

**Mobile Area Transportation Study  
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)  
Technical Coordinating/Citizens Advisory Committee (TCC/CAC) Meeting  
Wednesday, October 31, 2018 10:00 am  
SARPC Boardroom**

**MPO Members Present**

Mr. Bryan Kegley  
Ms. Jennifer White rep. Hon. Bess Rich  
Mayor Tom Williams  
Mayor Terry Downey  
Mr. Mike Black Rep. Mayor Howard Rubenstein  
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  
Mr. Dennis Sullivan rep. Hon. Byron Pittman  
Hon. David Baker

**MPO Members Absent**

Mayor William Criswell  
Hon. Lorenzo Martin  
Mayor Jimmy Gardner

**TCC/CAC Members Present**

Mr. Gerald Alfred  
Mr. Nick Amberger  
Mr. Mike Black  
Mr. Jeff Zoghby  
Mr. Jason Wilson  
Ms. Jennifer White  
Mr. Merrill Thomas  
Mr. Richard Spraggins rep Mr. James Foster  
Mr. John Murphy  
Mr. Ricky Mitchell  
Ms. Margie Wilcox  
Mr. Dennis Sullivan

**TCC/CAC Members Absent**

Mr. Bert Hoffman  
Mr. Tom Briand  
Ms. Mary Beth Bergin  
Mr. Brian Harold  
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  
Ms. Dianne Irby

**Guests:**

Ms. Edith Louden  
Ms. Lula Albert

**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 July 11, 2018 MPO Meeting. Motion was made by Mr. Norman Walton with a second by Mr. Vince Calametti. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the minutes of the October 17, 2018 TCC/CAC meeting. Motion was made by Ms. Margie Wilcox with a second by Mr. Jeff Zoghby. Motion was approved.

The fourth item on the agenda was the approval of Bridge and Pavement Performance Measurement (PM2) Targets, Resolution 19-001.

Mr. Harrison said the first resolution in your folder is 19-001. This is the last of the performance measures adoption that you'll see. Those that have been a part of this process know that we have adopted safety performance measures, we've adopted system performance measures and those are all based on travel time. The Wave Transit, I think last time, we adopted the Transit Asset Management Plan which is a performance measure so this is PM2 Bridge and Pavement. The safety was PM1, system performance is PM3 and now the bridge and pavement is the final performance measure. These performance measures are statewide. These performance measures were actually calculated by ALDOT. There are really three of them. There's NHS Bridges in good condition and poor condition. There's interstate pavement in good and poor condition and then there's non interstate national highway system roads in good and poor condition. For the bridges, the condition grade is based on the National Bridge Inventory, condition rating for bridge deck, bridge super structure and bridge substructure and culvert. It says that the good condition is 28.4% and no more than 2% in poor condition is the performance measure target. For interstate and non-interstate, they started in January of this year, ALDOT started collecting the following metrics which is the internal roughness index, rutting and cracking percentage and faulting. For the interstate in good condition greater than 50% is the target in year 2021. Poor condition less than 5%. The non-interstate is greater than 40% this year and in 2021 and in poor condition no less than 5% in 2019 and 2021. ALDOT already collects all this data and as I understand it just like the system performance measures, there's no consequence for not meeting these targets yet. We don't know what the next Federal Transportation Bill will have in it concerning performance measures, but right now, safety as I understand is the only performance measure that has any real consequence which is right now, ALDOT is spending about 60% of the State safety funds on safety projects. If they don't meet the PM1 which is safety then they'll have to spend 100% of the safety money on safety type projects. We have to adopt these and then from now on, we have to report the PM1, PM2, PM3 and the Transit Asset Management Performance Measures in all of our TIP's which is the Transportation Improvement Program and our Long Range Plan which actually we will get on the agenda today. We reviewed this at the October 17<sup>th</sup> TCC Meeting and it was properly advertised out for the public.

Ms. Wilcox said I have a question. We have projects that are coming up, is there a way to include this information?

Mr. Harrison said these projects pertain to the overall system in the TIP so there's language in the TIP that basically says all of our projects work towards these goals. The individual projects, metrics, how they work towards the goal, I don't think there's going to be actual metrics for that if that's what you're asking.

Ms. Wilcox said we have a current project and we already graded some of them, but if there's a ways to add a column of how that particular bridge scored. Are they scoring each individual bridge?

Mr. Harrison said I don't think so. ALDOT does, yes. ALDOT has part of the bridge inventory I think. They already collect some of this.

Mr. Calametti said yes. We score bridges on multiple items. Deck service is one, super structure is one, piling, settlement, bridge approaches. Those are all scored on each bridge.

Ms. Wilcox said so you don't give the grade ahead of time so this body can consider it in their minutes, is there a way to make sure that the engineer attending this meeting can bring that up as we vote on these projects in the future?

Mr. Calametti said as Kevin said, it's really two different scoring. These standards are based on state standards, but I think is the question, yes...The question if this bridge is replaced will it help make this goal. Yes, ALDOT can supply that information at the TCC meetings.

Ms. Wilcox said but even we are voting and prioritizing projects, I think that would be a good thing to know what that particular scored in case something needs to be pushed back.

Mr. Harrison said right, but the problem with that is, for example, the McFarland Road Extension, that's a new alignment. We're not going to have any metrics on a bridge that doesn't exist yet so that's going to be problematic.

Ms. Wilcox said I understand that, but when we do others that come up, I think it's good useful information.

Mr. Calametti said sure.

Mr. Harrison said system wide, it will be in all of our documents from now on.

Motion was made by Mr. Dennis Sullivan to approve Resolution 19-001 with a second by Semmes Mr. Baker. Motion passed unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the Amendment of the Destination 2040, Long Range Transportation Plan, Resolution 19-002.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder actually pertains to the attached amendment which ya'll were mailed. Y'all were mailed actually a bigger copy. This has been vetted through Federal Highway Administration and ALDOT Montgomery. They had quite a few comments on it and some of these sections are summarized. We had I think probably too lengthy of an amendment so they vetted it and gave us comments to reduce it. Why do we need to amend the Long Range Plan? Y'all don't have this, but this is the AASHTO Practitioners Handbook. Under fiscal constraint and I tell you this because in March of 2015 when we adopted this Long Range Plan, tolling the I-10 Mobile River Bridge was not a financial commitment so the Long Range Plan has to be a fiscally constrained document. When we adopted it we had Federal Highway approval to adopt the Long Range Plan as fiscally constrained without the financial commitment really for the bridge. Now that we know the bridge will be tolled, the NEPA guidelines suggest that Federal Highway Administration will not issue a NEPA decision document for a project in a Metropolitan Area unless that project included in the fiscally constrained Metropolitan Transportation Plan which is our Long Range Plan. In essence, fiscally constraint is a finding that's projected revenues are sufficient to cover the projected costs of the projects in the plan. The guidance recognized that toll revenue can be considered one source of revenue to satisfy fiscal constraint requirements. The need to make fiscal constraint determination made require projections to be made regarding anticipated toll revenues in the Long Range Transportation Plan. Tolling wasn't a financial commitment when we adopted so what we are doing today is we are amending the Long Range Plan for tolling specifically for the I-10 Mobile River Bridge. We're actually working on our next Long Range Plan. We are forecasting the socio-economic data for 2045 now. It is due March of 2020. I just want to review some of this. Y'all were mailed the full document. This has been somewhat summarized. If y'all could turn to page 5, table 1.1, the cost of the construction is \$1.1 billion. That's in the Mobile Urban Area only. The Eastern Shore MPO has

to do the exact same thing we are doing today. Utilities is \$10 million and PE is \$51 million. 1.2.1 Public Private Partnership is new on page 6. 1.2.2 Tolling on page 6, tolling, capacity, Title VI and bicycle pedestrian are new. I'm going to get to all of those in just a second. That's really the three items of the whole long range plan that as changed. The capacity portion for highways, the Title VI which is the environmental justice and the bicycle pedestrian. Performance measures since we are amending the long range plan, we have to include the performance measures which are on page 7 and 8. This is now included in the long range plan and will be in more detail in the March 2020 Long Range Plan when it is adopted, but those are the safety, the PM1, the transit which is the Transit Asset Management Plan, the assets which is what we just adopted for pavement condition and bridge and then the system performance that we adopted last meeting. If y'all can turn to page 13 in the document, Table 2-2. The bridge was in the Long Range Plan so the number of lane miles is not changed. The network still remains the same. What has really changed is the toll which changed the traffic. If you turn to page 14 and 15, this is based on our analysis. This is not based on ALDOT's analysis. You can see with the toll on the graphic on page 14, the Cochrane Causeway will be at capacity as compared to not having a toll in year 2040. A lot of that traffic is deferred to the Causeway and Cochrane Causeway up Bay Bridge Road and actually some of it goes down 65 which is evident between 45 and Moffett Road is now at capacity. Some of the metrics on page 15, table 2-4.

Mayor Williams said can I ask you a question. The first time that I was aware that the George Wallace Tunnel would have a toll, I heard Mike Lee speak to the Saraland Chamber recently and that was the first time that I had heard that mentioned. To me, and your talking about the Causeway here, that in my mind would greatly increase the causeway traffic if both the bridge and the Wallace Tunnel have a toll. Is there any plan to really make some appreciative changes to the Causeway as this project moves forward?

Mr. Harrison said I think there are and Vince, you might want to speak to that.

Mr. Calametti said there are. We have, once the Causeway gets to certain performance measures, we have access management, we have traffic signals that will help facilitate traffic there at mid-bay. We have potential traffic signals probably at the Battleship. We have access management that will help facilitate movement through, make it more efficient so that's built into the contract and the overall NEPA document that we'll make these improvements. Similarly on Cochrane Bridge, Baybridge Road, Papermill Road, we have made commitments to improve that through access management areas.

Mayor Williams said in my mind, I can just see a large increase of traffic in that area and of course it's has really popular restaurants and other businesses along that stretch. I personally prefer to take the Causeway as the Bayway. If traffic stops, at least I can get out of my car and get on the shoulder of the road.

Mr. Calametti said and I think that is what our study showed and what Kevin's study showed also. That's all been taken into account.

Mr. Harrison said some more of the metrics on page 15, some of the number of lane miles over level of service D changed, principal arterials went significantly higher with the toll due to the length of the Cochrane Causeway is really what that is. Page 17 shows some of the cost estimates in the actual bridge. The actual number of projects didn't change on page 16. If I can get into page 21, this is the Title VI. The travel time changed really to and from the Bayway and Causeway and this was about a 30 page thing that Anthony and I worked up that Federal Highway made some comments and had us summarize, but essentially there is an insignificant travel time discrepancy to the low income minority traffic analysis zones compare to all the other zones. We have compared travel time to major trip generators, hospitals, reatail centers to those traffic analysis zones that are low income, minority traffic zones compared those travel times to all other zones and there is no real significant travel time disparities. That's essentially what the Title VI of the environmental justice section does. When we adopt the plan in March of 2020, we now have more definitive bicycle/pedestrian facilities part. Tom, do you want to talk about that?

Mr. Piper said on page 25 is the section that talks about bike-ped facilities. As part of the original plan and this board adopted a resolution several years ago that said the MPO supports putting facilities on the bridge unless it's deemed unfeasible. Then, they recommend a crossing over the river, river improvements to get bike-ped across the Mobile River. That was basically all the plan originally said. Now that we have a lot more information, this goes into a little more detail. In the bid package ALDOT is working out for the concessionaires, it includes a belvedere on the bridge which basically there will be an elevator on the western side of the bridge and there will be an overlook, that's what a belvedere is. Also, not in the bid package, but concurrently ALDOT is committed to building bike ped facilities on the Cochrane Bridge basically from along Baybridge Road from 165 to the east end of the bridge. Those will be built at the same time but not through the bid package, not through the concessionaires but by ALDOT. Then, there will be connections from here, from Broad Street up to Baybridge Road and then from the east end of the bridge down to the Battleship. That's something that ALDOT is committed to doing with the help of local municipalities and other agencies. Also as part of the bid package that ALDOT is putting out, there are value-added options. Those value-added options are to if it's deemed financially feasible to include bike-ped facilities all the way across the new bridge and another value added option is an elevator on the eastern side of the river so that you go up the elevator on this side, go across the belvedere, the belvedere would be longer and you could get in the elevator and go back down on the east side of the river. That would be another river crossing that way, but those are options that are not set in stone. That's basically what this section of the plan says and there's a map on page 27 that shows where all those things are.

Mr. Harrison said at the TCC/CAC meeting, we discussed this a pretty good bit and we had an idea on this yellow part right here, this path, Tom and I were thinking out loud what a great idea it would be to have this bike path come out of the delta over those levees there. We were told that was a bad idea. We were told there were some hazardous materials there and the cost is probably not a good idea. We thought it was a good idea and it would be a destination path. All these changes will go into the new plan which is due March 2020 which probably this spring we are going to start the public participation process for the new Long Range Transportation Plan.

Motion was made by Mr. Nick Amberger with a second by Mr. Dennis Sullivan. Motion passed unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was to the approval of ALDOT requested projects in the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with Demonstration Funds; I-10 Mobile River Bridge Project, Resolution 19-003.

Mr. Harrison said Resolution 19-003 is a request from ALDOT. It says demonstration funds. I think that is really just a funding category. This will have federal, state and concessionaire funds. This fiscal year. This was a request by ALDOT. We just included this cost estimate in the Long Range Plan and that's for construction for \$1.1 billion and utilities for \$10 million. In order for them to spend any money, it has to be in the TIP first and that's what we're doing today. This was also advertised and discussed at the October 17<sup>th</sup> TCC/CAC meeting. Vince, do have the timeline on this, on the ROD or the FEIS, is that December or February?

Mr. Calametti said the interchange modification report has been approved which was huge. The Record of Decision and the EIS, there's meetings actually going on today with FHWA to finish up the comments on that.

Mr. Harrison asked is that one document?

Mr. Calametti said the draft EIS and the ROD will be one document.

Mr. Harrison said the final rule came out Monday for that.

Mr. Calametti said we are looking at end of January, first of February Record of Decision. From that Record of Decision, we will be able to put out our final request for proposal. That's about a three month, four month process. That's the time frame all three concessionaires will be doing their final design, coming up with their final cost. That puts us in a summer 2019 timeframe to sign an agreement with the concessionaire. So that's summer. We will actually

have a contract signed, then they have a three or four month process that they have to have a financial close. That's where they got to go get their money. In that three or four month period, there will be an early works program. Early works absolutely will be design, but it will be utility relocation. It's items that they know they have to do. They are doing a quite of bit of design right now. That correlates to this summer 19 dates. Full construction will start first part of 2020. I should mention that there is a process where we will have to go to the Toll Authority to validate everything that I just described. That is the contracting authority.

Mayor Stimpson asked Vince, do you have any indication of where construction starts?

Mr. Calametti said we are all learning a lot about this. Construction will start everywhere.

Mayor Stimpson said kind of like the Pensacola Bridge?

Mr. Calametti said exactly. I had an opportunity to attend the MPO meeting in Florida with Director Cooper and I purposefully drove him back through that project because I wanted him to understand it's a much shorter project than this. It's probably three or four miles. I counted 20 large cranes. I think this is going to be a huge undertaking and it's going to be everywhere.

Mayor Stimpson said if you haven't that Pensacola Bridge project, it's pretty amazing. Just go by and look at it. Get you an idea.

Mr. Calametti said one of the things we have done is we have done a tremendous amount of geotech Work on the Bayway. That will do two things. It will cut down on the concessionaire's uncertainty as far as geotechnical is always an issue. Then that will give them a leg up on the design of the Bayway. They'll know a lot of what they can get going. I think that is going to be one of the very first actions is a lot of Bayway work.

Motion was made by Mr. Bryan Kegley with a second by Mr. Nick Amberger to approve Resolution 19-003. Motion passed unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was the approval of ALDOT requested projects and modification in the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program, with Interstate Maintenance Funds, Resolution 19-004.

Mr. Harrison said Resolution 19-004 is Interstate Maintenance Funds. These are funds spent at the state's discretion. The TIP that four year program of projects is 2016 – 2019. Anytime there is a project deleted or added, it requires this planning process. It requires to go before the TCC and then y'all. That's really what we have here today. There was some I-10 East Tunnel Interchange Bridge Bearing Rehab projects. Y'all may remember those. Those went before you about a year ago I think and they are now requesting to be deleting. There is a new resurfacing project on 65 north of 43 to 225 in Baldwin County and then the PE for it. So those are both new projects and then the lighting rehab project along the Bayway is being deleted from that four year program of projects. Any time there is a shuffle like that, it requires action of the board and actually the next couple of resolutions are about the same thing.

Mayor Stimpson said the deletion of those, the West Tunnel Interchange, is that just going to be picked up somewhere else in the bridge project?

Mr. Calametti said yes, the free flowing ramps will be removed. We'll go back with West Tunnel Interchange design so those projects are just being deleted.

Motion was made by Mayor Tom Williams with a second by Mr. Bryan Kegley to approve Resolution 19-004. Motion was approved unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was to approve ALDOT requested projects and modification in the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with National Highway Funds, Resolution 19-005.

Mr. Harrison said Resolution 19-005 these are National Highway Funds again spent at ALDOT's discretion. There is a new project which is the PE for the Mobile River Bridge Project. That's being funded with National Highway Funds this month, this fiscal year. The second project is kind of a shuffling of funds. Any time there is a major cost estimate change, generally the cost estimate goes up. In this particular case, the cost estimate is going down, but I think that's because of the BP funds interjected into this project which is the 158 Extension, Lott Road Overpass and Jug Handle which y'all remember two MPO meetings ago, that project was also introduced with the BP funds. That added cost estimate of \$32 million, the new cost estimate is \$20 million. Any time there is a significant cost estimate change, it requires the planning process. Then we have two new projects. This is the resurfacing on 98 from Magnolia Grove Parkway to Stimpson Lane and then the resurfacing of 163 from the south end of Dog River Bridge to the south end of the I-10 overpass for \$2.5 million. Those are both new projects. These were reviewed with the TCC/CAC on the 17<sup>th</sup> and properly advertised as well.

Mayor Williams said on the 158 project, what changes were made on that to lower the estimate?

Mr. Harrison said it was actually the BP funding, I think which is the next resolution. Is that right, Vince?

Mr. Calametti said yes, some BP and some scope changes. Construction costs have gone up considerably over the past 3, 4, and 5 years. We're just re-scoping to stay within our overall corridor costs for that. Nothing that effects any kind of roadway capacity. Just finding ways to cut costs.

Motion was made by Mr. Bryan Kegley with a second by Mr. Nick Amberger to approve Resolution 19-005.

Mayor Stimpson asked if there were any further discussion.

Mr. Calametti said I would like to mention on the Dog River Project, I think it's from Rogers Road to the south end. That's a five lane section. There's not a lot of traffic in that area so ALDOT is re-purposing some of the pavement so we will have a three and four lane section in there, but were also putting dedicated bike paths. That will tie into the Perch Creek project. The city received a grant. ALDOT is kicking in about \$3.5 million. The Perch Creek Bridge will be raised. Right now, the girders are in the water. It will be raised. With the raise, it will facilitate kayaks and also have dedicated bike path on it. It will tie into this project and that will be a good partnership between the City and ALDOT.

Motion to approve Resolution 19-005 passed unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was the approval of ALDOT requested project modification I the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with BP Funds, Resolution 19-006.

Mr. Harrison said Resolution 19-006 in your folder, this is again some more of that shuffling of funds. This is not a new project, but is being funded with BP funds. The 158 extension from Glenwood Road west to Lott Road for \$31 million. This project has already been authorized but it needs MPO approval to move forward. We want to thank your local legislator for making this project possible with BP funds.

Motion was made by Mr. Nick Amberger to adopt Resolution 19-006 with a second by Mr. Bryan Kegley. Motion passed unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the Mobile MPO requested project modifications in the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with STP Attributable Funds, Resolution 19-007.

Mr. Harrison said 19-007 in your folder is the STP Attributable Funds. That's y'all's money. There is no new projects here. It's a new fiscal year and we are trying to remain fiscally constrained so we are shuffling around projects. Any time a project gets moved from 2019 outside of 2019 requires the approval of the MPO. That's really what we are doing today with the exception of the first two projects. Zeigler Boulevard from Forest Hill to Athey and Zeigler Boulevard, Cody to Schillinger, those are both scheduled this fiscal year. We've got some new cost estimates on those and those are pretty significant cost estimates that require approval of the TCC and approval of the MPO. The first cost estimate, the old cost estimate was \$13.7 million. That new cost estimate is now \$17.6 million. Zeigler from Cody to Schillinger had a \$4 million cost estimate. The new cost estimate is \$9.4 million. The rest of the projects are really projects getting moved outside of the four year program. The majority of these are either getting moved into Fiscal Year 2021 or Fiscal Year 2020. The first is Dauphin Street, the utilities and construction, that project is being moved from Fiscal Year 2019 to 2021. Three Notch Road, additional lanes from Schillinger to McDonald, both the right of way and utilities is getting moved from Fiscal Year 2019 to 2021. Utilities being moved to 2022. The new alignment on McFarland Road from Old Pascagoula to Three Notch, the right of way was 2019, now is next Fiscal Year in 2020. The utilities for McGregor from Airport to Dauphin Street have a target date of December 1, 2018, now it is November 2019. That is Fiscal Year 2020 so it requires y'all's approval for both construction and utilities. If anybody has any questions concerning these projects, Nick is here with the City, cost estimates or anything like that.

Councilmember Richardson said I have a question. Is this the second time we moved this?

Mr. Harrison said which project is that?

Councilmember Richardson said Dauphin.

Mr. Harrison said the first time we requested to move it outside, it was tabled and we did not move it. I think y'all repurposed Dauphin Street to the project it is now. That \$7 million actually, the construction was \$3 million, but it's being moved out and we've added \$4 million to it. It's now a \$7 million project. It is the second time it has hit y'all to be moved and I don't think, Nick, I don't know, the timeline we don't have a choice.

Mr. Amberger said this is one that is actually right on track. What's happening later next week, we have a kind of kickoff meeting with ALDOT Local and ALDOT Montgomery to start the scoping. If you recall, the City Council passed the design contract a couple of weeks ago. There was a Dauphin Street project several years that the design didn't get off the ground. This is the one that we believe will be successful and the community is going to accept the design for it.

Councilmember Richardson said it is rare and seldom that any project coming on this agenda dealing with the roadways east of I-65, we have 200,000 people in this City. 100,000 live west of I-65 and 100,000 east of I-65. Finally we got a segment here east of I-65 and we keep pushing it and pushing it. [INAUDIBLE] It's time to focus on the citizens. You try driving Dauphin Street to Sage Avenue. You crawl and you crawl and you crawl trying to get past the interstate. I am opposed to putting this off another second, let alone to 2021. I just want to register my opposition. Most of what you vote on, none of it is east of I-65. We have been obligated, we have been wiped out for all those issues we have with the roadways east of I-65. Sage Avenue, same thing. We can't get no funding. We finally got this little segment. Look what we're paying for Zeigler Boulevard.

Mr. Harrison said that Zeigler project has been moved. Every year, we move that project further and further. Dauphin Street's not the only one getting pushed back. All of this is the federal process. It takes a long time to get these federal projects done. Zeigler Boulevard is a prime example of that. That has been in the past two TIP's and it keeps getting pushed further and further. It was actually scheduled for March, now it's scheduled for May and I think we are finally about to get it started. We understand your pain, but it's the process.

Mr. Amberger said I would like to add that I hope the Councilmember will recognize the aggressive schedule, the 2021. This is realistically from starting design to potential construction when most of these projects have been upwards of 10. This Dauphin Street project is unique in that the right-of-way almost entirely exists. There's not a right of way acquisition process to go through so I think we will see that project very, very quickly, but it does, it's dealing with the interstate overpass where we will be coordinating with ALDOT. It does have a lot of coordination on the design but I will tell that is an extremely aggressive, but realistic, deliverable. I hope you can appreciate that.

Councilmember Richardson said I will close out by saying, I'm asking for preferential treatment because of systemic [inaudible] over a long period of time off the citizens east of I-65 can't even get a project on this agenda. Please, can this project get on the agenda, no more pushing it away, no more shoving it back. Let's go.

Mr. Kegley said I might add that our office is working with Nick Amberger's office and the funding that you see here, that \$7 million is in the upcoming pay-as-you-go program to be voted on this November 6<sup>th</sup>. Will the approval of the 2018 pay-as-you-go program that funding will be available to the city.

Mayor Stimpson said very good. Without the money it doesn't work.

Motion was made by Mr. Nick Amberger with a second by Mr. Dennis Sullivan to approve Resolution 19-007. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Harrison said the next item on your agenda requires no resolution. It is the review of the STP Attributable Funding Schedule. This is the 11 by 17 folded paper. It is the last item in your folder. This is the draft. This is not the 2016-2019 TIP. This is a draft and I say that because this project here, number 10, Celeste Road from I-65 to Forrest Avenue, has not entered the TIP yet. It has not been voted on by the TCC and has not been voted on by the MPO. We had a TCC sub-meeting in August to draft the new TIP. That project was introduced by Saraland. They would like to move on it in 2019 with the PE. That process is getting started. You will see that project again this fiscal year entering the TIP for PE in 2019. Before we do that, you will a blank box. We will have to get a committee to score that project as it compares to all the other projects, but you will see on project 1 and 2, these are the new cost estimates. In the year 2019, this we've got \$35.5 million worth of projects being done. I asked the city, the obligation authority for the state ran out pretty early. If we get these projects done, the earlier the better. I'm afraid at the end of the fiscal year, ALDOT may not have the obligation authority. We've had that fear in the past and \$35 million considering we can only program \$10 million, we want to make sure those projects are done as soon as possible. I also want to point out, in 2018, you'll notice that there is \$11 million instead of \$9.6. That is part of the appropriations act of 2018. President Trump signed into law and the \$1.38 million was apportioned to the MPO. That just went back into our general fund so we got an addition \$1.4 million, but you can see in year 2022, we are negative \$426,000 and we still have the long range plan we will be creating here shortly. There will be other projects added as part of this process. I know most likely with the construction of the new USA facility, Cody Road might need to be added to the program, but this is just the draft 2020-2023 TIP, the next go around of funding and we still don't have enough money so we are going to have to figure something out before we adopt this.

Mayor Stimpson said is the scoring system, is the scale the same for the Congestion Management and for the other projects?

Mr. Harrison said it is not. The scoring is actually out of a 100 on the big projects. They are objective, subjective. They are based on funding availability, based on dates of when the projects can be done. The subjective part has economic vitality, how many jobs they think will be created, economic impact of the project, stuff like that. We do have a subcommittee of about five folks that rank these projects as they enter the TIP. We just met probably six

months ago for Airport Boulevard. We will meet again for Celeste Road. I will get everybody's rankings and we will average the score to get a score for the project.

Question was inaudible.

Mr. Harrison said that is a higher ranked project, Dauphin Street. Dauphin Street is ranked the highest.

Mayor Stimpson said so that will give Mr. Richardson a sense of comfort.

Mr. Harrison said Dauphin Street is the highest ranked project, the highest priority.

Mayor Stimpson said looking at this sheet here Fred, at the scoring system, Dauphin Street is the highest rated project which means it has..

Councilmember Richardson said that's true.

Mr. Harrison said if you notice all of these projects on here are unshielded. They are not US, they are not state routes, they're not interstates. All the projects on here are county or city roads. This the city and the county's only source of funding to improve that capacity. Are there any questions pertaining to the STP Attributable Funding Schedule?

Ms. Wilcox said you answered it, but I didn't quite hear it. What is the 5.3 and 4.9 made up of?

Mr. Harrison said that's on a scale of 10 and those are actually based on intersection improvements. The congestion management process projects, we are allowing \$500,000 federal funds per project and that scoring is really based on delay savings based on, and the city puts it into a software, to calculate the amount of delay saved based on the project.

Ms. Wilcox said okay, thanks and I recommend that we have a rolling meeting on number 10, like we did for Airport Boulevard.

Mr. Harrison said yes, we will be meeting soon.

Ms. Wilcox said in a car, driving that road.

Mr. Harrison said yes, and I think you suggested that, we go out and look at it.

Mr. Black said we spoke about that yesterday.

Ms. Wilcox said we did the first rolling meeting last time and as a committee member on that committee it just really helped to be driving that road and have the county engineer pointing out the nuances that I wouldn't have normally considered.

Mr. Harrison said that Celeste road project, I-165 opened up in 1992. As soon as it opened up, Celeste Road exploded in development because people could get to downtown faster. We recognized that and Celeste Road has actually been in the long range plan since then.

Mayor Stimpson asked since when?

Mr. Harrison said since the 90s in the long range plan. Once 165 opened, it really opened up Celeste Road.

The next on the agenda was old business.

Mr. Harrison said the only old business I have is the US 45 Study is out. Volkert finalized it. It is online at mobilempo.org. Really, the next step is funding and I think some of it's scope, it can resurfaced in 2021 and 2022. I think there's safety money available. It listed some recommendations in the 45 Feasibility Study.

The next item on the agenda was new business.

Ms. Wilcox said as your responsibility on this committee, I think inform yourself about the Pay-As-You-Go Program. It's on the ballot November 6<sup>th</sup>. That's what we work with in the county so please make sure to get the word out to your constituents and citizens that even though it's been ratified, it might get lost on the ballot. It's on page 2.

Mr. Kegley said the very last item on the ballot.

Ms. Wilcox said get them to flip that ballot and look. Please tell people it's not a one page ballot. Funding for the county roads, it will affect everything we do here so please make sure to get that word out.

Mayor Stimpson said and not all of that money is spent in the county. Some of it is spent in the city.

Ms. Wilcox said that's what I'm saying, it effects everybody in the room.

Mayor Stimpson said that's right. We need to make that clear to everybody. It's been a very good program. Let me ask Vince or somebody, what kind of escalation in cost are we seeing year over year. Is there some kind of ballpark?

Mr. Calametti said I think over the past few years, it's been 40 to 60% on some of the major items. We have historically, ALDOT's procedure is that every time we have a major event in a project, we update our estimate. An event, I mean by a 30% review, 60% review, final review, but on the Zeigler project because of the issues with AT&T, those projects sat for three or four years and those estimates didn't get updated and they got caught in that escalation. We have started the process on all ALDOT projects, we update it every six months regardless of whether it is active or not, we update every six months. I think all the sponsors should update their estimates every six months, then this escalation won't hit us as hard as this one hit us. Forty to sixty percent, part of it is the escalation of materials, part of it is going to be some of the tariffs we are seeing on steel, part of it is a good thing, we got a lot of work down here. We got a lot of busy people and that's going to increase our prices.

Mr. Amberger said one cubic yard of concrete four years ago cost about \$70 for a contractor to buy and today it's about \$110.

Mayor Stimpson said how much.

Mr. Amberger said \$110 and that's just the raw cost of concrete so anything concrete related has gone up 35 to 40%.

Mr. Harrison said we had a cost estimate about a year ago, we had a question on the cost estimates. I want to thank Vince, the new Schillinger Road project, we get information now every month on the cost estimate on the Schillinger project under construction. It's still underestimate I think. We appreciate that.

Mayor Downey said I get a lot of questions on the toll. I get a lot of questions. I know it's a parking lot out there. What is the process on how the toll will be determined and what will it be? I've seen \$3 to \$6.

Mr. Calametti said it will be \$3 to \$6. There will be a frequent user discount for the people that use it to go back and forth. Ultimately, it will be up to the concession team because they have to put this whole thing together. They have to make a proposal that is financially feasible for them and that will be acceptable to ALDOT and the federal government. We understand that if the toll is high, we are going to see too much toll aversion. It is that happy medium. Three to six is the answer with a frequent user discount that will even apply to commercial trucks per axle. If you are a commercial with two axles, your \$3 to \$6.

Mr. Calametti said it will be \$3 to \$6. There will be a frequent user discount for the people that use it to go back and forth. Ultimately, it will be up to the concession team because they have to put this whole thing together. They have to make a proposal that is financially feasible for them and that will be acceptable to ALDOT and the federal government. We understand that if the toll is high, we are going to see too much toll aversion. It is that happy medium. Three to six is the answer with a frequent user discount that will even apply to commercial trucks per axle. If you are a commercial with two axles, your \$3 to \$6.

Mr. Harrison said I have on other new business item, this Friday at 8 am if anybody is interested in walking the Three Mile Creek pathway, it's a Three-Mile Creek tour. They are meeting at MAWWS at 8 am this Friday and they are going to walk the 2.5 miles from Moffet Road all the way to Municipal Park where the Three Mile Creek Trail goes. If anyone is interested in that, it should be a soggy walk so bring boots. Tom is going to be walking. I've got to be here.

With no other new business, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

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

1/30/19  
Date

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

1/30/19  
Date