

**Mobile Area Transportation Study  
TCC/CAC Meeting  
Wednesday, May 9, 2018 10:00 a.m.  
SARPC Transportation Department Office**

**TCC/CAC Members Present**

Ms. Margie Wilcox  
Mr. Brian Harold  
Mr. John Blanton  
Ms. Kellie Hope  
Mr. Matthew Lambert  
Mr. Kevin Harrison rep. Ms. Jennifer Denson  
Mr. Gerald Alfred  
Mr. John F. Rhodes  
Mr. Brad Wittman rep. Mr. James Foster  
Mr. Bryan Kegley rep. Mr. Ricky Mitchell  
Ms. Kina Andrews rep. Ms. Dianne Irby  
Ms. Mary Beth Bergin  
Ms. Michele Rumpf  
Mr. Edwin Perry  
Ms. Tammy Olivero rep. Mr. Nick Amberger

**TCC/CAC Members Absent**

Mr. Donald Watson  
Mr. Merrill Thomas  
Ms. Casi Callaway  
Mr. Fernando Billups  
Mr. Dennis Sullivan  
Ms. Jennifer White  
Mr. Tom Briand  
Mr. Bob Harris  
Mr. Troy Wayman  
Mr. John Murphy  
Mr. Donye Woodard  
Mr. James Jacobs  
Mr. Bert Hoffman  
Mr. Jeff Zoghby  
Ms. Kim Sanderson  
Ms. Melanie Baldwin

**GUESTS:**

Ms. Carol Hunter  
Mr. Drew Davis, Volkert

**STAFF:**

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

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

The second item on the agenda was to recommend for approval Resolution 18-009 for an ALDOT requested project modification in the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with Bridge Funds.

Mr. Harrison said the first item is to recommend approval of ALDOT requested project. This is with bridge funds, 18-009. This is to replace the bridge on the Causeway over the Tensaw River. This has been in the system for quite some time, but it has had a cost increase from \$19 million to \$24.5 million. That is about a 28% cost increase. Any time there is large cost increase on projects, we like to have MPO approval of those cost increase. Last night, there was a public hearing on it at 5 Rivers. I do have a stack of handouts on it and the comment period is open. That is the first resolution.

It is really an existing project and the resolution is for the cost increase. The bridge does have a multi-use path on it. They are going to build a new bridge to the south and change the direction of the current south bridge to westbound. The new bridge will be eastbound and then they will demolish the old bridge on the north side and add a bunch of land and rip rap. It will have a multi-use path.

Mr. Blanton said a protected multi-use path.

Motion was made by Ms. Margie Wilcox with a second by Ms. Mary Beth Bergin. Motion to recommend for approval was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval for Resolution 18-010 for an ALDOT requested project modification in the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with National Highway Funds.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder is 18-010. This is National Highway Funds and this is just a utilities project for \$130,000 for the 158 extension Lott Road Overpass and jug handle. This from Seabury Creek to partial Lott Road and I know this is somewhat of a rush on this one because it is scheduled for this year, this utility project.

Motion was made by Ms. Margie Wilcox with a second by Ms. Michele Rumpf. Motion was approved.

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

Mr. Harrison said the next item on the agenda is to review the STP attributable funding schedule. This is usually at the end of the agenda, but I did this because of item 5 on the agenda which we will get to in just a minute. If everyone will look, there are some italics on this. The italicized numbers is what has changed since we reviewed this with you. The first one is for project 1, Zeigler Boulevard, Forrest Hill to Athey, the construction, project 37215, has been pushed out to March of 2019. It was scheduled for this fiscal year, but has been pushed out to March for \$13,698,000.

Ms. Wilcox said did you do the markup.

Mr. Harrison said I don't think there is a required markup on that one because it is only a couple of months. Is that right Edwin?

Mr. Perry said it didn't really change a whole lot. Typically we just adjust by 1%.

Ms. Wilcox said but we've found that hasn't been adequate.

Mr. Perry said if ya'll want to increase it, but from our last estimate that we ran, this is the number.

Ms. Wilcox said if it's a good number and ya'll are updating that.

Mr. Perry said the projects that we receive; we make sure the estimates are up to date.

Mr. Harrison said since you bring that up Margie. If you remember the last Schillinger project came in way over cost, and Tom and I started attending some meetings. What resulted in that is we, the staff, now get an update every month of the current projects underway. Number 2 and it is not in italics, this is just for discussion only, is authorized for \$7.5 million, Schillingers, US 98 to Lott Road. This is the MPO's money, there is another \$5 million tied to it that the State is providing so we actually have \$12.5 million for this project. That project was actually, the contract came in at \$9 million but we still have available \$12.5 million to do it. We get a cost estimate, what's been spent, right now there has been 36% spent. What ALDOT does is project the cost from what has been spent already, the current projection is about \$9.2 million which is well under what we have available. We are now keeping track of our projects and how is being spent and have available. Next project, project 4, McDonald Road, the right of way has been authorized. It is \$1,170,000. It was a \$1 million so that is a slight increase. Further down, all the way down at the bottom, project 11, has been authorized.

That is the PE for McFarland, Old Pascagoula to Three Notch for \$2.5 million. The carryover from prior years was \$36,530,494. That carryover actually went up by about \$200,000. I don't know what project caused that carryover to go up, but it raised our carryover by about \$200,000. One other thing that has changed is Government Street, the congestion management corridor. Those are in italics because we had an administrative modification to increase that preliminary engineering on the Government Street corridor. Right there downtown, we are going to try and do some adaptive signals with the congestion management process money. I wanted to review this with ya'll because the next item on the agenda will be adding and removing some project from this schedule of funds. Is there any question on the current STP schedule of funds? This is what the MPO spends at their discretion.

The next item on the agenda was recommend approval of Mobile County requested project in the 2016-2019 TIP with STP Attributable Funds, Resolution 18-011.

Mr. Harrison said the next item on the agenda is Resolution 18-011. We do not have a 9 digit number yet because this just came to us this week. This is to add additional lanes on Airport Boulevard from Snow Road to 1.46 miles west to just past Eliza Jordan Road. This is the preliminary engineering for this project and this is for next fiscal year for \$1.3 million. This project will be funded at the same time, if you look back at your schedule of funds that we just reviewed, project 9 and 10 are currently outside of the 2019 year so they are not actually in the current schedule of funds. The County wishes to remove these two projects from the system and replace it with the Airport Boulevard widening from Snow Road to Eliza Jordan. The preliminary engineering is \$1.3 million. The right of way is estimated to be 1.5, utilities is 1 million and the construction is about 9.9 million. It is kind of a wash for the two Three Notch projects to widen Airport from Snow Road to Eliza Jordan.

Mr. Kegley said the two Three Notch projects are about \$15 million whereas the Airport Project is about \$13.7 million.

Mr. Harrison said and they are in the outer years right now. About this time next year we are going to have to develop the new TIP. To those new to the process, this is the schedule of funds called the Transportation Improvement Program and the years, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 and the only good years of this schedule. I have always included these 2020 and 2021 out here just to let us know what is scheduled next. This time next year, we are going to have to create a new 2020 to 2023 TIP. As you can see, we are already negative to 2020. We are going to have to do some shuffling out of projects. Some of these are going to have to be pushed back out to 2022 and 2023.

Ms. Wilcox asked this just came up, the Airport Boulevard.

Mr. Kegley said yes, we are looking at putting it in the 2018 this fall and in order to do that, I need to make sure that the TCC and MPO is okay with it being in the TIP.

Mr. Harrison said it is in the Long Range Plan.

Mr. Kegley said it is currently in the Long Range Plan on Map 1.

Mr. Harrison said and the committee will have to get together to rank the project in terms of objective, subjective rankings. We have an economic ranking process which is here the project score. This is the first time we have added a project to the TIP in years.

Ms. Wilcox said that is why I have reservations about it. Where did it rank? Have you done the ranking yet?

Mr. Harrison said no.

Ms. Wilcox said but we are going to vote on it prior to us ranking it and the ranking it was to give this committee the information to be able to make those decisions.

Mr. Harrison said correct.

Mr. Kegley said we just haven't had the opportunity to have one of those meetings in a while.

Ms. Wilcox said I don't think it is proper procedure if we have already established something to help this body make a decision to do it prior to doing that. I can certainly be overruled but that is just my opinion.

Mr. Kegley said I guess that is part of the reason that we proposed to remove the two Three Notch projects.

Ms. Wilcox said and you hit right in District 104 when you did that.

Mr. Kegley said well the traffic just hasn't been increasing as much in that area as much as what we had anticipated.

Ms. Wilcox said you don't think that with all of the new industry that that is not going to add quite a bit to that area.

Mr. Kegley said these two sections of Three Notch are beyond McFarland Road. We actually are putting in the 2018 pay as you go, that section of Three Notch which is project 6 on the TIP. We are going to move ahead with federal funding for that section of Three Notch from Schillingers out to McDonald and that will include the intersection there at McDonald Road. Then these two sections of Three Notch will be on there going out towards Dawes Road. The ADT's just have not been increasing out there like what we have anticipated, but that section of Airport Boulevard to Snow is just blossoming. There are subdivisions coming up all over the places.

Ms. Wilcox said I agree and I have had somebody call me about wanting a red light out there and I passed on ya'lls information. I still hate that we went through a couple of years debating how us laymen could have the same information that you engineers already have. That is why we came up for a way for the engineers and the people that work in your field to be able to communicate the criteria. The criteria was objective and subjective. Is everybody here aware of that or should we get Kevin to give an overview?

Ms. Andrews said I would like to hear about the criteria.

Mr. Harrison said I don't have it in fun of me but there is objective and subjective. The subjective are the actual numbers: how many different funding sources; the year that it is funded. You can't change those. They are based on fact and numbers. That gives into the score. The objective is the committee members. There are five members on the committee. They rank the project based on economic vitality, jobs, density.

Ms. Wilcox said traffic counts.

Mr. Harrison said the traffic counts are subjective. The objective is really economic vitality, population, and density. That is what all of these numbers to the left are. These two particular projects that are being moved are the lowest scoring projects. This project, is it going to rank higher than these two projects? Yes, I would think so.

Ms. Wilcox said and I would also probably agree with that, not having seen it, but knowing the facts and streets. I just hate seeing us do it before we get that information.

Ms. Andrews said I guess my question to is and this is for FY 2019 but what they are proposing to remove is already in the out years so which projects get impacted by moving this in now. Are they County projects?

Mr. Harrison said yes. The Three Notch projects, number 9 and 10 which are in the outer years.

Ms. Andrews said yes, so what I am saying is that you are putting more money closer what gets kicked out of 2019.

Mr. Harrison said if you look at 2019, we have a balance of \$7 million. We have enough to cover it but we are negative in 2020. So next year, when we do the TIP, some of this county stuff is going to get shoved back. These are in 2022, the construction of this, and Bryan they may have to move back if we don't have the money for that.

Mr. Kegley said the construction you mean?

Mr. Harrison said you have McFarland, Old Pascagoula; the PE was just authorized for that. That is another big project. We are just going to have to see what the numbers do. This project may have to be pushed back.

Mr. Kegley said we will end up having to move some of those projects a year or two on out. Quite frankly, the construction for this Airport Boulevard that we are discussing today, it takes on average about six years to get a project to construction when you are using fed funds because you have to go through the right of way process, the utility relocation, planned development, to get it to a point to where you can go to construction, it is about 6 years out. Realistically, this thing won't go until about 2023 or 2024, construction. There is environmental and all kinds of stuff you to do to go through the process, but I need to go ahead and get it on the TIP so that I can put money in the upcoming pay as you go program to get this process started.

Mr. Harrison said when is the deadline.

Mr. Kegley said about a month.

Ms. Wilcox said how long have you known that you wanted to do this.

Mr. Kegley said about a month.

Mr. Harrison said this project has been in the long range plan for a while.

Ms. Wilcox said I know but it is just making sure that we follow the processes that we have established.

Mr. Perry said I was thinking that the ranking was once they were on this list to kind of help us justify priority on what needs to be let first. I didn't know it was to what gets added.

Mr. Harrison said this is the first project that we have added.

Mr. Perry said I thought the scoring was priority if we had funding issues. If a project has a 60 then we think it would be in the best interest for this project to let first over the other project.

Ms. Wilcox said but to leapfrog it over something that is on there that would be to me something that I would want to know. I fully admit that I think it would score up there.

Mr. Perry said I don't think it was to qualify to get on the list. I think it was to show the priority of what would be the best for the area.

Mr. Harrison said I am not sure that is in our process. We have written a document for the process.

Ms. Andrews said do you have the opportunity to revisit the criteria that makes up this project score before we get into the creation of the new TIP.

Mr. Harrison said I can put you on the committee, yes.

Mr. Andrews said that would be wonderful.

Mr. Kegley said the next time we have that meeting; there will be other projects that I am sure the city is going to want.

Mr. Harrison said this time next year, like I said; we have to renew the TIP for 2020 to 2023. Each one of the projects in that system will have to be looked at. It might be a good time to reevaluate some of the project scores.

Ms. Andrews said absolutely, I think you would need because landscapes and other factors have changed over time.

Mr. Alfred said Kevin, how do we insert the project without compromising the process?

Mr. Harrison said we can insert the project and then next week, we can by email, rank this particular project based on the scoring methodology and have it ready for the MPO.

Mr. Kegley said I already have maps prepared and all of that kind of stuff.

Ms. Andrews said and maybe too at some point especially when we kind of get to the update, have a more formal mechanism for such situations.

Mr. Harrison said I agree. Unfortunately, it takes so long to get these federal road projects done; we haven't added a project since we did this. We did this how many years ago, Margie?

Ms. Wilcox said at least two.

Mr. Harrison said it has been longer than that.

Ms. Bergin said it was with the Prichard project on Wilson Avenue.

Mr. Harrison said that has been five years at least.

Ms. Wilcox said but we are going to try and do this statewide, and I used this group as a shining example, don't fail me now. We've got infrastructure out there and we have to be able to communicate. To me, I know that number on the side may not mean a lot, but each new member that comes on, I want ya'll to know how much work goes into that and there are areas where we have to set them aside for other reasons, but at least we make informed decisions.

Mr. Alfred said we have a process in place to do this and now we have a deadline of meeting next week to insert something.

Mr. Harrison said we meet in three weeks. We are an advisory board; the MPO makes the ultimate decision.

Mr. Alfred said okay, but what I am saying is we do all of this, they rank, they are coming in behind the scenes and they may outscore some of these as far as priority.

Ms. Wilcox said would be comfortable making a motion including what we suppose the ranking would be.

Mr. Perry said again, I think the ranking is for once it gets on this list, not to get on this list. I don't think the process is to have a score to be able to get on the list.

Mr. Harrison said I think Edwin is right because all of the projects were on the list when we ranked them. This is the first real instance we've had where we added the project.

Ms. Wilcox said we should check the minutes. It was my intent to do it all. It was my intent that any time this body, the TCC Advisory Committee, made a decision and made a recommendation to the MPO, that we would have this information so that we had something to back it up. In the past, this particular group has been flagged for alleged politicism for which projects go forward and that was a way to make the process transparent. It is not a reflection on anybody. It started with Joe Ruffer. He had so much information in his head and so does he that we couldn't possibly

access but if we put it down on paper and learn how they come up with it and use their data to come up with these rankings, then we would at least be able to defend the position we took.

Ms. Andrews said I have a question for Bryan. Is this the only source for the PE or is this the preferred path to get the funding for that work?

Mr. Kegley said the other portions of the project, the right of way; the utilities and the construction would need to come out of the TIP funds. What I am trying to do is get the project of the TIP so that I can put it on the pay as you go program to be voted on this fall. We are in the process of generating that pay as you go program now, probably June or July, I have to have that list close to finalize. Having this on the TIP would allow me to go ahead and include it on the 2018 pay as you go to get that process started. If anyone has been out there on this section of Airport Boulevard, coming eastbound in the morning, it backs up all the way to Eliza Jordan Road. It is ridiculous. The thing is we have more and more subdivisions being proposed out there. I've got to get that process started now, the design process.

Mr. Harrison said this project has been in the long range plan a long time. That is the map of the long range plan right there. That is the 2040 Long Range Plan adopted March 15, 2015. We do it every five years. Our travel demand forecast model which we use all kinds of technology to figure out the projected growth. The Delaney Property, the Alabama Pecan property, all that property out there on Airport Boulevard, we recognize as prime development which is why the Airport Boulevard widening has been in the long range plan.

Ms. Andrews said at the same time though, if you look at some of the goals for MAP for Mobile and trying to encourage people to move towards the city core, I don't know that we want to make it super easy for people to live way out in terms of looking at are we being more reactive or proactive in what we are encouraging growth wise. Is that going to be addressed or could it be conceivably considered when we visit some of this stuff.

Mr. Harrison said I would like to think that we are proactive, but it sounds like we are being reactive already because it is already backed up to Eliza Jordan Road. To your point, when we do our socio-economic forecasts, we do try to put some of that back into town growth in our forecast. It will be vetted with the city and the county and all the cities in our jurisdiction.

Mr. Andrews said I guess I am saying is just because it is backed up, does that make it a priority and it kind of goes back to the scoring and how we prioritize some of this stuff.

Mr. Kegley said we try to project out five years on these long range plans and we come up with a long range plan and a few months after that, we get a notification from a large developer that he just bought a 1000 acres right out here and he is getting ready to put another 500 homes there. And you realize I didn't put that segment of the road on the long range plan and then it is another five years before you get an opportunity to do that unless we inject something like this.

Mr. Harrison said and the long range plan is fiscally constrained. We get \$10 million a year times 25 years that is \$250 million. It sounds like a lot of money but all of those green roads on that map is over \$250 million. The 158 up at the top is BP funds. All of the other green projects is that \$250 million. We can't fund everything. The Airport Boulevard goes past Eliza Jordan Road in terms of need. Then again, so does a lot of the other roads that we just don't have the funding for.

Ms. Andrews said has the MPO in their past planning coordinated with the school system. I just kind of fast forward into some of these things, widening roads, more subdivisions, more families, more kids, schools is that something ya'll have ever coordinated with on long range planning?

Mr. Harrison said two years ago, Martha Peak was very helpful. She sent out a mandatory survey to all of the principles and we had a great response. It was a mandatory survey in terms of sidewalks and whether they needed sidewalks. There were some responses that said we don't need sidewalks, kids don't walk to the school.

Mr. Piper said we also do look at school populations and the projected growth of the schools in the model.

Mr. Harrison said and the 604 section 18 properties. That actually goes into our SLEUTH model.

Ms. Andrews said it is based on what the trend analysis is showing and that is what you prioritize projects on?

Mr. Piper said we do look at that.

Mr. Harrison said we are updating this now and you are going to be heavily involved in what goes into the projected forecast model. We use satellite imagery; it is called the SLEUTH model. If anyone has ever seen it, it is really cool stuff. Anything did it. We've got 1984 to 2012 satellite imagery and you can just see the changes. We've actually added the 3D dimensional urban forecast of that trend for each sidewalk, rooftop, and pavement. We have rasterized all those images and it is a color in all of those images. We give each traffic zone a growth rate and we present it to each city. It worked last time when we presented it to the city, the City of Saraland said you've got way low even though it is all undeveloped property at 65 and 158, there is a hospital, there is retail, there's hotels. It is coming. We are not allowed to talk about it, but it is coming so put it in there.

Mr. Piper said we do schools, we look at that also.

Mr. Harrison said is there a motion to add the PE to this and this week or next week we will have the ranking prior to the MPO meeting to put on this list.

Mr. Kegley said if I may, if it makes it a little bit easier, I would like to make a recommendation on project 11, McFarland Road. The right of way of \$6 million, I would like to move that out to 2020. No need to increase. Utilities, is currently in 2020, I would like to move that to 2021.

Mr. Harrison said that actually, if I can interject, moving that \$6 million past the 2019 date is an MPO required action. Any time you add some stuff or push stuff back past the 2019 date, requires a MPO resolution.

Mr. Kegley said that doesn't have to be done now. We can do that anytime in the future. I am just looking at things a little bit more realistically because we are just starting PE on that now.

Mr. Harrison said this why we are here. If you want to make that motion, you can do it. That is a required MPO action. The only issue is that it is going to look like we have \$13 million in that outer year.

Mr. Kegley said my next recommendation was to move construction out to 2022 if we can. That would be a little bit more realistic there.

Mr. Harrison said that would certainly set us up for building the next TIP. Instead of being negative \$4 million, I think that would give us a positive number instead of negative 7.7, it would give us a positive number.

Mr. Kegley said we updated the cost estimates on project 8, Zeigler Boulevard. The construction now is estimated at \$4 million instead of \$5 million.

Ms. Wilcox asked why did you move, a lot of time you can do utilities and construction in the same year. Why would you space it out a year?



Mr. Kegley said we like to do our utilities upfront. Some of these projects, utilities is actually bid with construction. If that is the case, utilities would be authorized a little bit ahead of time. You could leave them in the same year. A lot of times, ya'll do that, don't you Edwin?

Mr. Perry said yes and you can schedule it where one is at the end of the fiscal year and one is at the beginning so they are really only two months apart.

Ms. Wilcox said because this project scores better than some of the ones above it. I would hate to see purposefully just moving it out if there are some that scored lower just moving it out.

Someone said I think the only reason for moving it out is that it just recently got authorized and PE is just starting.

Mr. Kegley said that's right, it is timing.

Mr. Harrison said that would actually set us up for some positive numbers for 2021 when we develop the new TIP. Although it would look bad that we have \$13 million in 2019, but we would be positive in our outer years. The motion would be to add Airport Boulevard PE, \$1.3 million, in 2019 with the caveat that we will have a ranking prior to the MPO meeting in terms of project score with objective and subjective numbers and then the same resolution, move project 100059789, \$6 million for right of way out to 2020. That would be the motion.

Motion was made by Ms. Mary Beth Bergin with a second by Ms. Michele Rumpf.

Mr. Kegley said and to reduce the cost for construction on project 8 from \$5 million to \$4 million.

Mr. Harrison said right and that is an administrative change that doesn't require action of the MPO. And those on our project ranking committee, I will be in touch with you by email.

Motion was approved to add widening of Airport Boulevard.

Ms. Wilcox said can I offer a motion that we do the ranking since we have never added a project and there seems to be some discussion as to whether we do it for projects added or after they are on the list, I would like to make the motion that we do it on both counts. Not affecting what we've done, but from this day forward we go ahead and do that prior since it was not clear that we do that. I understand that it wasn't clear.

Mr. Harrison said what we can do and I agree with the motion, but when we develop the TIP next year, have that methodology in the document; as projects enter the TIP we will have the ranking prior. Will that work?

Ms. Wilcox said that we have the project ranking before we vote on it.

Mr. Harrison said and that can be methodology in the next TIP.

Ms. Wilcox said so would a motion and everyone voting on that be appropriate since we are making that change.

Mr. Harrison said I don't think we need a resolution from the MPO for that, but a motion for the board would be fine.

Mr. Kegley seconded the motion.

Motion was approved to add methodology for ranking before projects enter the TIP was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of the Alabama Performance Management Agreement between the State of Alabama and the Mobile Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Mr. Harrison said this actually doesn't require an MPO resolution but it does require an agreement between the MPO and the State. The FAST Act has created new performance measures for state's and MPO's. I am not going to read this whole agreement to you, but it is basically an agreement between us and the State of Alabama. There are several facets of performance measures. Safety performance measures is the first one. We've already adopted a resolution stating that we will abide by the state's targets and performance measures. There is no consequence for the MPO and the urban area to not meet its targets. There is a consequence to the State. If the State doesn't meet their safety targets, one of the five, which is number of fatalities, rate of fatalities, number of injuries, rate of serious injuries and number of combined non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries, if they don't meet one of those targets which is basically a five year average, you take the five year average and project it out one year and if they don't meet that target, the state consequence is that 100% of the safety money has to be used on safety projects. Federal law allows a state to flex 50% of their safety money. The State of Alabama right now is using 60% of the safety money on safety projects. The consequence of not meeting a target is that they will have to use 100% of the money on safety projects. There is no consequence to the MPO. The MPO has already adopted the state's safety targets. That pretty much goes the same with bridge condition and national highway performance. This is data that will be done and collected by the State of Alabama and presented to us. The MPO will have to do an annual report of all of these performance measures. The next one is for highway system, freight and this is a travel time reliability performance measure. I don't quite understand what the federal government was doing when they came up with this, but it is not the performance measure of congestion; it is how reliable the congestion is. If you are congested from 5:00 pm to 5:30 pm, you are a highly reliable target. Transit, the State of Alabama does have a transit performance measure. This is for the 5311 projects. Our next item on the agenda is for the Wave Transit's performance measures and targets. Because the WAVE Transit is a 5307 recipient for a large urban area, they have to do their own performance measures and targets. Really what this is an agreement between the State of Alabama and the MPO that we will do everything in the FAST Act that is required of the MPO in terms of performance measures and targets. There will be an annual report that will be required of us to complete but it will be with data from the State of Alabama provided to us. From then on, our long range plan, our TIP, we will have to note how each one of the projects in the Long Range Plan and TIP works towards the goals of each one of these performance measures. It is an unfunded mandate of the FAST Act.

Ms. Andrews asked how does the state select its safety projects.

Mr. Harrison said that is a competitive process. It is 90% federal and 10% match. The sponsor, generally the city or the county will present to the state on the safety of project. There is a whole application where you have to list incident data, crash data and stuff like that.

Ms. Andrews asked what is the deadline.

Mr. Harrison said it is ongoing and generally if it is done like as part of a resurfacing project, you get more bang for your buck.

Ms. Andrews asked what kind of project?

Mr. Harrison said turning signals, dual lefts, stuff like that.

Mr. Perry said it is more of a cost benefit type thing where you can just look at cross intersections and crash data and depending on what that construction cost and how many crashed you are going to prevent is a lot of times how it gets measured.

Ms. Andrews said can it be used for pedestrian crossings.

Mr. Perry said I believe so if there is enough data to support it.

Mr. Harrison said interestingly enough, the number of fatalities and the number of incidents, is directly tied to the unemployment rate. As the unemployment rate drops, the population has more disposable income and the VMT increases the number of fatalities. That is actually in the document. I am willing to bet with our economy and with Airbus, Wal-Mart and Amazon, what the port is doing, I would imagine our unemployment rate is going to be dropping which is going to be increasing the number of fatalities so if we don't meet our target, I am of the opinion, that we are probably not going to meet our target, the State is going to have to use 100% of the money on safety projects.

Ms. Andrews said how much safety money do they have.

Mr. Perry said I don't know.

Ms. Wilcox said is there a way to influence that rating. If things have changed dramatically, if we are being ranked on our circumstances prior to all of this economic development?

Mr. Harrison said it is updated every year.

Ms. Andrews asked who sets the target.

Mr. Harrison said the State of Alabama. Tim Barnett just retired so they have a new person that is a safety engineer, but they update the target every year. It is a five year rolling average that is a multi-faceted formula and has five different things tied to the formula. One of them is unemployment rate. One is the number of incidents in the past five years with a trend analysis. Anthony, we've tried to develop our own numbers to see if it would benefit us to do our own and the formula is kind of complicated and they look at it every year and update it every year.

Ms. Wilcox said well if it is a rolling number that is about as reasonable as can be.

Ms. Hunter said so they set a target of the acceptable number of fatalities.

Mr. Harrison said that is right, for the whole State of Alabama. Our resolution several months ago said that we support the State's targets and all our projects will work towards those targets and performance measures. Not just safety. What this agreement says is for safety, for transit, for pavement bridge conditions, travel time reliability and freight time reliability. That is what the agreement says. All of those performance measures, we will have to do a report every year on how our projects work on reducing those targets. This is all from data provided to us by the State. Anthony and I looked at the travel time reliability and the freight time reliability that is data that we have that we looked at it, but if there is no consequence, the State is going to provide that to us. We are working towards reducing the State's goals and reducing their targets.

Mr. Lambert said and that goes along with like the congestion stuff.

Mr. Harrison said that's right. System Performance is what that one is. There is no resolution on this, but this is an agreement that I would like a motion and a second for us to enter in this agreement with the State of Alabama.

Motion made by Ms. Wilcox with a second by Mr. Brian Harold. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of the Transit Asset management Plan Performance Measures for the WAVE Transit.

Mr. Harrison said because the WAVE Transit is a TMA, a large urban area over 200,000, they are required to have performance measures for their FTA 5307 funding and their projects funded with those funds. This is the WAVE Transit's performance measures. This is pretty much the exact same thing that the State of Alabama is using, a reduction of 10% of their current active inventory that has met their useful life. This resolution was authored by the WAVE Transit

and approved by the State. It does require MPO action. What this really says is that these are the performance measures that the WAVE Transit will have to reduce their targets.

Motion was made by Mr. Bryan Kegley with a second by Ms. Wilcox. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was review of the Draft FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program Funding Schedule.

Mr. Harrison said this is our PL funds. A couple of things are different. Those of you that have been a part of this process for a while might recognize that we have had some preparation for nonattainment of air quality in our budget. These tasks, the staff and I, this is what we charge our time to. This year our federal amount is \$480,000. Last year was \$471,000 so our match will go up a little bit this year. We never spend that much money. This is actually our staff time. We've got about \$100,000 left over from this each year. That is what funds our third party studies, US 45, is our current study which we have contracted with Volkert. As an update to that study, we will have a stakeholders meeting at the Toulminville Library on May 17<sup>th</sup>. Our budget is basically what this is. Our process is, I review it with you all, I send it to the state, they send back comments. You will see this again. The TCC will review this again and it will be adopted by the MPO in August or September. The biggest change on here is task 3.6.1 is about \$50,000. Last year, it was about \$17,000. We will be updating our Long Range Plan so a lot of our hours will go to that. No resolution needed on this, but I always like to review it with you prior to submitting it to the State.

Ms. Wilcox said I just want to clarify that our air quality is improving and that is why you don't have to spend as much time on it.

Mr. Harrison said the air quality is improving greatly. The threshold went down. We have three monitors and they are below .65 right now.

Ms. Wilcox said for the people that didn't endure when we were worried about air quality and what that would do to our road funding, that was a big issue and a lot of time that had to be spent on it. That's good for our health that that is no longer a burning issue.

The next item on the agenda was old business.

Mr. Harrison said we are going to try in our next long range plan, one of our weakest links in our long range plan is our freight plan. We tried to develop a freight model. We've purchases INRIX data some time ago. We have that. One of the things that would validate our freight model, APM Terminals has conducted surveys. Brian if you want to go over some of that.

Mr. Harold said what we are doing is just having a questionnaire that we conduct on each truck that enters the terminal. We do about 600 truck visits a day and that number is increasing. When they are leaving, we have someone ask them did your trip originate inside or outside Mobile County. Based on that we have a criteria if you are outside of Mobile County, what routing did you take? Did you come from I-10 or 65, etc.? Then also where they are going, again in or outside of Mobile County. We are taking that data and giving it Kevin. It is broken down and graphed. It should be easy to digest. Our plan is, and we are getting better at it. We've done it twice so far. The second time we capture 308 truck visits. Our goal is to get them all but it takes some time. Our plan is to conduct this study once every quarter and if it needs to be done more often, we can do that. Hopefully, we will be able to capture the trends and the direction the trucks are moving.

Mr. Harrison said valuable data and our travel demand forecast model we have a separate truck trip that hits the network and this will help to validate those truck movements along with the INRIX data. Thank you for doing that for us.

The next item on the agenda was new business.

Mr. Rhodes said the SARPC annual job fair is tomorrow out at the fairgrounds. We have 100 companies that will be setting up so if you know anybody that is need of a job or wanting to look at what's out there, from 9 to 2 tomorrow at the Fairgrounds.

Mr. Piper said the transportation alternative program applications, we only received two. We received one from the City of Prichard for sidewalks and ADA crosswalks around Ella Grant Elementary School and then we got one from Mobile County for ADA compliant curb cuts in various locations around unincorporated Mobile County. We had \$690,000 available. Each of these was basically \$200,000 so we will have quite a bit of money that will rollover into next year's application. Also the bicycle pedestrian advisory committee met last week and ALDOT was there to talk about the Mobile River I10 Bridge. We were talking about bike ped crossing the river and what we need to do. We were going to amend the bike/ped section of the Long Range Plan to include what is in the draft of the RFP for the value added options.

Mr. Perry said we have a base option which is a belvedere on the west side of the River which would be elevator, stairs and just an observation area. Also as part of the base option, we would have a bicycle pedestrian path from I165 along Baybridge Road going to Cochrane and then tying down on the other side of Cochrane. The path on Cochrane would be a protected path. We would do some lane adjustments to be able to provide a protected path. The value added options that we are requiring the concessionaires to provide a preliminary design and a cost on is a full path on the Mobile River Bridge starting from the Virginia Texas Street area and tying down on the other side of Alsgo and continuing a path over to the Battleship. Another value added option would be from Beauregard and 165 connect, providing a path along 165 to connect to the Baybridge Road base bath and then the last value added option was taking the Cochrane path on the east side of the river and continuing it down the Causeway to tie to Battleship Park.

Mr. Piper said the BPAC also recommend adding a value added option which would be another elevator on the East side of the river so that you could go up over and down to get across the river and connecting all the way to Daphne either along the Causeway or Bayway.

Ms. Andrews said you've made the recommendations but who determines whether or not those are included.

Mr. Piper said it will go ultimately to the policy committee and we will have amendments to the Long Range Plan and they will say yay or nay.

Mr. Harrison said at this meeting we were supposed to modify the Long Range Plan, but in looking at the NEPA process and what is required of the MPO on a toll facility, there is an environmental justice stuff that has to be done in terms of low income and minority populations that we have in our long range plan but we don't have it with the toll. The new volumes because of the toll should be in our long range plan but we don't have those and a bike facility if it is a bridge to help the NEPA process. It was our intention to modify our Destination 2040 Long Range Plan at this meeting. We had the volumes for the toll, we had the BPAC meeting, we have what they kind of want, the environmental justice part is not finished yet so we are going to wait for the June July timeframe to modify the Long Range Plan. They are looking at how the toll would affect the low income populations in Mobile and Baldwin County. They are doing the analysis on that. To assist with the NEPA process, we should have that in our Long Range Plan. We don't have what the consultant for the bridge is doing. We are going to wait until they finalize that. You will see it at the next TCC meeting along with the BPAC, what they are recommending.

Ms. Hunter said does your modeling include tolling on the tunnels as well.

Mr. Harrison said our model has the traffic for a \$3-\$5 toll with the causeway and the Cochrane Bridge as the untolled route so the Wallace Tunnels would be part of this. We are concerned about the volume of traffic and the travel time for the low and minority population. The Wallace Tunnels are included as being tolled.

Mr. Kegley said what about the Bankhead. Is it tolled as well?

Mr. Perry said the free route is Bankhead and Cochrane.

Mr. Harrison said in the modeling world it is a cost, just like time is a cost.

Mr. Lambert said the Bankhead is off the table for closing for pedestrians.

Mr. Perry said as a permanent closure yes.

Ms. Wilcox said it was not as popular as one would have thought as I understand it. It was big one the first couple and then kind of died off.

Mr. Perry said it died off during football season.

Ms. Wilcox said probate court is having a hard time coming up with people to check names off during voting. If you know anyone that wants to do that in helping keep our process that would be a good thing to do.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to be "M. Wilcox", written over a horizontal line.A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to be "J. Perry", written over a horizontal line.

Chairman, TCC

Date 5/23/18