MPO Climate Change Work Group Meeting
February 24, 2010
1:30-3 pm
Meeting Notes

Key Participants

Name	Affiliation	Email
Kevin Harrison	SARPC	kharrison@sarpc.org
Don Powell	ALDOT	powelldo@dot.state.al.us
Edwin Perry III	ALDOT	perrye@dot.state.al.us
Mike Flood	PB	flood@pbworld.com
Tina Sanchez	Mobile County	tsanchez@mobilecounty.net
Ricky Mitchell	Mobile County	rmitchell@mobilecounty.net
Mike Meyer	PB	meyer@pbworld.com
Christi Willison	PB	Willison@pbworld.com
Gerald Alfred	The Wave Transit	galfred@thewavetransit.com
Bob Harris	ASPA	bharris@asdd.com
Tom Piper	SARPC/Mobile MPO	tpiper@sarpc.org
George Crozier	Dauphin Island Sea Lab	gcrozier@disl.org
Steve Perry	The Forum	sperry@hdaissues.com
John Bell	City of Mobile	bell@cityofmobile.org
Nick Amberger	City of Mobile	Nick.amberger@cityofmobile.org
Jennifer Denson	Partners for Environmental Progress (PEP)	jdenson@pepmobile.org
Bert Hoffman	Urban Development Dept, City of Mobile	HoffmanB@cityofmobile.org
Casi Callaway	Mobile Baykeeper	callaway@mobilebaykeeper.org
Donna Jordan	Mobile Baykeeper	djordan@mobilebaykeeper.org
Beth Moore	ICF International	BethMoore@icfi.com
Anne Choate	ICF International	achoate@icfi.com
Harrison Rue	ICF International	hrue@icfi.com
Rob Ritter	FHWA	Robert.ritter@dot.gov

Introductions

- Participants around table introduce themselves
- Rob introduces the project
- Anne introduces team

Rob Ritter: Presentation

- Clarification of the fact that we are focused on process and procedure; it's up to Mobile to make decisions about how they'd like to proceed with adaptation strategies
- Most of project is focused on Mobile, smaller amount focused on how to make the procedures and approach usable for other areas/MPOs

Study Area

- Grand Bay cluster most likely to become part of Mobile urban area after next census (Kevin Harrison)
- Also, after Mobile region is deemed non-attainment, planning area boundary will be entire county (Kevin Harrison)
- Should look at 18 ft-surge line of two counties (Mobile & Baldwin) at minimum
- Dauphin Island should not be avoided—so we need to include southern portion of county
- MUST include causeway
- Baldwin County doesn't have as much data as Mobile (doesn't have transp forecast model, not part of MPO)
- There's an urban cluster by eastern shore, near where I-10 crosses Bay
- Two roads from Baldwin county feed in to Mobile traffic patterns
- There are pipelines in Dauphin island
- Note that not everyone in Mobile agrees on climate change
    - Rob notes that we're not here to discuss *cause* of climate change, but how to plan for future scenarios
- Question on how we will be engaging stakeholders
    - We will be sending out our Public Outreach plan for Work Group to review
        - Can include open houses, periodic meetings, web sites, etc. Luke warm reception to discussion of this project at the spring open house.
- Question: Mobile is higher elevation than other areas, so why was Mobile selected?
    - Rob: who was interested, where was there involvement, which areas had diversity of transportation systems represented; also, size of area had to be manageable
- We should look at line of at least 25 feet of elevation
- Include I-65 bridge, and rail line that crosses delta
    - This would hit all major corridors that cross bay or delta
- General consensus that Dauphin Island should be included
    - County boundary perhaps should be study area
- Baldwin County—would probably go beyond scope of this group
    - But MPO model has external points feeding in to it, starting at county line
- Including Baldwin would spread our resources thinner
- Perhaps, the plan should include how to consider adjacent area
- Let's include causeway, even though part of it in Baldwin County

What is critical?

- We will develop preliminary list of critical assets, and will send out to the group

- What about utilities? They are critical
  - Are we looking at everything inside the study limits?
  - No, but things that are critical to critical transportation may be included
  - Things that are *using* the transportation infrastructure, but are not critical to critical transportation, will not be included (e.g. water/sewer lines in the R.O.W)
- Budgets are limited—they can't afford to raise everything up higher
  - Activities will be likely limited to major assets
- Major infrastructure already designed for what's coming 10-15 yrs in advance
  - The unknown is tricky—why spend $$ to raise things up more if we're not sure an event will actually occur
  - [→ perhaps this is something to keep in mind during our presentations/communications. Structures are already built to standards based on risk; it's never known that a flood or hurricane will actually happen, just the risk. We should communicate that climate change adaptation is just taking this one step further.]
- SLR is going to cross state/county/city responsibilities
- Flood maps based on historical data
- Surge is on top of SLR
- Evacuation routes not in standard study areas, and are vulnerable to increased run-offs
- Evacuation routes critical
- During previous event, damage exceeded level of expected surge b/c of wave height
  - Wave height is big unknown, based in part on depth of water
  - Force of wave much greater if sea levels are higher

Task 2 data

- Post-disaster construction prices go way up, beyond projections; this will be important as we consider damage functions and the axis on cost (are costs equal to the cost of rebuilding or the cost modified to reflect a premium like what was experienced after Katrina)
  - Need to account for variability on costs. Per-unit costs may be tied to severity of damage
- There is a document prepared after Katrina that shows damage up and down coast—may have some of the info we're looking for
  - Kevin or Don will try to find it

Who else to include?

- Alabama Oil & Gas
- Inland waterway people
  - Warrior (company)
- General feeling that may not be appropriate to present at spring open house
  - At least until we have some results to present