Program_(TIP)/Amended_2035_LRTP_Volume_II.htm</p> <p>There being no further comments or questions, motion was made to approve as presented, seconded, and the motion carried.</p>		
CONCLUSIONS		
TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
Approve for Public Comment and Recommendation to Approve by Resolution Amended Conformity Determination Report (CDR)	Mr. Steve Leach	Mr. Bob Colby Chattanooga- Hamilton County Air Pollution Control Board
STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

**ITEM #3. APPROVE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATION
TO APPROVE BY RESOLUTION AN AMENDMENT TO 2011-2014
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)**

**MS. BETSY EVANS
RPA STAFF**

DISCUSSION		
<p>Ms. Evans said that detailed TIP pages were contained in the packet including the ITS project TN021610.10 just discussed in Item #2 above and approved by the IAC on February 10, 2012, plus four CARTA projects: CARTA11 Various (IAC concurred that the project is exempt from Conformity on March 2, 2012), and CARTA31 Bus, Van & Electric Shuttle Replacement (State of Good Repair Grant), CARTA32 Shelters & Amenities, and CARTA33 Bus Replacement (TIGGER Grant). IAC concurred these last three CARTA projects were exempt from Conformity on February 13, 2012. Additional information is available at the website shown in the packet.</p> <p>There being no further questions or comments, motion was made to approve as presented, seconded and the motion carried.</p>		
CONCLUSIONS		
<p>Mr. John Van Winkle said that bids have been opened on the current (first) phase of the ITS project, that work should be under construction in approximately six weeks, and that he would like to have the phase completed by the end of this year.</p>		
TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
Approve for Public Comment and Recommendation to Approve by Resolution an Amendment to 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	Mr. Steve Leach	Mr. Phil Pugliese Outdoor Chattanooga
STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

**ITEM #4. DEVELOPMENT
OF THE 2013-2014 UPWP:
KEY PROJECTS,
DISCUSSION OF
ADDITIONAL NEEDS AND
TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING REPORTS
(TPR)**

**MS. KAREN RENNICH
RPA STAFF**

DISCUSSION
<p>Referring to a handout being distributed, Ms. Karen Rennich said that staff is beginning to develop the upcoming Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The handout provided a quick explanation of the UPWP, which identifies planning tasks, funding sources, schedule of activities and who is responsible for completion of tasks (including TDOT and GDOT work in our area and the TPO Staff activities). In the past, the UPWP has been a 2-year program and the current 2012 UPWP is available on the WEB or in hardcopy. Ms. Rennich reviewed the Key Projects for the current fiscal year 2012 UPWP including projects: Complete, Underway/Ongoing, Beginning, and Potential Transportation Planning Reports (TPR's) which have been mentioned in the current UPWP (see handout for further details). Air Quality Conformity for Ozone (Beginning) was pushed out due to the EPA announcement, and Climate Change Research and Green House Gas Emissions Reduction/Modeling may be accommodated in the Long range Planning process. Ms. Rennich said that some of the current activities will be under way for several years (Transportation Plan and Long Range Regional Transportation Plan), and will roll over into the upcoming UPWP.</p>

Ms. Rennich said that staff is considering doing several data collection studies in Fall 2012 (1Q 2013 UPWP) including Travel Time, Traffic Counts, External License Plate Recognition, and possibly others. Ms. Rennich opened the floor for discussion or suggestions for other items of interest to the members, and said that staff would be glad to do some research or follow up for the jurisdictions on matters of interest. Responding to an inquiry, Ms. Melissa Taylor said that High-speed Rail/Mag-Lev Corridor Coordination/Planning (Underway/Ongoing) is listed as a placeholder in the UPWP, since the TPO would have to process any kind of grant/discretionary funds that may come through on the project. She does not expect that the TPO staff will do any specific planning studies associated with the project, and The Enterprise Center typically gets funding for their planning efforts in coordination with GDOT's work on the corridor. This placeholder enables the TPO Staff to spend time processing information for a plan (possibly 2040), or amending the TIP for any funding that comes through on the project. Mr. Todd Leamon will send information regarding a possible LRTP illustrative non-funded project (Cummins Highway/underpass). Ms. Rennich said that a link to the current 2012 UPWP would be sent to TCC members on the following day to assist members in providing input for the upcoming UPWP (possibly an additional study or continuation of a project). Ms. Rennich requested that ideas be discussed with staff, or be sent to staff by email, and she expects to provide a draft UPWP for consideration at the next TCC meeting (*May 1, 2012*).

Ms. Melissa Taylor said that, for the UPWP, a Participation Plan update would be processed soon changing "Transportation Plan Adjustments" (not a common occurrence) to only "Transportation Plan (or LRTP) Amendments," and that the Bonny Oaks Subarea Study (a land use transportation planning process previously cited in the plan) would probably move forward as well (not related to the implementation Bonny Oaks project). Responding to an inquiry, Ms. Angie Midgett said that the TPO was asked last fall to prioritize a list of projects (provided by TDOT) which were already under development by TDOT, and that Bonny Oaks was added to the list by the TPO as a notation that the TPO wished to submit the project separately; however, it was not on (and could not be added to) the list of those projects already under development by TDOT.

Ms. Midgett said that TDOT is aware that Bonny Oaks is a priority for our area by the TPO (being on the list submitted to TDOT by the TPO last fall), and the project will be considered by TDOT as the three-year program is being developed. Ms. Midgett said that there is a "group effort" to look at all projects submitted from the RPO's, MPO's and any other projects TDOT is developing for consideration in the three-year program. TDOT is meeting now to make decisions about the three-year program. Ms. Midgett said that the list sent to TDOT last fall by the TPO with the additional project (*Bonny Oaks*) has been forwarded to the group for consideration for the three-year program. In addition, Ms. Midgett suggested that a letter (signed by both the City of Chattanooga Mayor and Hamilton County Mayor) be sent as soon as possible to the Department of Transportation Commissioner, accompanied by a letter signed by the TPO TCC Chairman with the list previously submitted to TDOT. Ms. Midgett said that the three-year program is usually approved by the Legislature in early May, but it could be approved in April. There being no further question or discussion, **motion was made that a letter (signed by both the City of Chattanooga Mayor and Hamilton County Mayor) be sent as soon as possible to the Department of Transportation Commissioner, accompanied by a letter signed by the TPO TCC Chairman, stating that the Bonny Oaks project is a priority for this area, and requesting that the Bonny Oaks project be considered as the TDOT three-year program is developed.**

Ms. Midgett said that the letters should include the project list already submitted to TDOT (fall 2011), and state that the Bonny Oaks project is not on the last three-year list sent to the TPO (fall 2011), but that it is a very important project for this area, and that the TPO would like to have the project considered as the three-year program is developed.

Ms. Rennich said that the staff will draft the letters as soon as possible, and that the TPO Executive Board will be notified of the TCC's action (the next TPO Executive Board meeting is April 17, 2012).

Ms. Rennich said that a link (or hardcopy) is also available for a handbook which provides MPO general activities (*The Transportation Planning Process Key Issues (A Briefing Book for Transportation Decisionmakers, Officials, and Staff)* by the Transportation Planning Capacity Building Program, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. Staff is beginning to provide this recently updated handbook to new TCC and TPO Executive Board members, and staff will provide the TCC with the link.

CONCLUSIONS

TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
Motion was made that a letter (signed by both the City of Chattanooga Mayor and Hamilton County Mayor) be sent as soon as possible to the Department of Transportation Commissioner, accompanied by a letter signed by the TPO TCC Chairman stating that the Bonny Oaks project is a priority for this area, and requesting that the Bonny Oaks project be considered as the TDOT three-year program is developed.	Mr. Todd Leamon	Mr. Bob Colby

STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Staff will draft letters as outlined to the Department of Transportation Commissioner: (1) to be co-signed by both Mayors (City of Chattanooga and Hamilton County), and (2) signed by TCC Chairman, and notify the TPO Executive Board of the TCC's action.	Ms. Karen Rennich	March 9, 2012

ITEM #5. PREPARATION FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: SCENARIO PLANNING

**MR. TIM MORELAND / MS. YUEN LEE
RPA STAFF**

DISCUSSION
<p>Mr. John Bridger said that Scenario Planning is a new and potentially powerful/effective tool for informing planning processes which the staff is looking at for the Regional Transportation Planning process. He said that, following an overview by Mr. Tim Moreland, staff would like to have feedback from the TCC members regarding some discussion points related to how the TPO uses Scenario Planning.</p> <p>Mr. Tim Moreland said that Scenario Planning is both a <u>modeling tool</u> and a <u>process</u> for identifying and assessing future growth patterns that help to develop a shared vision for the future. Mr. Moreland said that any good planning process tries to answer five questions: (1) Where did we come from, (2) Where are we now, (3) Where are we going, (4) Where do we want to go, and (5) How do we get there? In many ways, the Scenario Planning process is trying to answer these same questions. The main difference from previous planning efforts is that Scenario Planning evaluates a greater number of variables and alternatives in greater detail, thus creating greater insight into planning for the future than the traditional model evaluating a few alternatives.</p> <p>Mr. Moreland then presented a possible Scenario Planning process using the above five questions. The first two questions are answered in visioning workshops where the public is invited to consider their past and present and share their values and goals for the community's future. The third question is answered in a growth workshop where different development scenarios are created. Question four is addressed in a preferred future workshop where the public is presented with various scenarios (which have been ranked against the goals and values which they outlined in the first workshop), and chooses their preferred future. The last question is answered in an action workshop.</p> <p>Mr. Moreland discussed the connection between Scenario Planning and the Travel Demand Model (TDM), which takes the on-the-ground demographics and puts them on the roadway network in the form of simulated traffic patterns (how people move around throughout the region). Where people "are" will drastically impact how they move and where congestion occurs, so the land use piece is very important. Mr. Moreland said that the transportation / land use connection is one of the key things on which staff is focusing through the Scenario Planning process and modeling work, and he provided examples of the transportation/land use connection (impacts).</p> <p>Staff hopes to use Scenario Planning and the modeling perspective to do a robust analysis for the Trend Scenario, focusing on the supply of land available for development. The model being built will assist the TPO to understand what land is developed, what land is available for development, the capacity of that land, and the likelihood of development – providing a more robust trend year forecast. Referencing a PowerPoint map, Mr. Moreland indicated areas for the recently completed Central Hamilton Scenario Planning Study (center of Hamilton County); and then moving outward to the TPO area (model currently being developed); and then to the broader regional area for which the Scenario Planning process will be done. Mr. Moreland said that staff is coordinating these efforts as far as possible considering timelines. For the current model being developed for the Regional Transportation Plan, Mr. Moreland said that the pre-planning and Peer Review by experts were done in 2011, the Data Preparation Model was streamlined and completed, and professional focus groups (developers and realtors) were involved to discuss possible future growth (data used to develop the Trend Model). The model building began in early 2012, and staff anticipates completion of the model in summer 2012.</p> <p>Mr. Moreland said that there are two continuums in which the Scenario Planning model/process can be developed ranging from a "closed to open process," and from a "simple level of complexity to a complex level." He said that the staff wished to ask the TCC members to assist in determining where on the continuum of the process and level of complexity they would like for the TPO to fall (pros and cons of each were discussed as shown in the PowerPoint presentation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to proceed through the <u>process</u> (open or closed, or some combination): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how the scenarios are created (Staff/Stakeholder process and/or with a level of public process) • The level of <u>complexity</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -how the scenarios are used (TDM trend projection / TDM scenario projection / Trans project selection ranking / criteria)

For moving forward with Scenario Planning for the Regional Transportation Plan, Mr. Moreland described in detail four potential options as follows (providing pros/cons):

Option 1. Modeling for Model's Sake – use scenario model to create a trend scenario that will feed into the TDM. This option provides the benefits of better demographic forecasts for the TDM that are tied to supply. This is the most closed option and does not require public involvement, and misses many of the benefits of Scenario Planning.

Option 2. Internal Modeling - use scenario model to create a trend scenario that will feed into the TDM / Craft various scenarios internally by staff / focus groups. This option provides many of the benefits of option one as well as some of the benefits of Scenario Planning. This is still a closed process with no insight into the needs and wants of the public.

Option 3. External Modeling - use scenario model to create a preferred scenario that will feed into the TDM / Craft various scenarios through a public process. Used as an educational process. This option provides all of the benefits of the first two options, provides insight into the needs and wants of the public, and is more time and resource intensive than the other two options.

Option 4. All In Scenario Modeling – use scenario model to create a preferred scenario that will feed into the TDM / Craft various scenarios through a public process. Used in the selection of transportation projects. This option includes all of the benefits of other options, and also the option to directly link the needs and wants of the public with transportation projects. This is the most open process and also the most resource and time intensive option.

Ms. Melissa Taylor said that the Scenario Planning public involvement process is separate from the public involvement process that will be done for the Long Range Regional Transportation Planning process, which is required and which will continue as it has in the past. Mr. Moreland said that the Scenario Planning process should be integrated within the Regional Transportation Planning process. Ms. Taylor said that, in the past, the public process has been utilized to inform investment, but not for the TDM or necessarily for project selection (except for helping to guiding investment based on the interest of the public). The approach being considered today is a much different approach than what has been done in the past, and that is why these potential options are being presented to the TCC members for consideration.

It was suggested, and was the general agreement by TCC members, that a combination of Internal/External Modeling is the option of choice by the TCC (a combination of Option 2 and 3 - perhaps an Option 2.5). This could include the involvement of stakeholders and possibly surveys, and other ways of obtaining input from a broader range of community participants (a truer cross section) than what might otherwise be expected (or obtained in the past). It was suggested by the TCC members that the staff develop three or four potential approaches from which to choose, with the initial focus including professionals and stakeholders for an informed technical/professional perspective, and also including the public process.

In summary, Mr. Bridger said that it was his understanding that the general consensus of the TCC members was for the front end to be the open visioning process to inform values; then more technical/stakeholder groups would be used to actually develop some potential scenario outcomes, which would be presented back to the general public for review and input. The question then would be whether or not to fully integrate the preferred scenario into the TDM, or use it only to influence the criteria for the selection of projects.

Mr. Moreland said that the trend is being used with the development and real estate professionals (where we have been in the past and this is likely where we are going in the future). The preferred scenario says that “this is where we want to go.” There are different ways to use the preferred scenario in the transportation planning process. If the preferred scenario is fully integrated into the TDM and it differs from the “trend” (example: a preferred scenario with land use built around bicycles), then the bicycle friendly land use data would be fed into the TDM. With each project, the TDM model would identify where potential congestion would occur and suggest improvements for consideration. The alternative is to simply compare each project against the preferred scenario values. A decision will have to be made by the TPO about how to use the preferred scenario (fully integrated into the TDM, not integrated into the TDM, or a combination).

Regarding the project selection process which has been successfully used in the past, Ms. Melissa Taylor said that public involvement has been utilized to help target investment – an investment strategy which was based on a set amount of money aligning with Groupings in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Taylor said that moving forward with this new approach, it is more taking projects and weighing them against one another for ultimate project selection based on the preferred scenario. Mr. Moreland said that the idea is the transportation and land use connection, and one way to influence land use is through transportation. If there is a certain land use design that is desired, then there is a certain transportation network that you need to have (transit, biking, freeways, or highway expansion). If the community wants a certain land use, then one way to achieve that is through transportation infrastructure improvements (a more direct link between transportation and land use than what was made in the past). Mr. Moreland said that Memphis has just gone through this process (probably using the External process), and that their MPO Board chose the Trend Scenario, and fed it into their TDM to use for their project selection for the LRTP. The Scenario Planning process has been used nationally and has been named a Best Practice by FHWA.

Mr. Bridger said that, if the preferred scenario is fully integrated into the TDM which is then certified, all projects must measure against that scenario (possibly difficult to change). He suggested that, perhaps the model could be used for a qualitative tool to help inform the criteria for ranking and providing flexibility. Mr. Moreland said that it depends on the commitment to the TDM output. The TDM and Scenario Planning could be used just to compare ideas, compare different

futures, and for an educational process. Mr. Moreland said that it will be up to the TPO Executive Board to decide how locked in they wish to be to the those things, and perhaps a technical question for TDOT whether or not TDOT is willing to let the TPO use the preferred scenario if it does not match the "trend." Ms. Angie Midgett (TDOT) said that this would be a discussion with FHWA.

Mr. Bridger said that this is the first time staff has done this model, that there is a tight one-year deadline, and there is little room for error. He said that, because of more risk and possible impact on the deadlines due to unforeseen cause and effect, he encouraged that the preferred scenario be used to inform how projects are ranked, with consideration being given to possibly putting the preferred scenario into the TDM during the next round. Mr. Bob Colby asked, "Whether or not, by identifying where growth would occur, it would also be decided where growth is not going to occur?" Mr. Bridger said that the "trend" is based on the natural lay of the land (existing infrastructure and based on input from developer and realtor professionals). Mr. Bridger again said that, if desired, the preferred scenario could be selected which would then be used to inform the review criteria, but not be plugged into the box (TDM). The TPO would then be making more informed transportation choices based on the preferred outcome, but would not be limited to the information from the TDM. Mr. Bridger said that the TPO has consultants who are working with the staff on the TDM. Ms. Taylor said that the TDM is not a multimodal model, wondering then how it could inform a full blown true scenario, but said that advancements are being made in the area of some other modes (bike/walking efforts and transit).

Mr. Bridger thanked Mr. Moreland for the presentation and the TCC members for their recommendations, and said that staff will talk further with the consultants and update the TCC members with more specifics regarding the possible approach.

TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
No Formal Action Required		
STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Staff will talk further with the consultants and update the TCC with more specifics regarding the proposed approach.	Ms. Yuen Lee Mr. John Bridger	

**ITEM #6. FINAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM OF STREETS
MAP UPDATE (TN PORTION)**

**MS. MELISSA TAYLOR
RPA STAFF**

DISCUSSION		
<p>Ms. Melissa Taylor said that the Functional Classification System of Streets (FCS) update began approximately two years ago when the TPO Staff asked the jurisdictions for potential roadways where there might be projects but where the roadway was not functionally classed, and if there were roadways that should be declassified. Working with the jurisdictions, the necessary maps were created, recommended for approval by the TPO TCC, approved by the Executive Board, and submitted to TDOT and FHWA for approval (which has been received). The maps included in the meeting packet were recently returned to the TPO from TDOT but have not been reviewed for accuracy by the TPO Staff. These maps were provided to the TPO Executive Board on February 21, 2012. The TPO Staff requested that the Executive Board members review the maps with their technical staff and advise the TPO staff (<i>within a week or one and one-half week</i>) if the maps did not reflect the original intention based on what was originally submitted by the jurisdiction. The Town of Signal Mountain map did not reflect what was originally submitted by the jurisdiction (loop that would have connected back into James Boulevard). TDOT is working to correct the Town of Signal Mountain map and there is no indication that the change will not be approved. Ms. Taylor asked that each jurisdiction review their map(s) making sure that the map(s) match what was originally submitted, and advise her as soon as possible if there are any discrepancies. Ms. Taylor said that the TPO has an opportunity at this time to correct any discrepancies in these maps (which are for the original submittals approved by the TPO Executive Board and sent to TDOT/FHWA), but that the TPO cannot add any additional requests for change at this time. Ms. Taylor said that any additional changes will be addressed when TPO staff looks at functional class again for urbanized area boundary changes. The FCS will have to be updated following that effort, and Ms. Taylor is aware that the City of Chattanooga and the City of Soddy-Daisy already have possible FCS changes to submit, and there may be others.</p>		
CONCLUSIONS		
TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
No Formal Action Required		
STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

--	--	--

ITEM #7. STAFF REPORTS

**MS. KAREN RENNICH
RPA STAFF**

DISCUSSION		
<p>Status summaries and contact information for the following projects/programs were included in the meeting packet; there was no further discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of 2011-2014 TIP Adjustments/Modifications • Notice of 2035 LRTP Adjustment • Safe Routes to School • TPO Executive Board Officers and Quorum Update 		
CONCLUSIONS		
TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
No Formal Action Required		
STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

ITEM #8. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND OTHER ITEMS OF IMPORTANCE

**MS. KAREN RENNICH
RPA STAFF**

DISCUSSION		
<p>The next TPO Executive Board Meeting is April 17, 2012. The next TPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) meeting is May 1, 2012.</p>		
CONCLUSIONS		
<p>There were no other questions or comments.</p>		
TCC/BOARD ACTION/RESOLUTION	PERSON PRESENTED MOTION	PERSON SECONDED MOTION
Meeting adjourned.	Chairman John Bridger	
STAFF FOLLOW-UP	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON COUNTY/NORTH GEORGIA
 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC)

March 6, 2012 (1:30 p.m. Eastern – DRC/1A)

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION</u>
Donald Brown	Catoosa Co Public Works
Jeremy Byson	Catoosa Co Public Works
Betsy Evans	RPA
Melissa Taylor	RPA
Yuen Lee	RPA
Angie Midgitt	TDOT
Annie Powell	CARTA
Loretta Hopper	Town of Signal Mtn.
John Bridger	RPA/TPO
Tim Moreland	RPA/TPO
Joe Frazee	Collegedale
Jeanne Stevens	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Philip Taylor	Order Chattanooga
STEVE WALKER	GDOT



CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON COUNTY/NORTH GEORGIA
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC)

March 6, 2012 (1:30 p.m. Eastern – DRC/1A)

NAME

REPRESENTATION

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTATION</u>
KEVIN LEACH	CITY OF CHATTANOOGA
John VanWinkle	" " "
DENNIS MAWDE	CITY OF CHATT.
TODD LEAMON	HAMILTON County
Bob Colby	APCB
Karen Remick	CHC RPA
Rozanne Brown	RPA-TPO