

**Mobile Area Transportation Study
TCC/CAC Meeting
Wednesday, March 4th, 2020 10:00 a.m.
SARPC Transportation Department Office**

TCC/CAC Members Present

Mr. John Murphy
Ms. Kim Sanderson
Mr. Nick Amberger
Mr. Jason Wilson
Ms. Nancy Hewston
Mr. Frank Williams
Mr. Merrill Thomas
Mr. John F. Rhodes
Mr. Logan Anderson
Mr. Richard Spraggins
Mr. Ricky Mitchell
Mr. Edwin Perry
Mr. Dennis Sullivan
Mr. Jeff Zoghby
Ms. Jennifer White
Mr. Gerald Alfred
Mr. John Blanton
Mr. Jim DeLapp
Mr. Tom Briand
Ms. Shilo Miller
Ms. Marie York for Shayla Beaco

TCC/CAC Members Absent

Mr. Donald Watson
Ms. Margie Wilcox
Ms. Casi Callaway
Mr. James Jacobs
Ms. Essie Montgomery Johnson
Ms. Jennifer Denson
Mr. Bob Harris
Mr. Fernando Billups
Mr. Ted Flotte
Ms. Mary Beth Bergin
Ms. Christienne Gibson
Mr. Jason Franklin
Mr. Brian Harold

GUESTS:

Mr. Vince Beebe

STAFF:

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

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Rickey Rhodes.

The next item on the was to recommend approval of SARPC requested modification to the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program, FTA 5310 Funds, Resolution 20-006.

Mr. Harrison said we have a MPO meeting on March 25th. Right now, we only have two resolutions. These will go before the MPO. The first item is the FTA 5310 funds. Back in September we had a call for projects. We get about \$317,000 a year for FTA 5310. We had a call for projects. We have a committee that ranked all those projects. It is a competitive process. These are the projects that were awarded by the committee, but things at the FTA level take a little time. We are just now getting them into the system. The first one is Independent Living Center, a 14-passenger bus and one ADA compliant mini-van. That's \$81,000 federal. That's an 80/20 with a 20% match required on that. AltaPointe has been awarded four small 14 passenger buses that are ADA compliant for \$149,000. That is capital with a 20% match required. Via Health has been awarded one small ADA compliant bus, \$45,600. That's capital so a 20% match is required. City of Satsuma has been

awarded operating funds of \$31,675. That's a 50% match required. SARPC gets program administration, 10% of what has been spent and that's at 100% funding. These projects will go into the TIP. As soon as they are in the TIP, they will be ready to be awarded.

Ms. Williamson said it takes about two months to go through the FTA approval process once it's in the TIP.

Motion was made by Mr. Nick Amberger with a second by Ms. Jennifer White to recommend approval of Resolution 20-006. Motion passed with one abstention by Mr. Zoghby.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of the DRAFT Envision 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan, Resolution 20-007.

Mr. Harrison said this is the 25-year Long Range Transportation Plan. We do this every five years. The past couple of meetings, we've reviewed this with you. This is the actual plan. It's over 300 pages. We didn't send the hard copy to everyone. We sent you the link. It's online. I have several copies here if somebody really ones. We did have some MPO members that requested a hard copy. It's a draft. Building these documents this big, we're going to find errors. I found errors last night. Everybody has a copy of the Executive Summary which is the short version which I am going to review with you. The resolution is obviously on page 5. The first part, public involvement. These are the questions; these are the answers. If anybody wants a copy of our online survey, we had about 140 respondents. Some really good questions in here with a lot of good comments. A lot of them about the bridge. There is a word cloud in the executive summary that kind of shows what most of these comments are. These will be in the appendix of the document because this alone is 40 something pages. The actual comments will be in the appendix of the document. If anyone wants what the comments were, we have them right here. This was the early public involvement. We had a meeting on January 29th, public involvement meeting. We had about 40 people show up. The online survey was actually I think a more effective way of getting the information out there. The public meeting, we really had two written comments from that meeting. One was a bicycle advocacy comment. The other comment was these bike lanes are not justified. There's nobody on them so they kind of washed each other out. Any questions on the public involvement part of this? It kind of steered the plan. The environmental concerns, we do have a map that shows all the 4F properties, the flood plains, the schools and other areas, historic properties, all the federal guidelines we are supposed to be looking out for. Section E2 starts the plan summary. The performance measures, just about every other meeting we talk about performance measures. Those of you who have been to these meetings, you know that we have adopted the state's performance measures. In the plan will be the criteria and how we're doing terms of the targets and approaching those performance measures. Title VI of the Long Range Plan, all of the improvements, all of scenarios, we made sure that there was no disparaging travel times, that there was no increased travel time to the low income/minority populations to target areas like trip attracters, the malls, the hospitals, large job zones and none of these scenarios had a disparaging travel time. The bridge is not in here and when Anthony and I did the analysis, the bridge with a \$6 toll did have a disparaging time through Prichard up on 65. We've amended the document because the bridge is not in here. If the bridge does go back in here with a \$6 toll, there will be some added travel time to low income, minority zones because of 165. The toll diversion of everyone going up 165 that creates a lot of capacity that added travel time there. As of now, no bridge, there's no added travel time. Bike/ped, Tom you want to go over that.

Mr. Piper said we updated the plan to reflect all of the new trails that are under construction like Three Mile Creek. We've had a lot of things that have been built and we are trying to identify where they need to be connected so that we have a network and not just here and there. That was one of the main things we tried to do in this bike ped plan. There's a lot of planned projects that I think will tie them together.

Mr. Harrison said and those projects are listed in the summary and actually the bicycle/pedestrian part of that Long-Range Plan is pretty extensive. Public transportation as you recall, last long-range plan we had a Transit Development Plan done by a third party. This go around, we asked the Wave Transit to do it. Gerald Alfred put together our Public Transportation part of the Long-Range Plan, and Gerald I appreciate you doing that. Do you want to go over the section?

Mr. Alfred said we participated in the process and within this, the Wave is the public transit provider for the City of Mobile. We have a total of 13 routes that service the city. In this plan, it's broken up into two sections. There are five phases that we're proposing within the plan, but there's two sets of goals. The goals, short-term, some of things that we are addressing immediately is the airport. That has begun already along with the expansion of the Moda route including the GM&O building which historically we did not service. Those are some of the immediate needs that have been addressed with the plan. Along with that, we're going to add Tripper Services, some flex routes and ultimately the relocation of the transit hub itself. We're looking for a more centralized location in the next 20 years. For right now, all the buses are actually coming downtown to the GM&O building. We're looking to make it more centralized somewhere near the shops of Bel Air. Have all the buses come in and then go out. It will make more sense right now. Those are some of the things. If you have any questions, give me a call.

Mr. Harrison said the extensive plan is in the actual plan. It's pretty extensive in there also. Included with the transit part, the FTA 5310 which we talked about. Then also the Demand Response Transit Feasibility we are doing. We hired Via and Goodwin, Mills and Cawood. We've met with numerous stakeholders throughout the county. We're kind of developing a need right now and the funding scenario. We talked to ALDOT. There's a potential to use 5311 funds, rural transportation funds. Right now, there are 15 counties in the state that do not have rural transportation and we're one of them. The problem is Bayou La Batre is urban and there is potential we might be able to use some type of rural to get to Bayou la Batre. We met with the Lemoyne Citizens Advisory Panel. We're meeting with the corporations up 43 to hopefully get some subscriptions on 43. We can use that money to then match the federal funds. That study is going on in coordination with this. They highway facilities part, this is kind of the big one. If you go to page 25, we had a daily percent trip increase. This is all done through travel demand forecast modeling. It's pretty extensive in the Long-Range Plan and will be even more detailed in the appendix. Those of you not familiar, y'all run over the tubes, the traffic counters across the road, ALDOT does those for us. There's about 2400 around Mobile County. They did that in 2015 so we have a map of all the traffic counts for 2015. We've got a trip simulator, a traffic simulator. the input is households, number of employees for all these zones. The output is a simulated traffic. Once we match that up and it meets the 2015 traffic count, then we go back and forecast all that data. It gives a snapshot of what the traffic will look like in the year 2045. When we say 2045 E + C, that's existing and committed. If we don't build another from now until 2045, this is what the street network is going to look like. From 2014 to 2045, total internal trips is 10%, but if we add the external-external, those are folks going from Texas to Florida, Montgomery to New Orleans, it's about a 17% trip increase for the whole network. If you go to page 26, at the bottom, level of service, the capacity used in 2015, we had about 96 lane miles of level of service F. In 2045, existing committed, we had a 100% increase. We had 196 miles, but if we add the projects of the Long-Range Plan which we are about to get to, we had a major reduction in reducing the number of miles over capacity. From 2015 to 2045 with the projects of the recommended plan is about a 25% increase of number of lane miles of level of service F.

Mr. DeLapp said the count was in 2015. When will you another count?

Mr. Harrison said last month, every road, you should have run over tubes.

Mr. DeLapp said so for the next report, I guess you'll have a new number.

Mr. Harrison said they just did all of those counts for the next report. In fact, there are still counters out now that the state is doing. That data comes back to us.

Mr. DeLapp said so it's about every 4 or 5 years, you do an actual count.

Mr. Harrison said every five years.

Mr. Amberger said the big takeaway is that if we execute all these projects that we have with these attributable funds, in 30 years, we are still going to have 25% increase lane miles that are at level of service F.

Mr. Harrison said we don't have enough money to take care of all of it.

Mr. Amberger said yes, that's the point I was trying to make sure was heard.

Mr. Harrison said it's a lot better than 100%. If you go to the next page and look at the maps, 28 and 29, you can kind of visually see the red is level of service F. That means the volume of that road is over the capacity of the road. The projected volume, is over the current capacity of the road. If you look at that map and then look over to the projects of the Long-Range Plan, you can kind of see a correlation of where the projects are and where the need is. Are there any questions on the projects? They are kind of detailed in the table afterwards with the cost estimates. We've got about \$669 million worth of projects over the next 25 years. The MPO projects are about \$332 million. The state and other is \$254 million, and about \$82 million from Pay-as-You-Go. Of that \$332 million, one of the items messed up is the funding section in the Executive Summary. It's in the large document. The MPO has about \$276 million federal over the next 25 years. That equates to about \$345 million once the match is added to program. We've actually program \$332 million. There is some left over, but I don't know if we want as a committee to go ahead and decide to spend that. Any questions on the highway projects? This is a draft. This document, actually the big one is out at 43 different locations right now advertised that the public can come by and review the document. It's online and Federal Highway has already reviewed. ALDOT is currently reviewing it. Congestion Management Process, several years ago, we took \$500,000 federal from the previous section and carved it out for ITS, not right of way type projects. We kind of revamped on how we do the criteria. The new criteria is PM Peak speed to free flow speed, volume to capacity, and rear-end collision per mile. Page 35 shows what corridors are identified by the Long-Range Plan. It does identify three more sections: Moffett Road; Old Shell at South; and Airport Boulevard to Hillcrest are the next three sections that are awarded the \$500,000 for Congestion Management. Any questions on that?

Ms. White said we need to look at why Schillingers is not popping up on the map.

Mr. Harrison said I agree and you and I have talked about that. The way that we come up with the PM Peak speed and the free flow speed is through the NPMR data which used to be through HERE. Now it's provided by INRIX. INRIX has access to large data; Bluetooth, GPS, cell phone, you name it, they're going to try and grab that type of data. The speed is in five-minute increments. Every five minutes, you're given the average speed of the link on the road. Anthony has actually calculated all this for our network. We downloaded it for October 2015. It was 14 million records long.

Mr. Johnson said we did it for 2017.

Mr. Harrison said its huge data but what we're able to do from that data is calculate the actual, natural peak period from the speeds and the actual free flow from those speeds because we're given time of day and the average speed at five-minute increments. I don't know why Schillinger is not showing up in that data because it should be. In fact, there's others that should be as well.

Ms. White said yes, if that one's not showing up, then there might be others not showing up. We know that between Tanner Williams and Grelot, there's congestion issues.

Mr. Harrison said the identifier is 75% so if the free flow speed at 3 in the morning on Airport Boulevard is 45 miles an hour, then the peak period as defined by the natural peak, if it's 33 miles per hour, that's below 75% so maybe Schillinger, that peak is at 76 or 77%.

Mr. Johnson said it might not have as many rear end collisions per mile.

Mr. Harrison said any other comments or questions? Freight, there are some freight projects that came from the Port. They are listed in here. A big one that I would like to put a twinkle in Mobile's eye is a planned initiative to establish an inland port to move container cargo to go from the port to inland distribution, site undetermined. Did y'all look out the window yesterday? Did you see the huge ship? It was a massive container ship. When those containers hit our network, the rail, the

street. What they do at Hampton Roads, Virginia, the freight comes into Hampton Roads, they rail it to Front Royal, and then they put it on the trucks. It gets all the trucks off 95. I think we need to start looking at that now because there is nothing, we can do at 65. It is already way over capacity. We can't widen it. Being the terminus at I-10, there's not a whole lot we can do. What we can do is in the next 25 or 30 years, start thinking about how we can ship freight north and put it on trucks up there. That's at least mentioned in here. Then the climate change analysis is a regurgitation of last long-range plan. Air quality conformity, we are well below air quality standards for ozone and particulate at this point. That's the Executive Summary. It's a draft. It's a miracle that we got it out at this point. It's a large document. Please review it. Anyone who wants a hard copy of the big document, you're welcome to it. If anyone wants a copy of the survey results, you're welcome to it. There's no bridge in the Long-Range Plan. If you would like to, we can have a discussion on the bridge. I have a feeling it's going to come up at the MPO meeting. The Eastern Shore MPO passed a resolution supporting the Expressway idea. I don't think that's prudent to pass a resolution that ALDOT doesn't support. I think we need to work with ALDOT and any resolution that we support would have the blessing of ALDOT. Any discussion or thoughts?

Mr. Murphy said the Long-Range Transportation Plan can be amended.

Mr. Harrison said it can be amended. The bridge is actually in the big plan as a visionary element. It's a visionary project. It's on the wish list, but there's a lot of other projects on the wish list. Until the state legislature or the State of Alabama comes up with a funding scenario that ALDOT approves of, that we approve of, that the Eastern Shore approves of, we can modify this plan very easily and then put it into the TIP. As y'all know, in August, we tabled the bridge to put it into the TIP subsequent a meeting that didn't happen. In terms of Roberts Rules of Order, I don't know.

Ms. White said wouldn't it just automatically go into the TIP?

Mr. Harrison said well it was tabled.

Ms. White said I know, but if you never vote on it, I think under Roberts Rules of Order, it goes into effect.

Someone said it should be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Harrison said but it was tabled subsequent a meeting that didn't happen.

Mr. Piper said it still needs to be addressed at the MPO meeting.

Mr. Harrison said and I would love suggestions on how to address it.

Ms. White said you would either table it again and give a further out date to vote on it or you would have to have a different resolution regarding it if you are not going to put it into the TIP.

Mr. Amberger asked is there going to be a presentation to the MPO about what Baldwin County is presenting?

Mr. Harrison said I don't think so. Dr. Lou and Kevin Spriggs did its last meeting. The Eastern Shore supported that exact plan. That's great, but there's no way to fund it. Having the bridge tabled is now obsolete since it is not in the plan. It has to be in the long-range plan in order to be in the TIP. That motion to table, we might have to deal with it and say we take it off the TIP which is publicly not going to be very good in my opinion.

Someone asked do we need a motion to go ahead and just get rid of what we have tabled completely?

Mr. Harrison said I would like an open discussion on how to proceed with this.

Mr. Zoghby said do we put it into the plan, it just says being considered by the full MPO to cover ourselves?

Mr. Harrison said it's in the current long-range plan which ends the second this is adopted. The bridge is tabled to enter the TIP so the second this document comes into effect, it's no longer eligible to be in the TIP because it's not in this document.

Mr. Zoghby said can we add it to that document as a footnote somehow.

Mr. Harrison said we have a section on the bridge.

Mr. Piper said it has to be in the fiscally constrained portion in order to be in the TIP and it's not fiscally constrained because we don't have funding for it.

Mr. Amberger said I don't know that the Roberts Rules of Order police is going to come arrest any of us. We should probably just sit status quo until we get guidance from ALDOT of what ALDOT is going to embrace or not embrace. They might just say, you had your chance, we're going to wait and you are going to get through another election cycle which would be potentially another administration and that thing might take a whole new face. The prudent thing to do would be to probably sit right where we are.

Mr. Zoghby said so we need a motion on this plan and we're not going to change it. Then I make a motion on this plan with the caveat that we ask the SARPC attorneys to look into the issue that you asked you about.

Mr. Piper said I think we can postpone indefinitely. I think that's an option.

Mr. Zoghby said I just say check with our attorney so we know that we are covered.

Mr. Harrison said the reason that I bring this up is because that article when the Eastern Shore made their motion to adopt the plan, one of the reporters said and the Mobile MPO table their resolution. I don't want there to be any confusion about that. We'll ask our attorney about it, but perhaps we can just keep it tabled as an option.

Mr. Rhodes said as far as the motion for this resolution 20-007, do we want to include the caveat. Your motion was what Jeff?

Mr. Zoghby said just to approve it.

Motion to approve Resolution 20-007 was made by Mr. Zoghby with a second by Mr. Amberger. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was discussion of the Human Coordinated Services Transportation Plan.

Mr. Piper said every couple of years we have to update the Human Service Coordinated Transportation Plan. The last time we did it was 2017. We are in the process of updating that plan. That plan details funding for Elderly and Disabled like the 5310 program, JARC and New Freedom programs, but JARC is rolled into 5307 in the urban area and in the rural area 5311. New Freedom is rolled into 5310 now. It's been that way since Map-21. We're updating this plan. If you want to apply to the 5310 program, it has to be derived from this plan and you have to participate in the plan. We are having a meeting here on the 18th at 10:00 am. That's basically it. It's just a matter of getting the plan updated and adopted so it's current. We still have the same needs. There's not a whole lot of change it what it says.

Someone asked if a notice would be sent out on the meeting.

Mr. Piper said yes.

The next item on the agenda was old business. There was no old business.

The next item on the agenda was new business.

Mr. Harrison said under new business, those of you that look at my newsletter, the BUILD grant has been announced. It's a billion dollars. The deadline is May 18, 2020. Both TAP grants have been announced, the state and ours. May 15th is the deadline for both of those. The state has changed some of their regulations on the State TAP funds. No longer is it just municipalities. They've opened it up to other agencies. I think pedestrian signals are now eligible under that grant. That's big because those are expensive. I think they did this this year because it's a dual year award.

Mr. Amberger said let me make a recommendation. Anybody that might pursue one of those, if your project has a real estate need in it, I suggest you stay away from that. These projects typically take us about two years or longer to get running. When there is a real estate component, it's exponentially harder. They're going to ask you to sign documents that you are probably not going to be comfortable signing because you are not going to be able to find the deed from 1825 or this or the that. Just as a word to the wise, if you are pursuing something, I would recommend a clean project that does not have real estate. You can do it, but it will be a heavy lift and you will be reaching out to an external consultant.

Mr. Piper said our application, for the urban area, is electronic only now. Same way it was back in 2018.

Mr. Murphy said my understanding is ALDOT put a restriction that an agency cannot apply if they have not completed a previous project. Does your application have that restriction?

Mr. Harrison said no because we only have eight eligible applications.

Mr. Amberger said I recommend that applicants get their project designed completely where there's no real surprise in unit prices and stuff. If you've got an elected official with a line on a drawing saying I would like to put a sidewalk here, until that thing has been fully engineered, surveyed, and designed, you really do not have a good idea of what the true cost is going to be. You might apply linear foot cost to it and think you know, but I can guarantee to you with 100% of my life, you don't know. When you do that, you have bad realizations after you got the grant and everyone is happy, then elected officials are made because you are not executing it in a timely manner. The advice is stay away from real estate, but most of the time you are not going to know there is real estate until it is fully designed. Get it designed, find out if you have real estate issues and think of the grants as extra money. If you approach it any other way, you, your staff and elected officials are going to experience pain.

Mr. Harrison said there is an applicant that was awarded a \$190,000 and the new cost estimate was \$370,000.

Mr. DeLapp said we've looked at some of these BUILD recently. We found that a lot of those were well over budgets.

Mr. Harrison said now, this municipality has a real problem. It was \$190 and now its \$370 so what do they do? Do they shorten the project? They've got a real situation.

Mr. Piper said you can shorten the scope of work as long as you stay within the original project limits.

Mr. Amberger said with ALDOT, you have to have a right of way map. With our own funds, we may encroach a little and go on, but you have to do correctly with ALDOT. Those projects are a little more 65/35 as opposed to 80/20.

Mr. Piper said the state is only accepting one application per entity, but with ours you can submit as many as you want.

Mr. Harrison said this was supposed to be under old business, but in your folder, you have this 11 by 17. I want to update everybody on where the MPO money is. If you recall, at the last meeting, the Zeigler Boulevard, project 1, Forest Hill to Athey, had a large cost increase and we had to move some projects out. That's why project 4 has utility and construction moved out. However, if you look down at the carryover in italics, \$49,374,000, that went up from last meeting by about \$1.6 million. If you recall, at the last meeting, we had spent all of this but about \$4,000. We've had a cost increase, that was the Schillinger Road project, I think. They are closing that project out and we had an increase in carryover. Rarely, sometimes it does happen, but we had an increase in carryover so now instead of a \$4,000 balance, we have a \$1.6 million balance. I don't suggest we program something there right now because we're going to lose it.

Mr. Amberger said Zeigler is scheduled to be let in May of this year. We've still got an issue with the railroad of signing a document. If anyone knows anyone from Canadian National that's the top of the food chain, let us know. Try to avoid projects that have railroad in them also. That's another good thing to avoid. It's added three years to this project. Getting them to sign a real estate document and subsequent agreement for a signal, it complicates it when there is federal funds involved so that's been the delay. Currently, pending one signature from one executive vice president, this Zeigler project will be let in May.

Mr. Harrison said the right of way Zeigler, Tanner Williams to Schillinger, project 6, is also scheduled to be let in May and then the Celeste Road, from 65 to Forest right of way, I think is scheduled for September.

Mr. Spraggins said Zeigler, number 6, is not going to be let in the next two years. It may not even start in right of way yet.

Mr. Harrison said the right of way is scheduled in May.

Mr. Spraggins said you've got it in 2019?

Mr. Harrison said it was first done in 2019. It's in 2020, but it was first scheduled in 2019. You may remember, we had discussion it should be noted where some of these first started so that's what that number means. The parenthetical year next to the project.

Mr. Amberger said this is a conversation for the group. ALDOT has changed the way they do the real estate acquisition. The local agencies are in charge of that. What that means is, what it has meant for the City of Mobile is that ALDOT has wanted us to front fund the real estate acquisitions only to get reimbursed on the back side so if we've got to go buy a piece of property that is \$100,000, we've got to go buy it for \$100,000 that would have our 20% in it, and then only request to get that 80% reimbursement. In the past, they would only invoice us for 20%. In theory, they're holding a whole pot of 100% so if those cost overran, it would get absorbed and at some point, 5 or 10 years later, they would send an invoice for that remaining balance. They are doing some things to control their costs which is smart on their part, but you as a recipient agency, it puts a little bit more of a burden on you to physically have the dollars when you go to your accounting department and say cut this check for a closing. I wanted ALDOT to here that because those processes have made it more difficult for the end user, but them collective as a group needs to hear it because if you got real estate, and I know it's primarily the county, you just need to be prepared to fully fund all of those exercises and then get reimbursed in the back. If it overruns, you will be coming back to this group saying I no longer need a \$1,880,000, I need \$4,880,000. Just be aware of that. It's a little different.

Mr. Harrison said they've also shortened the time to close these projects out, five years, I think.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

Chairman, TCC

Date _____