

**Mobile Area Transportation Study  
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)  
Technical Coordinating/Citizens Advisory Committee (TCC/CAC) Meeting  
Wednesday, July 11, 2018 10:00 am  
SARPC Boardroom**

**MPO Members Present**

Mr. Bryan Kegley  
Hon. Bess Rich  
Mayor Tom Williams  
Mayor Terry Downey  
Mr. Matthew Lambert Rep. Mayor Howard Rubenstein  
Mr. Edwin Perry rep Mr. Vince Calametti  
Hon. Fred Richardson  
Mr. Michael Chinn  
Mr. Ricky Mitchell rep. Hon. Jerry Carl  
Mr. John F. Rhodes  
Mayor Sandy Stimpson  
Mr. Norman Walton

**MPO Members Absent**

Mayor William Criswell  
Hon. Lorenzo Martin  
Mayor Jimmy Gardner  
Mayor Byron Pittman

**TCC/CAC Members Present**

Mr. Gerald Alfred  
Mr. Nick Amberger  
Mr. Matthew Lambert  
Mr. Jeff Zoghby  
Mr. Tom Briand  
Ms. Jennifer White  
Mr. Brian Harold  
Mr. Richard Spraggins rep Mr. James Foster  
Mr. John Murphy  
Mr. Ricky Mitchell  
Ms. Margie Wilcox

**TCC/CAC Members Absent**

Mr. Bert Hoffman  
Mr. Merrill Thomas  
Ms. Mary Beth Bergin  
Mr. Dennis Sullivan  
Ms. Jennifer Denson  
Ms. Casi Callaway  
Mr. Bob Harris  
Ms. Kim Sanderson  
Mr. Troy Wayman  
Mr. Fernando Billups  
Mr. Donald Watson  
Mr. David Rodgers  
Mr. Carl Butler  
Ms. Katherine Pitman  
Ms. Kellie Hope  
Mr. Donye Woodard  
Mr. Thomas Hughes  
Ms. Dianne Irby

**Guests:**

Mr. Daniel Driskell  
Mr. James Boyer  
Mr. Brad Lindry  
Mr. Ed Phillips

**Staff:**

Mr. Kevin Harrison  
Mr. Tom Piper  
Mr. Anthony Johnson  
Ms. Monica Williamson

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Stimpson.

The second item on the agenda was to approve the minutes of the May 23, 2018 MPO Meeting. Motion was made by Mr. Norman Walton with a second by Mr. Matthew Lambert. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the minutes of the June 27, 2018 TCC/CAC meeting. Motion was made by Mr. Jeff Zoghby with a second by Ms. Margie Wilcox. Motion was approved.

The fourth item on the agenda was the of SARPC requested correction to Designating the WAVE Transit as the Direct Recipient of FTA 5307, FTA 5339 Funds, Resolution 18-014.

Mr. Harrison said the first resolution in your folder is a correction. The Wave Transit requested to get a resolution from the MPO, actually, FTA requested that the WAVE Transit get a resolution from the MPO that they are the DR and at the last MPO meeting, I took that to mean as the Designated Recipient, not Direct Recipient. There is a difference so FTA asked that we request that. This resolution is nullifying that last resolution and it is just terminology. It is Direct Recipient rather than Designated Recipient. The City of Mobile passed Resolution 60-300 as the Direct Recipient of the FTA 5307 and 5339 funds, but I put the resolution as Designated Recipient. This is just a resolution correcting that error.

Motion made by Councilmember Rich to approve Resolution 18-014 with a second by Mr. Matthew Lambert. Resolution was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the Corrected Alabama Performance Management Agreement between the State of Alabama and the Mobile MPO.

Mr. Harrison said the next item on the agenda is another correction from the last MPO meeting on May 23<sup>rd</sup>. Y'all may remember we adopted a Performance Management Agreement with ALDOT. This agreement has been updated since the last MPO meeting. The only big difference and you will see in the first part of it; herein referred to as the State. This was the Alabama Department of Transportation. I think ALDOT's legal team got a hold of it and corrected all of the ALDOT's with the State. They've asked that we re-execute this agreement. One other thing that has been added is number 6 on page 5. By signing this contract, the contracting parties affirm, for the duration of this agreement, that they will not violate federal immigration law or knowingly employ, hire for employment, or continue to employ an unauthorized within the State of Alabama. This is a new agreement that we have been asked to execute. This has been advertised for a couple of weeks. It was reviewed with the TCC on June 27<sup>th</sup> and approved for recommendation.

Motion was made by Mr. Bryan Kegley to approve the agreement with a second by Mr. Norman Walton.

The next item on the agenda was the approval of the 2016-2019 TIP to include Performance Measures, Resolution 18-015.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder actually pertains to the agreement that any time after May 20<sup>th</sup> which you will find on section 4A and B of the agreement we just passed, the MPO will include the Performance Measures any time that the TIP is amended after May 20<sup>th</sup>. It is after that deadline. We

have amendments to the TIP today so we are modifying the Transportation Improvement Program to approve the performance measure terminology as per the agreement we just signed. This is actually, the resolution includes the verbatim of the text in the TIP. This is the TIP. It is a very fluid document. It is online. This is a copy of it. I've got several copies here if anybody is interested in having a copy but this is actually the language and it just says that the MPO will provide these performance measures as part of the TIP. This was reviewed with the TCC in June and advertised for a couple of weeks. The past four or five meetings, I have been over performance measures. If anybody has any questions, I will be happy to answer concerning the performance measures. Really, the safety, the MPO has no consequence for not meeting the targets annually. The State does have a consequence. If they don't meet the statewide targets, then they will have to use all of the safety money for safety projects. Right now, the State of Alabama is using 60% of the safety funds on safety and if these targets are not made throughout the state, then the state of Alabama will have to use 100% of the safety funds for safety projects. In terms of transit, I'm not sure of any consequences. This actually pertains to the State of Alabama. For the Wave Transit, we adopted these exact same performance measures at the last meeting. Y'all may recall at the last meeting, we had a performance measure resolution for the WAVE Transit that was identical to this. Assets, the pavement condition, bridges in good repair, those targets have not been set yet so we will have to come back and revisit this. The system reliability, those are going to be done by the state, but we will have to report them every year. About every August, you are going to hear from me about performance measures and targets and whether the state of Alabama has met them or not. That's what the agreement says that we just adopted that we will include this in our TIP, this resolution is including it into the TIP.

Motion to approve Resolution 18-015 was made by Mr. Norman Walton with a second by Mayor Downey. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was the approval of the 2016-2019 for Bridge Funds, a bridge replacement on SR-163 over Perch Creek, PE for \$870,000.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder, 18-016, is with bridge funds for the replacement of Perch Creek Bridge on DIP from mile marker 3.391 to 3.983 for \$870,000. This was actually done in April. This is really the reason why we are having a meeting a month after we had the last MPO meeting. This has a sense of urgency. They are ready to go on this project. The only thing required is MPO approval. I will say that when we reviewed this with the TCC/CAC on June 27<sup>th</sup>, we had about 10 citizens show up. Not really negative, but they wanted to know about the project. They were just interested in the project. Brian Aaron with ALDOT answered all the questions. They were just interested in what's going on with the project and really, I think when they redo the bridge, they have to get under it to inspect it. Edwin, I don't know if you want to go into the details of that, but all we are doing now is approving the funding for the engineering of the bridge. We don't any of that yet. This is just approving the funding for the bridge.

Motion was made by Mayor Williams with a second by Mr. Mitchell. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was approval of Resolution 18-017 to amend 2016-2019 TIP as requested by ALDOT with National Highway Funds for SR-158, utility work.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder, 18-017 is for National Highway Funds. You may recall at the last MPO meeting, we had a major cost increase on State Route 158 extension and it was up to \$30 million. This is actually going the opposite direction and anytime there is such a significant change, it requires the approval of the MPO. That's really what this is doing today. These are BP funds that are being used to do the 158 extension. It had a previous cost estimate of over \$30 million. Now the cost estimate is

just under \$200,000. The real reason is because it is being done with BP funds, but that cost estimate changed and requires approval of the MPO.

Motion was made by Mr. Kegley with a second by Mayor Downey. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was approval of Resolution 18-018 for modifying the 2016-2019 TIP with STP Attributable Funds as requested by the City of Mobile for Dauphin Street, Sage Avenue to Springhill Memorial Hospital for \$7,000,000.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution, 18-018, for Dauphin Street from Sage Avenue to Springhill. This is another cost increase. This is a STP Attributable Funds. This is the MPO money. The project previously had a cost estimate of \$3.3 million and now has a cost estimate of \$7 million in fiscal year 2019. The PE for this project is also already authorized. This cost estimate for the PE has gone up also. That was about \$300,000 and now is about \$700,000 added to that. Generally, it is about 10% of the construction, but because that is already authorized, this is going to be a carryover decrease which we will get to in our STP Attributable funds. Y'all may recall sometimes, our carryover funds from previous years just kind of fluctuates. That's where we are going to realize this \$700,000 being used on Dauphin Street. Who has that contract?

Mr. Amberger said Mott-McDonald.

Mr. Harrison said this really is just a cost estimate increase for the construction. Nick, I don't know if you want to go over what's changed in the project.

Mr. Amberger said in a nutshell, the project initially was not well received by the community. We went by and re-scoped it. We believe we got the issues resolved with the business owners along the corridor and worked with ALDOT on the interstate interchange part of it. We think we have a concept that's going to be very well received. It addresses pedestrians, bicycles, and all of the traffic needs there. What is unique about his one is that is really only one real estate component that we've got to deal with and we believe it is a very willing participant so we don't think the real estate is going to be the delay on this project so it should hopefully, upon City Council approval of the design contract, we should be able to move it forward to construction much quicker than a lot of these project do.

Motion was made by Councilmember Richardson with a second by Councilmember Rich. Motion was approved

The next item on the agenda was adoption of the FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program, Resolution 18-019.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution is 18-019. This is for the adoption of the Mobile MPO FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program. All the MPO members should have been mailed this document. It was distributed at the TCC/CAC meeting on June 27<sup>th</sup>. It is out for public review right now at 43 different places around the county and this is essentially our budget. I reviewed it with you last MPO meeting and the TCC prior to that. I do have copies if anybody needs a copy. Really the only thing that's different than last year is we've bumped up our task for the long-range plan which we will be working on this year and our freight planning which we are bumping up our freight planning in fiscal year 2019 as well. That's essentially the only difference. We get \$481,000 of federal PL funds. That really provides tasks for the four of us and we generally have about \$100,000 left in carryover which provides third party studies like the US 45 study that is underway right now. This is essentially our budget that I reviewed with y'all at the last meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Lambert with a second by Mr. Walton to approve Resolution 18-019. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was a brief presentation from ALDOT concerning Transportation Systems Management and Operations.

Mr. Harrison said we've asked Daniel Driskell from ALDOT to give a brief presentation on TSMO. This is the Transportation Systems Management and Operations for ALDOT. A lot of high-tech stuff going on and we asked Daniel to briefly talk to y'all about TSMO.

Mr. Driskell said good morning. My name is Daniel Driskell and I am the Southwest Region TSMO engineer. As Kevin just said that represents Transportation Systems Management and Operations. What is TSMO? It's a cross cutting approach where we look at everything possible to optimize existing infrastructure. One of those things I want to talk to you about today is the benefit of managing traffic signals. How many people in here like congestion? You just wake up in the morning and say I can't wait to go sit in traffic? Me either. How many people like paying taxes? I'm with you. I like to look at congestion as a type of tax. A tax on your time and in effect your money. In 2013, the average US commuter lost \$755 due to congestion. The average household lost \$1700 collectively. The US economy lost \$124 billion. I would say it's a pretty big problem. We realize it even here in Mobile. I recently took a trip to Atlanta and spend three days up there looking at some of the systems up there they are running and how they are managing their signals. There seeing really good benefits to managing their traffic signals in their city and supporting their transportation system that way. That's what we are talking about today, potentially hiring a traffic management consultant to over watch the signals. Just the operations of them so the maintenance responsibility would remain unchanged. Route jurisdictions would stay the same. There's a bit of equipment that would be needed to communicate with these signals, but once that equipment is in place, the management is pretty straight forward. Why would we want to do this? Because there is a lot of unused capacity on our roadways that improperly timed traffic signals are creating these problems. We need to provide for future growth. We want to increase efficiently and this type of application is going to give you 20% decrease on your travel times. We want to improve safety. We want to improve corridor operations. Part of it is constantly monitoring signals so repairs are going to happen faster when things break. We are going to improve reliability and erase jurisdictional boundaries. This is one of the big things that we see when you go from being in the county to being in a city and to being on a state route. A lot of times, the traffic signals operation differently and you don't know who to call when something goes wrong. when you have a company like this managing a corridor, they can erase those boundaries. Improve quality of life for residents. There are a lot of health benefits to improving congestion. There's obviously time and money saved. The benefit cost ratio are around 10 to 1 minimum compared to your traditional capacity projects which are around 2 to 1. And your time is priceless. To give you an idea of the economic impact of managing a corridor like Airport Boulevard, I just use that as an example, if we were going to manage Airport Boulevard from Schillingers Road to the Loop, it would consist of about 33 signals. Based on the average salary for Mobile County which is around \$16 per hour, if we increased efficiently on this section of Airport Boulevard, you could see a collective benefit of around \$ 6 million per year and for each person that would be over \$600 so that would be like a tax refund if you would. Benefit cost ratio for doing this segment would be around 15 to 1 and that doesn't include fuel savings and other things. Commercial impacts, businesses rely on vehicle travel. Congestion costs thousands of dollars to businesses every year. Inventory costs due to having to keep additional buffer stocked. Increased operating costs, who pays for that? We do every time we buy that products. We pay a tax on it resulting from congestion. Recent additions of Wal-Mart Distribution and Amazon, who's next? Just to give you an idea of some corridor management options if we were to do this, I think year one, a good deployment would be a couple of the

CIP projects that are already in the pipeline connecting all of the signals on Airport from McGregor to Sage and installing the equipment that would be necessary to do this type of project. Also, Dauphin Street. Those two corridors would be like low hanging fruit to do this on and I think you would see some benefits for low cost. Then a five-year plan could look something like this where you are managing around 200 signals and then you are making a significant impact city-wide. That's all I have today, if there are any questions.

Mr. Harrison said when you say managing signals, you mean a person is optimizing traffic flow on all those corridors?

Mr. Driskell said that's right. You would set a time like you want the signals managed from 7 am to 7 pm, a 12-hour day. You are going to pay a consultant to have someone watching that corridor and they are going to be responsible for x amount of signals. They are going to watch it. They are going to optimize it. If something changes, let's say there's a wreck. They will see that wreck. They can make changes on that corridor to help traffic to get around it. These are some of the problems that we see and I know several of you are probably familiar with terms like adaptive traffic signal systems. It's computer software that basically does the same thing. The problem is that software can't see into the future and it can't see problems as they happen. Managing it with people, with professionals that do this every day, is really the most bang for your buck that you can see.

Mr. Harrison said is this something that would happen with the new traffic management center that will happen with the bridge. Is this something that can house all of those corridors.

Mr. Driskell said that is the plan. As part of the scope of the Mobile River Bridge, there is a new TMC planned for that, that would be at the ALDOT office and there is enough room built into that TMC that we could house as many consultants as needed to do this county wide.

Councilmember Rich said when you are talking about consultants, are they individual entities or individuals working with ALDOT and cities are billed for their time? How do you envision the program?

Mr. Driskell said I envision the program to be under the MPO because that is an all reaching umbrella for Mobile County. That's the easiest way to do it. That's how I see the oversight of it, but there are traffic management companies that are consultant firms that only do this so they are specialized in it. There are several firms in Atlanta that are running their program. RTOP program is what it is called in Atlanta. They are seeing really good benefits up there and they are wanting to expand so they are looking at Birmingham and Mobile.

Mr. Harrison said do you know how the one in Atlanta is funded? We'd be happy to do this as a pass-thru on funds.

Mr. Driskell said it is hard to compare to Atlanta because they're managing 2500 signals or something like that. It's a huge amount and they spend around \$20 million a year so I think they have several pots of funding that are coming together. We are not talking about anything like that for Mobile. As part of their contract, they are actually doing maintenance of the signals as well so all of these signal contractors are working for the engineers so it's kind of an all-inclusive package whereas we are only talking about the management of the signals, the operations, keeping the maintenance where it is now because I think that is the best economic model

Councilmember Rich said I have another question about the companies. Do they have proprietary software that manages or are their technicians actually on the ground adapting signals?

Mr. Driskell said it is not proprietary. The main thing is having communications to get data back to them. Once they get that data back there are several public types of software they run. The main thing is having that person there that is managing it.

Mr. Harrison said which can operate more efficiently than any computer. We talked about that. I always envisioned it that a computer can optimize a whole corridor but not as efficiently as a person sitting there looking at it.

Mr. Driskell said as long as you are in the box, the computer system works pretty good, but as soon as you get out of the box, then it starts having problems. We saw this once we implemented our adaptive systems. We did one in Huntsville and one in Montgomery and one in Birmingham on 280. We had to have people assigned to 280, several people who only worked on that corridor because the computer system is not good on it. I won't say it was a waste, but it is not good in that instance.

The next item on the agenda was the review of the STP Attributable Funding Schedule.

Mr. Harrison said I asked Daniel to speak today because I want you to look at the bottom, the Congestion Management Process. This is \$500,000 a year. Really, eventually, Daniel was talking about installing equipment, this could be providing capital for some of those TSMO type projects. They can be identified under the MPO's congestion management process. Under any of these projects we can acquire the equipment being installed. That's why I asked Daniel to come today. This is y'all's money. The italics show changes since the last month. Some of them came yesterday. Yesterday, we had kind of a TIP working session. You will see the 2020 and 2021, those are the outer years of the TIP. We wanted to get together and start developing the 2020 to 2023. I want to thank everybody who showed up yesterday. I think we have a pretty good handle on it. You'll see the 2020, we are negative almost \$10 million and in 2021, we are negative \$10 million. I think we got a good handle on that yesterday. The first project that got moved out, the Zeigler Boulevard, Forest Hill to Athey, I think is scheduled for March 2019. Zeigler Boulevard, Cody to Schillinger, got pushed back to March 2019. The utilities for McDonald Road got pushed back to 2019. Some of this, I think has to do with the state perhaps may not have the ability for obligation authority this year. It's a rumor. I haven't heard anything in writing about it but this is the beginning of the last quarter of the fiscal year and it's possible that the obligation authority that the state has, has been used up. In other words, if the state has \$800 million a year, they can only spend \$800 million a year. What that means for the MPO, look at last year for 2017. We spent \$127,000 and in 2019, we've got \$50 million worth of the projects. So, Nick and the County, what we need to do is in the beginning of the fiscal year, we've got to have our projects ready to go to be let and I think that will prevent some of the obligation authority problems. If a project is ready to be let at the end of the fiscal year, it may not be let. It may not be authorized rather because of obligation authority. McGregor Avenue right of way had a slight cost estimate change. It is now \$2.3 million. The right of way for Zeigler, project 8, got pushed back to 2019 and under the Congestion Management Process, the Government Street Project had a recent cost estimate change as well. The engineering went up from \$60,000 to \$148,000 and the construction for that is \$476,000. I think the city is ready to go on that. Anyway, that's y'all money. If anybody has any questions on that, I will be happy to answer that.

The next item on the agenda was old business.

Mr. Harrison said old business, as y'all know, we've got a project underway, the US 45 Feasibility Study. I think it is going well. We had a public meeting at LeFlore High School on June 28<sup>th</sup> in the auditorium. Had a pretty number of people for a turnout. I've got brochures here. We had 70 people turnout. I want to thank Councilmen Fred Richardson and Levon Manzie for their help in this study. We've got two more public

hearings for the study. Volkert and Cern have been hired to do it. By the end of September, they will have for us recommendations and cost estimates. I think really the majority of US 45, they are looking at a road diet and they are getting public opinion on that now. Does anybody have any questions on 45?

The next item on the agenda was new business.

Mr. Harrison said under new business, we're creating a South Alabama Freight Forum which will be in about a month. I want to get all the trucking industries and the freight industries together in a room and talk about problems. See if we can develop projects from those problems and potential funding. We've got Brian Harold going to be participatory in that. He's doing a survey for us. Chris Watkins with Point Logistics, we are meeting with him tomorrow. I want to keep it to about 20 people and will probably meet twice a year. I want to find out where there are trucking problems, try to develop solutions and potential funding. At the same time, while we have everybody in the same room, we can talk about Water Street, present Water Street to them, present the I-10 Mobile River Bridge to the trucking and freight industry to see if they have any questions. If anybody wants to get involved in that, please see me.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, TCC

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, MPO

12/31/18  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

12/31/18  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date