

**Mobile Area Transportation Study  
TCC/CAC Meeting  
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 10:00 a.m.  
SARPC Transportation Department Office**

**TCC/CAC Members Present**

Mr. Merrill Thomas  
Ms. Kim Sanderson  
Ms. Tammy Olivero rep. Mr. Nick Amberger  
Mr. Bob Chappelle rep Ms. Kellie Hope  
Mr. Matthew Lambert  
Mr. Kevin Harrison rep. Ms. Jennifer Denson  
Mr. Gerald Alfred  
Ms. Dianne Burnett rep. Mr. John F. Rhodes  
Mr. James Foster  
Mr. Richard Spraggins rep. Mr. Ricky Mitchell  
Ms. Kina Andrews rep. Ms. Dianne Irby  
Ms. Mary Beth Bergin  
Ms. Michele Rumpf  
Mr. Brian Aaron rep. Mr. Edwin Perry

**TCC/CAC Members Absent**

Mr. Donald Watson  
Ms. Margie Wilcox  
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  
Mr. Brian Harold  
Mr. John Blanton

**GUESTS:**

Mr. Bobby Lankford, citizen  
Mr. Billy R. Anderson, citizen  
Ms. Iris L. Anderson, citizen  
Mr. Frank Vogtner, citizen  
Mr. Janic Terry, City of Mobile  
Mr. Cameron Carter, WAVE Transit intern  
Mr. Daniel Driskell, ALDOT

**STAFF:**

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

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Kevin Harrison.

Mr. Harrison said it has been requested that item 5 on the agenda be pushed up so we will start with that which is recommend approval of modifying the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with Bridge Funds as requested by ALDOT. This is Resolution 18-016. It is in your folder. This is project 100067045 Bridge Replacement on State Route 163 over Perch Creek from Mile 3.391 to Mile 3.983. This is for preliminary engineering on that project with Bridge

Funds matched by the State of Alabama and it is for \$870,000. This is scheduled for this Fiscal Year. The construction is scheduled for the year 2020. The TIP is a four year program of funds. It is from 2016 to 2019. That is kind of like a checkbook of all of your federal transportation projects. Because the construction is outside of that in year 2020, it doesn't require this process right here. With that, is there any discussion on the project?

Mr. Aaron said the project is a planned bridge replacement project because the existing structure is exceeding its service life. It has been out there for many years. It is in our program, the Statewide Bridge Replacement Program. ALDOT had intended to move forward with the bridge replacement. The scope of that involved raising it a couple of feet. We have issues inspecting that structure with it being so close to the water. We have access issues getting there so our scope intended to raise that bridge structure two to three feet primarily looking at it. It came to our knowledge a little afterward that the City had received some grant money to do some improvements at this location so we have had a meeting with the city to get information regarding their grant that they got and so we're partnering together with them so that hopefully both missions can be accomplished with a bridge replacement project that meets their requirements to get some of the more environmental aspects of the project as well as getting a brand new structure that we need for the safety of the traveling public.

A citizen asked you are talking about 2 to 3 feet? Is that after the water has risen in Perch Creek at it's highest level or is that at it's lowest level?

Mr. Aaron said we look at it from an average water height. We take into account the tide, we take into account that factor when we set that elevation. I think the city grant actually raises it higher than that. That exact number has not been determined yet. Again, we just had that meeting about three weeks ago with the city when we found out about it so we are still collaborating and working preliminarily with the city to really get the details of what the grant's scope of work was and how we can work together to combine them.

A citizen said as one citizen, I am asking that you raise it higher than that.

Mr. Harrison said Brian, is there an opportunity that you will have a public meeting on this.

Mr. Aaron said we will. We will have a public involvement meeting, a public hearing so that those in the community can see what is actually being proposed early enough in the process so that we can have an opportunity to hear from and make any changes that we think need to be made as a result of those comments.

A citizen said the bridge right now is setting at a plus 0. To get the bridge up to a 500-year flood plain, you are going to have to have it 13 feet if I am correct.

Mr. Aaron said that may be the case. Again, we are just now trying to get the preliminary engineering started that was the purpose of today's meeting. We got that money, we just need the approval of the board to be able to start spending that money and start that design work to start looking at what those water levels, hydraulics etc.

Mr. Harrison said the Bay Bridge has to be raised 1 foot above the 500-year flood plane is that because it is an interstate. Will that account for this bridge?

Mr. Aaron said I don't think the design standards will be the same with this bridge as it is what we are looking at for the Bayway on the interstate. If we raise the bridge 13 feet, in all honesty, the road leading up to it will be under water. It may not be 13, maybe it is 6 or 4. We don't know yet, but raising it is involved in that scope.

Mr. Harrison said and that is what this money is approving today, is the preliminary engineering for the bridge.

Mr. Aaron said correct. We need to get out and start surveying it and establishing some of the right of way limits and start some of that preliminary design.

Mr. Harrison said do you have a timeline for when your public involvement will start.

Mr. Aaron said I don't right now. My guess would be that we will try to come back to the public in six months from now, once we've got a good bit of information and data to show.

A citizen asked what is the approximate construction time on the bridge?

Mr. Aaron said for a bridge this size, you are probably talking nine months to a year. It is not a very long structure and because there is enough asphalt out there, depending on what we do, it has been proposed that potentially we could go back with two separate bridge structures and is some details we are looking at as part of the grant and that would encourage vegetation growth underneath the bridge and help environmentally from that standpoint. If it is two separate bridge structures, you can build one while traffic is staying on the other. It is less impact but we are actually even looking at the amount of laneage and asphalt that is out there now. When you look and consider the traffic that is out there today, it doesn't need five lanes of asphalt and a five-lane wide bridge. We are actually moving forward with a road diet that will be coming very soon where we are going to be taking those five lanes and going with three and providing bicycle paths on the side of the roadway. All of that coming together we are taking all of that into account when we are looking at the bridge. Maybe the bridge only needs to be three lanes wide.

A citizen said three lane roads are perfectly worthless. You get somebody in your lane that is not driving the speed limit because you cannot pass in the center lane so you are just holding up traffic. I think three lane roads is useless.

A citizen said and as you are saying that we do not need a five lane, evidently you have not been on Dauphin Island Parkway on a holiday weekend.

A citizen said that area is growing and the traffic is increasing all the time.

Mr. Aaron said we are looking at everything. We are looking at traffic, we are looking at the bridge, we are looking at what is going to be the best solution here. Again, sometime in the future, 6 to 8 months, we will be coming to the public to hear the comments on the bridge project.

A citizen said I was just glad to hear you mention that there is a possible solution to keep the traffic going maybe doing one side at a time. That was the main reason I wanted to come and show up today.

Mr. Aaron said we will not be shutting down the bridge to do that. We will try to figure out a way to keep traffic flowing.

Mr. Harrison said and what we are doing today is just approving the money to do the engineering design for the bridge and there will be public comment later.

Motion was made by Mr. Matthew Lambert with a second by Ms. Michele Rumpf to recommend approval to the MPO. Motion passed.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of SARPC requested correction designating the WAVE Transit as the Direct Recipient of FTA 5307, FTA 5339, Resolution 18-014.

Mr. Harrison said we adopted a resolution on December 13, 2017, 18-001 and instead of calling the WAVE the direct recipient we called them the designated recipient. Apparently there is a federal difference between a direct and designated recipient. That's what this resolution is and FTA caught it and said correct. We are nullifying 18-001 saying they are the designated and this resolution makes the WAVE Transit the direct recipient.

Motion was made by Ms. Mary Beth Bergin with a second by Mr. James Foster to recommend approval to the MPO. Motion was approved.

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

Mr. Harrison said we adopted this the last MPO meeting but the day after the meeting, ALDOT Montgomery sent us a new agreement and said sorry, the agreement you adopted was not correct. If you will notice, this is the exact same agreement that we adopted at the last MPO meeting except for the attorney's got a hold of it and now instead of ALDOT it says the state. For example, the first paragraph hereinto referred to as the State. The whole agreement has state instead of ALDOT. There is a hold harmless on page 3, 4 and 5. The MPO shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the State of Alabama so apparently the attorneys did not see the first agreement and there is a lot of this kind of stuff in here. This is the same agreement plus the legal stuff. What I need is a motion for the agreement to be executed and this would nullify the agreement that we did last meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Lambert with a second by Ms. Bergin to recommend to the MPO that the agreement be executed. Motion passed.

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

Mr. Harrison said May 27<sup>th</sup> was the federal deadline that any time we modified or amended our Transportation Improvement Program or our Long Range Plan, we have to include performance measures in our documents. That's actually what this resolution does. We have been talking performance measures for a year now and it is still confusing. At the last MPO meeting, we adopted the state's performance measures. Several meetings ago, we adopted the state's safety performance measures. This resolution is the language that is in the TIP. For safety and number of fatalities, that is target. Rate of fatalities is 1.49. The transit, this is the exact ALDOT target performance measure. This is to reduce by 10% the vehicles that met their useful life. We still do not have the asset targets performance measure so we are going to have to come back and revisit that. That is pavement and whether it is good or bad condition. ALDOT is going to do all of that.

Ms. Andrews asked if these would be incorporated into any type of scoring process for potential projects for funding?

Mr. Harrison said no. These performance measure targets are a federal process, a federal requirement. However, there is no consequence of not meeting the targets. It's a bunch of busywork.

Ms. Andrews said but doesn't it affect the state at some point?

Mr. Harrison said the safety money. Right now, the State of Alabama is spending 60% of the state safety funds. If they don't meet these targets right here, the number of fatalities, 1010, if they don't meet any one of these five safety targets, their consequence is they will have to use 100% of money on safety projects. The unemployment rate is directly tied to fatality rate. As unemployment rate drops, people have more money, VMT increases, that is a direct result of the unemployment rate, as VMT increases your number of fatalities is going to increase so they are directly related. In Alabama, our unemployment rate is dropping especially in Mobile. I have a feeling that we are not going to meet that fatality target. We are going to have more fatalities because people have more money, the VMT is going to go up. It would probably be a good time to have some safety projects lined up because there is safety money that the cities can apply for at ALDOT.

Ms. Andrews asked where is the information available regarding criteria and timeline for application for those safety funds?

Mr. Harrison said it is online. Tim Barnett with the state just retired.

Mr. Driskell said there is no deadline.

Mr. Harrison said it is 90% federal and 10% match. If you do it with a resurfacing project and you have a safety project tied to that project you are already doing, you can get more bang for your buck.

Mr. Piper said your local contact is Stephanie.

Mr. Harrison said system performance, the reliable is kind of hard to understand, but the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of the travel time on each interstate and non-interstate road is calculated. We have a two-year target and a four-year target for those. Is the road congested at a reliable rate, but is the congestion reliable? This is how the state came up with their performance measures and we've adopted their performance measures because there is no consequence for us not meeting the targets. I don't think there is a consequence for the state not meeting their target either. What this resolution does is put this language in the Transportation Improvement Program. The current one and the next one we will be doing.

Motion to recommend approval of Resolution 18-015 was made by Mr. Lambert with a second by Ms. Andrews. Motion passed.

Ms. Burnett said when these things are included, do you think at a later date they will be requirements?

Ms. Andrews said or even thought they are not requirements, can we just as a matter of practice, include some of these in some of our prioritization process.

Mr. Harrison said the way that this calculated is there is a network called the TMC which is the traffic monitoring channel. It is basically interstates and principal arterials.

Ms. Andrews said aside from the weird one, like going back to safety transit assets, can't those conceivably be incorporated into whatever scoring system as that further evolves.

Mr. Harrison said that exact number, where they got their data from, CARE, is incorporated into our congestion management process. We look at all of the intersections. We actually look at rear end collision because we consider where there is a rear end collision it causes congestion. We do look at all that for all of our intersections and we prioritize those projects in our congestion management process.

Ms. Andrews said but only within that congestion management process which is a tiny fraction of the overall funding.

Mr. Harrison said it is \$500,000 a year.

Ms. Andrews said and what is the total funding, again?

Mr. Harrison said \$10 million from the MPO.

Ms. Andrews said maybe that is just something we can revisit at some point. If we are collecting data and it makes sense to do so, finding other ways to do that.

Mr. Piper said in our ranking process for the TIP projects attributable, we look at safety. Not with these numbers but we look at three or more hazards or conflicts are eliminated.

Ms. Andrews said and maybe that is where we refine it to incorporate some of this. I remember reading that one and it is still kind of vague and if we are having more specificity here, it might make sense to utilize it.

The next item on the agenda was recommend approval of modifying the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with National Highway Funds as requested by ALDOT.

Mr. Harrison said if you recall at the last MPO meeting, we had a rather large cost increase on a project. Anytime there is a cost change of over \$5 million or over 10%, it requires a resolution for the MPO. This is that same project. The old cost

estimate was \$30 million and now it is \$200,000. That is a shifting of funds. This is being funded with BP funds. It is the project over Glenwood Road.

Mr. Foster asked it went from \$30 million to \$200,000?

Mr. Aaron said this is actually, state dollars will not pay for reimbursable utility work. That means the utility had to go out and pay on their own for everything that we are requiring them to move. This project was originally federal money. It is now state money with it being BP. However, this \$200,000 is going to be federal money so that those utilities can be reimbursed for that work. It says previous cost estimate is \$30 million. That is the road work so to speak and the \$200,000 in utility is kind of attached to it, if that makes sense.

Motion was made by Mr. Foster with a second by Ms. Bergin to recommend resolution for approval. Motion passed.

The next item on the agenda was recommend approval of modifying the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program with STP Attributable Funds project increase as requested by the City of Mobile, Resolution 18-018.

Mr. Harrison said this is for Dauphin Street. Dauphin Street had a \$3.8 million cost estimate. That estimate has gone up to \$7 million. We are going to review the STP Attributable Funding Schedule in a little bit. We have a positive balance still in the outer year of \$2 million. What this does is kind of move some of the county projects, will move some of the county projects out when we do the next TIP. The scope has slightly changed. This is a diverging diamond. At one point it was additional lane but at this point this is a capacity improvement. We are still improving capacity with this project. Why did this go up.

Mr. Terry said it is the work that is involved with a diverging diamond. Also, there is some cleaning up of some access issues that are west of the interstate associated with the hospital and then a little bit of lite access management over to Sage. Then the work with the diverging diamond over the interstate is a substantial increase of cost.

Mr. Harrison said you can see on the 11 by 17 on Dauphin Street that the right of way went up a little bit to \$700,000. It doesn't require a resolution. The utilities are still at \$280,000 for the project as I understand it.

Ms. Burnett said in the redesign of the bridge is there a pedestrian walkway included.

Mr. Terry said that is in the consideration, yes.

Ms. Andrews asked at what point is that determined process wise?

Mr. Terry said given the size of the bridge and trying to encompass all of that on the bridge and still getting the benefit of the capacity, it hasn't been determined.

Ms. Burnett said is there a way to provide pedestrian traffic access not in the diamond itself, but in a different way?

Ms. Andrews said hopefully over the Three Mile Creek Trail at some point.

Ms. Burnett said is it part of the diamond design.

Mr. Terry said that is what is going to have to be vetted.

Ms. Burnett said so maybe or is it a requirement?

Mr. Terry said it is a requirement.

Ms. Burnett said okay, so it will happen somehow.

Mr. Terry said that is my understanding.

Mr. Piper said it has federal funds tied to it, it has to.

Mr. Terry said possibly you don't get the laneage you need. It will have to touch the bridge and will cause an increase in cost. That will have to be evaluated.

Ms. Andrews said are there examples of other diverging diamonds in this state with pedestrian access.

Mr. Aaron said not in the state, no.

Mr. Harrison said as this is scheduled for next year, are ya'll going to have a public comment period on this project.

Mr. Terry said yes.

Mr. Foster said there is a zero missing on the cost.

Motion to recommend approval of Resolution 18-018 with the correction of the zero made by Ms. Bergin with a second by Ms. Andrews. Motion passed.

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

Mr. Harrison said everybody has been given the document. This is actually our budget. This is the work the staff and I do over fiscal year 2019. At the last TCC meeting and the last MPO meeting, I reviewed with ya'll the funding for this UPWP. This is actually the text that describes everything that we will be doing the next fiscal year. The only real difference from last year is our long range plan funding. I increased it because our long range plan is due March of 2020 so I increased those funds. On page 47, the total task for that is \$63,000 to do the long range plan in fiscal year 2019. Hopefully it will be done so we can adopt it by March 2020. This is going out for public comment at 43 different places around the county for two weeks. Ya'll are welcome to take it home and read it and give me any comments that you might have on it.

Ms. Andrews asked if it was online for public comment.

Mr. Harrison said it will be on Friday, June 29<sup>th</sup>. I have received comment from ALDOT, Federal Highway and the Federal Transit Administration on the document and there is little things I have to change. Once I correct all of those it will be online for two weeks for comment.

Motion to recommend the Fiscal Year 2019 UPWP, Resolution 18-019 was made by Mr. Lambert with a second by Mr. Alfred. Motion passed.

The next item on the agenda was a presentation from ALDOT concerning Transportation Systems Management and Operation (TSMO).

Mr. Harrison introduced Daniel Driskell from the Alabama Department of Transportation.

Mr. Driskell said I am the ALDOT Southwest Region TSMO Engineer. For those of you who don't know what TSMO is, FHWA defines it and it stands for Transportation Systems Management and Operations. A fancy name for a lot of things that we have been doing for a long time but also a lot of new things too. Their definition is a cross cutting approach meant to optimize existing infrastructure with better integration, coordination, and systematic implementation of key operations. If you don't remember anything than what I got underlined, optimizing existing infrastructure, that's what we focus on. As part of this meeting, I have heard several projects come up. Funding is our biggest challenge today. Capacity projects

cost millions and take 10-12 years to implement and we don't have that kind of time or resources. We have a backlog of projects that is getting longer every year. TSMO approaches look at what can we do now, what can we do on a small scale to make even a small improvement. Sometimes it is a bit larger improvement than we think.

Ms. Andrews said so you are saying looking at decreasing congestion through ways other than widening a road.

Mr. Driskell said that is the main thing. Congestion is our major target. It is what we focus on on a daily basis because it has implications of safety, it has implications of efficiency and reliability. These are all things that we really focus on in TSMO. Just some neat facts and when I say neat, not neat. Does anyone here just like congestion? Do you wake up in the morning and say I can't wait to get out there and spend 30 minutes at these traffic signals before I get to work? Nobody. I don't either. One fact is in 2013, you, being the average US commuter spent \$755 in congestion. Typical households spend around \$1700 and are projected to spend \$2300 by 2030 which is in 12 years. That is not far away. An extra \$2300 basically coming out of your bank account because of congestion. That to me kind of relates as another tax or another insurance policy, something that you could probably live without so all we have to do is reduce congestion. It is a pretty easy fix. Not so easy, but we've got some ideas. What we are talking about today is hiring a traffic management consultant under the MPO that would manage and operate traffic signals and corridors. We are not proposing any, we are just saying that it is a good idea to look into what are some of the benefits. That maintenance responsibility would stay the same, route jurisdictions would stay the same. It would include installing some equipment to communicate, operate and view the traffic signals. There is a little bit of infrastructure build included. Why do we want to do this? We want to reclaim unused capacity and we want to provide for growth. Future growth should be on the front of all of our minds because we've got some really important companies that have recently come to Mobile; Amazon, Wal-Mart, probably a lot more looking at it, but the transportation system is a big part of that. We want to increase efficiency and reduce travel times by 20% and that 20% is the average of what you will see by managing signals. We want to improve safety. Anytime you can reduce congestion, you are going to automatically increase safety. We want to improve corridor operations and provide some improvements for our emergency responders and make their job safer, allow them to be able to get where they need to go quicker. Preemption is one of those tools that come as a byproduct to this. Work orders would be issued from the consultant directly to whoever maintains those signals so you would be getting quicker information about this signal broke, we think your loop detector has gone out. You are getting more up to date information, constant monitoring. Improve reliability on managed corridors. Erasing jurisdictional boundaries and this is very important and this is why I put this together and wanted to present it to the MPO. It is very aggravating when you go from one municipality to the next and you are stopping at every redlight. You are like five miles back, I was going good. No one really pays attention to the jurisdictional boundaries other than those of us who already know about them. Blurring those out or erasing those and putting them under one umbrella I think is really good for operations. We want to improve quality of life for residents. There are health benefits of not being caught in congestion. How many people get stressed out about, am I going to make it to work on time? Am I going to make it to this meeting on time? Added stress. Stress is bad for your health. We've already talked a little about the money savings. Time savings and the list goes on. Benefit cost ratio on these type projects is in the minimum 10 to 1 and most of your capacity projects at an average rate is 2 to 1. You are getting a lot more bang for your buck on these TSMO type projects, specifically managing traffic signals. Time, we can't replace time. Some of the economic impacts that a commuter would see and this is just a scenario that I came up with. What if we were to manage traffic signals on Airport Boulevard from Schillingers Road to the Loop? That consists of 33 signals. If we were to do this and the average salary in Mobile County is \$16 per hour so that is what I used to come up with the savings. If we were to increase the efficiency on this corridor managing these 33 signals for 10,000 people per day, we could put back in their pockets \$638 per person. You remember a few slides back, you are already spending \$755, you are being taxed by the transportation system, this could potentially give that money back to people who travel Airport every day. It's a cost savings. It's a tax break of sorts. Collectively, this improvement would be worth about \$6 million per year. That's how we come up with a cost benefit of 15 to 1 based on what it would cost you to manage these signals. Pennies on the dollar. Capacity project, Airport Boulevard, you can't even talk about widening Airport. It is what it is. This would be a perfect example of improvements because there is really not a lot more you can do out there so optimizing these signals



would be huge for that. This doesn't even include fuel savings. Big economic impacts on the commercial businesses around. We've already talked about Amazon and Wal-Mart coming in. These businesses, transportation is what they do. It has a huge role in how they make money. Businesses rely on predictable travel time, reliability is huge for them. Inventory cost, buffer stock due to unreliability, pass that on to the consumer. Increased operating cost, we pay for it. Fuel and time surcharges, so that is another tax that is not even figured into that \$755 you are already spending. You will spend more when you go to the grocery store so there are other impacts there.

Mr. Driskell continued I wanted to put together some ideas of corridor management options. I talked with Jennifer White from the City of Mobile and kind of got an idea of what the city is talking about doing for capital improvement projects over the next few years. I think some of these signals are already connected on Airport Boulevard. Mary Beth, you can chime in on that.

Ms. Bergin said almost there.

Mr. Driskell said put the project you are going to do is going to finish that, correct.

Ms. Bergin said yes.

Mr. Driskell said so all of those signals will be connected and that is what you need to manage that corridor. Basically, the infrastructure build will already be done for this corridor as well as Dauphin Street. It would be very cost effective to take those two corridors and hire a traffic consultant to manage those and you would see big improvements on those. If we were talking about a year one idea of let's try this, let's do 25 signals which is a good starting point. These two corridors would be number one and number two on the list.

Mr. Harrison said and what we are talking about is optimizing signals for traffic. The side streets, the signals, everything, optimizing that corridor to the best possible solution. I guess a consultant would do it or would it be 24 hours a day computer generated? How would that optimization happen?

Mr. Driskell said you wouldn't necessarily need 24 hours a day because your time of day plans work pretty good at night and a lot of your signals on Airport Boulevard, you are just going to put on flash so 24/7 monitoring is not needed.

Ms. Bergin said not with the service road, you can't do that. They have to fully operate on Airport Boulevard.

Mr. Driskell said yeah, I am not talking about all of them.

Ms. Bergin said around the mall, they do that already.

Mr. Driskell said it is probably more of a let's say 6 am to 7 pm, a 12/13 hour a day focus. You are catching the morning rush, everything during the day and the afternoon rush. I think you get the most bang for your buck that way. You could structure the contract to do 24/7 but you are going to spend more.

Mr. Harrison said but is it a computer optimizing it.

Mr. Driskell said no, you are having a person. A lot of you have probably heard adaptive traffic signal systems. We are installing one on the Eastern Shore now. They are helpful. It is computer software that optimizes the system. The problem is you still got to have a human that looks over the shoulder of the computer software to make sure it is doing things as needed, but it has a problem as a computer, it doesn't know what real life issues are. Let's say there is a wreck on the system. It doesn't know that wreck has happened so it takes it a little while for traffic volumes to hit thresholds and make changes whereas, if you have someone sitting there monitoring the system, they can see this coming and make the changes before it happens and has a bad affect on the system. Even installing an adaptive system, you still need someone,

a person, to manage it. This is basically cutting out that expensive software system and let's just do it with people because you are going to need them anyway. This is optimizing the optimized.

Mr. Harrison said where would that happen.

Mr. Driskell said this model comes from Atlanta. I went and spent three days in Atlanta. They have a program there that is called RTOP, Regional Traffic Operations Program. It's been around for several years now and it has evolved. What I reviewed was the evolution of where they've gone. It started out as this consultant would have corridor A from point to point and then another consultant would have another corridor. Just managing a corridor wasn't giving them all the benefit they really needed in the transportation system so they modified into more of a grid management system. You've got to start somewhere so I think we start with corridors kind of like they did and we move more towards a city-wide management system. I keep saying city because most of my signal are showing in the city, but this is a county wide plan. Schillingers Road, in the red, that is a big part of they system especially now that it has been widened. I think more people will take Schillingers Road. I think it may even become more of a bypass in the future.

Mr. Harrison said how many corridors does Atlanta have.

Mr. Driskell said this is about 8 or 9 corridors here represented by around 200 signals. Of course, it is hard to compare to Atlanta, I think they have about 2000.

Ms. Andrews said theoretically, by making some of these corridors more desirable to travel on, can you assume that other points of projected congestion might be eased?

Mr. Driskell said absolutely. Let's take Airport Boulevard for example. You make Airport Boulevard better and more people are going to want to use it. That automatically makes Cottage Hill and Dauphin better. That's the transportation system and that's why you want to take that holistic look at it but you have to start somewhere. Equipment is a big part of getting to this point. Being that the City is already really close on these two corridors, that's step one. Let's see the benefits and then let's decide what the next steps are. Just so you know some of the plans that ALDOT is looking at doing, we're trying to build out and ALDOT can only manage signals on state roads. We are focused on like 98 and 90, Broad Street and those areas. We've got a CMP project that we are doing right now for Highway 90 where all the signals from Broad Street and Bankhead Tunnel, they will all be connected. They will all be updated with new equipment and ALDOT will optimize that system and manage it on a daily basis.

Ms. Andrews said and the signals that are kind of near it are managed by the city then? So, this will be a mechanism to get everything talking to each other or does that happen anyway?

Mr. Driskell said no, it does not happen. We are focused on Highway 90. The city, if you are talking about Dauphin or downtown in that midtown area, or Canal, they will not be managed. That could be something that could be realized under this contract that you will have a consultant manage those. Right now, I don't think the city has any plans to do that. They don't have the staff or the resources so it is something that is a little bit better suited to a contract under the MPO. It's a group effort.

Ms. Sanderson said so you don't see any additional funding coming from this. It would just be a MPO type project?

Mr. Driskell said I couldn't say about additional funding. There may be some resources out there. I haven't really had a chance to dive into that yet. I think the initial focus is using what we've already got available.

Ms. Andrews said but could we conceivably run those trend analysis models to make assumptions of efficiencies gained by these models.

Mr. Harrison said look at that map right there. When we screen our corridors for congestion and the CMP which Daniel mentioned is our Congestion Management Process, we're coming up with the same corridors because we are screening for rear end collisions, we are screening for travel time, we're screening it for volume to capacity ratios, so we are coming up with the same corridors. If you look right here and this is actually the next item on the agenda which is review the attributable funding schedule, this 11 by 17, if you look at the bottom of it, the Congestion Management Process, we are putting \$500,000 federal a year towards these congested corridors. The first one that Daniel was just talking about is Government Street, the next one is Dauphin Street which was on the previous slide which is in conjunction with the \$7 million. The next one is Airport Boulevard. It's possible, if it pleases the committee, to use this \$500,000 a year to fund that.

Ms. Andrews said that is not what I mean. You look at this top part where all the big money is where most things are adding lanes and if this logic is worth adopting, then I think there needs to be a discussion on do we need to add these lanes or can we take some of this investment, put it there, to decrease the need for those additional lanes in the future.

Mr. Driskell said and that's why I love TSMO because it makes sense. If something costs us \$10 million versus we've got something that cost \$100,000, let's try that first.

Mr. Harrison said if you get a project that pay as you go is going to fund or if the city wants to replace ones of it's projects like Zeigler Boulevard with something like that.

Ms. Andrews said but it is bigger than the city. It's looking at the periphery too. It's looking into the county. Yeah, our models show that as things are going now, growth is happening so let's build some more roads and go out, out, out. I think that is a reactive approach. I just think that it's worth a look as we get into the long-range planning and we revisit some of these funding in the out years, I think there needs to be that discussion of is the answer to keep adding lanes or can we take part of what we were planning on spending on adding lanes as part of the whole MPO budget to do this.

Mr. Harrison said when we do the long-range plan and you are going to be a part of this process, we are going to have a map of all the problems and then there is going to be a visionary map. We don't have enough money to do all of the projects that we need to get done. What we've highlighted in the long-range plan, are those major projects that need to get done that the sponsors, the County Commissioners, the City, your bosses, want to get done so if you want to convince your bosses to spend money elsewhere on projects like Ziegler and Schillingers and stuff like that.

Ms. Andrews said but doesn't it need to be more. Does the MPO only fund whatever the county says I want and the city says I want, that is what is getting funded?

Mr. Harrison said kind of. The projects are identified in the Long Range Plan. They are either a city road or a county road or a state road.

Ms. Burnette said another comment that if you use corridor management and reduce lanes, doesn't that come into safety because you are not adding lanes and people aren't going as fast. I mean do they kind of complement each other, this and safety?

Ms. Andrews said and maybe it is a education component, too, because it seems very expensive and time consuming to always have the answer be add a lane.

Mr. Driskell said it is and it gets to the point to where you can't even do it at all like on Airport Boulevard. You cannot add another lane out there unless you did away with median. It is possible but based on the funding and everything that goes into that, it is not possible. You have to come up with another way and operations being that proved way is pennies on the dollar to see those improvements. The discussion is great. I love hearing this. However, let me say this, there are some times when there is not a TSMO strategy that will help like widening a road. Sometimes, a two-lane road, there is

just nothing that you can do to that but add a lane. It's not a one size fits all. However, when you already have a wider road, a Hillcrest that is four lanes, a Grelot that is four lanes, a University that is four lanes, that's when you start looking at the operational improvements that you can make.

Mr. Harrison said and really Kina, that \$500,000 a year federal is something that eventually our congestion management process can be TSMO.

Ms. Andrews said isn't that a matter of tweaking the percentage of money that goes to the bottom half of the sheet versus the top half. Is that an easier solution?

Mr. Harrison said I don't know if you were here when we restructured this for the congestion management process, but I recommended a million dollars. It was whittled down by the committee to \$500,000. The committee did not agree to a million dollars. I hear you, but the committee voted on \$500,000 rather than a million. It cuts into funding for these projects.

Ms. Andrews said I understand there is limited funding. Perhaps in the long range plan, there can be more of a focus strategically on how we address some of these anticipated congestion problems.

Mr. Piper said Danny, do you have a dollar amount that you think we should start off with? You are talking about paying for this out of attributable funding, right?

Mr. Harrison said no, not all of it. If anything, the \$500,000 of the congestion management process coming from the attributable, but it is going to have to have multiple funding sources.

Ms. Andrews asked are the STP attributable funds able to be used on that theoretically?

Mr. Driskell said yes.

Mr. Piper said what kind of money are you thinking, Any idea?

Mr. Driskell said no, I am just presenting the idea. I wanted to plant the seed. Funding is definitely an important thing that is going to have to be discussed. Based on feedback, it sounds like everyone is interested so I think that discussion will be held probably at the next meeting. Kevin and I have had these conversations. It can definitely and probably should compete with the idea of capacity, having the majority of funds. You are getting a lot more bang for your buck. We need to get our foot in the door and we need to have some performance measures where we can say, 'okay, board, we showed you. We gave you 20% capacity back by doing this and it only cost you this. How about you give us more money to do this with and let's realize those benefits.' You have to start somewhere.

Mr. Foster said so are you envisioning another type of TMC facility to oversee and watch.

Mr. Driskell said we are planning a new facility as part of the scope of the Mobile River Bridge. We could have a new TMC as quick as four years, but there has to be a project. It may take longer than four years, but we have a new TMC planned and that TMC houses more than just the state dot. We are going to be bringing in more city and county potentially.

Mr. Foster said for like these locations, I guess you would be putting independent cameras at each intersection to monitor what is going on?

Mr. Driskell said potentially. You would definitely want cameras at your more important intersections so cameras is definitely part of the plan and then communication to the cabinets. You have several variations that you can go through. I love these two corridors because you already have fiber connected or will have in the near future. Once that happens you have the infrastructure. It's a no-brainer.

Mr. Harrison said does anyone have any more questions for Daniel?

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

Mr. Harrison said the 11 by 17 in the folder is the attributable money. It is the MPO's money. What is in italics is recently changed and if you will notice, we have \$2 million here in the positive. Year 2020 and 2021, we are \$10 million over. What I want to do in a working session, ya'll are more than welcome to attend but it is primarily going to be the city and county, we have to develop the 2020-2023 project of funds. Right now, we don't have enough to do these; Celeste Road from I65 to Forrest Avenue is a long range plan project. City of Saraland would like to have that project in the plan as well. That is another \$17 million-dollar project.

Mr. Lambert said they have committed to doing their share.

Mr. Harrison said at the very least, the PE and the beginning of that project at least should be in the next TIP. That meeting is going to happen in the next couple of weeks. I will send something out and call it a work session, not necessarily a TCC meeting, but we need to figure this out because we have a year to adopt this. I would rather it be in place now, have the projects laid out and have a positive balance for each year. We don't have enough money to do all of those projects. We are already looking at a \$10 million deficit in 2021. That would be a zero balance right there if we move all of these projects back let alone adding Celeste Road for \$17 million.

The next item on the agenda was old business.

Mr. Harrison said if ya'll remember, we had APM Terminals do a survey for us. Every time they get inspected, one day a quarter, they will be handed an iPad with several questions regarding origin and destination. We purchased INRIX data for truck data, what this is leading to is a Freight Advisory Committee. The MPO will not only have a Technical Coordinating/Citizens Advisory Committee, Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee, we are going to have a Freight Advisory Committee. It's going to be a lot of the truck drivers. What's going on with Wal-Mart, the Port, Amazon, the airline industry, it is time that we have a voice from the trucking industry in terms of our infrastructure. It will probably meet twice a year. I don't know when we are going to meet or who is on the committee but we will be working on that in the next couple of weeks. US 45, tomorrow night, we have a public meeting for the US 45 feasibility study from 5 to 6:30 at Leflore High School gym. Volkert is working on that along with CERM. They have some pretty good support for road diet on US 45 from Springhill up to where it drops a lane so three lanes with bike/ped on that road. The public hearing is tomorrow night at Leflore High School.

The next item on the agenda was new business.

Mr. Harrison said anybody that knows Joe Nix, today is his last day at ALDOT out of Montgomery. He was our MPO guy out of Montgomery.

Mr. Alfred said Mr. Parker's last day is Friday. He is with McDonald Transit. There is another company that is going to be providing management services. It will be First Transit. Actually First Transit was here twelve years ago. The GM is going to be Mr. Michael Chinn. He is relocating from Dallas, Texas and his first day will be Monday. He has over 34 years' experience so I am excited to work with him. He is actually been a general manager and has been a regional safety director. He has managed paratransit in the past.

Ms. Bergin said I have some new business. This year, I am the vice president of the Alabama Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers. At our annual meeting, we give out awards to different members of our organization. This year recipients of one of our awards couldn't make it so I was asked to come today and present it to him. It is the Transportation Professional of the Year Award and it is awarded to Kevin Harrison for his work for the area for the state. He participated a lot in the Southern District Meeting we held here in Mobile back in April. He literally had all of our entertainment planned

for us and his staff volunteered and helped with us as well. For that, and for all of the other things he has done for the organization and the State for Transportation Planning.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Chairman, TCC

Date \_\_\_\_\_