

Technical Coordinating/Citizens Advisory Committee

February 24th, 2021

10:00 am Virtual GoToMeeting

Members Present:

Hon. Margie Wilcox
Edwin Perry
John Murphy
Dennis Sullivan
Frank Williams
Nick Amberger
Shayla Beaco
Mary Beth Bergin
James DeLapp
Jennifer White
Logan Anderson
Shilo Miller
Jason Franklin
Jeff Zoghby
Chris Curry
Nancy Hewston
Brad Wittman for Ricky Mitchell
Kim Sanderson
Richard Spraggins
Dr. Laura Cepeda
John F. "Rickey" Rhodes (TCC/CAC Chairperson)
Gerald Alfred
Michael Hora, ALDOT

Guests:

Barrett Dees
Glenn Mosely
Wade Bonzon
Matthew Barcliff
Bryan Fair

Members Not Present:

Bob Harris
John Blanton
Donald Watson
Merrill Thomas
Essie Johnson
Fernando Billups
James Jacobs
Brian Harold
Casi Callaway
Christienne Gibson
Jennifer Denson

Staff:

Kevin Harrison
Tom Piper
Anthony Johnson
Monica Williamson

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

The second item on the agenda was to recommend approval of consider amendment to 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) STPAA, Mobile County, 100044866 Gopher Tortoise Mitigation Habitat Development \$300,000 Resolution 21-001.

Mr. Harrison said that this project uses STP Any Area Funds and is for \$300,000 for Gopher Tortoise Mitigation.

Motion to recommend approval was made by Ms. Margie Wilcox with a second by Mr. Dennis Sullivan. Motion approved.

The third item on the agenda was to recommend approval of an amendment to 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) STPMB (CN) - New Alignment of CR-25 (McFarland Road) From CR-28 (Old Pascagoula Road) to CR-358 (Three Notch Road) \$13,100,000, Resolution 21-002.

Motion to recommend approval was made by Mr. Dennis Sullivan with a second by Mr. Nick Amberger. Motion approved.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval to delete 100056130; (UT); BR; Replace Bridge, Bin 008714, SR-16 (US-90) Westbound Over Tensaw-Spanish River, Resolution 21-003.

Mr. Harrison said this a bridge project on the causeway the utilities is being deleted. ALDOT is here if anyone has any questions. I'm not sure why it is being deleted.

Ms. Wilcox said I do want to hear the explanation.

Mr. Perry said it is just getting moved because utilities have already been relocated since there is no utilities that need to be done, we are deleting the projecting.

Ms. Wilcox made the motion to recommend approval with a second by Ms. Jennifer White. Motion approved.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of amendment to 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FTA 5310 funds to include the Program of Projects, Resolution 21-004: City of Satsuma (\$33,085 Federal/\$33,085 Local); Via Health and Fitness Center (\$38,400 Federal/\$9,600 local) and the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission for program administration (\$31,736 Federal/\$0 Local).

Mr. Harrison said this is the federal transit administration 5310 funds. It is for seniors and individuals with disabilities. This money is apportioned to the MPO. We had a call for projects in September of 2020 and the committee didn't have to meet because we have more money than projects that were applied for, but this is the projects that were awarded as a part of the process. The next step is to introduce the projects to the TIP and then we can get the projects awarded. This is City of Satsuma for \$33,085 federal and VIA for \$38,400 and the money does come with administration to SARPC. I will say we have received some CHRISSA money that I will talk about later. It's about \$55,000 and we are trying to develop a program to get homebound seniors to vaccinations for Covid-19. We are going to use the 5310 program to try to use that CRSSA money to do that.

Motion was made by Mr. Jeff Zoghby with a second by Mr. Nick Amberger to recommend approval. Motion passed.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of the FY2020-2023 Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan, Resolution 21- 005.

Mr. Harrison said the next is Resolution 21-005. This is for the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan. We have to update this every couple of years. Any time anyone applies for Federal Transit dollars in the SARPC boundary which is Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile County, it has to fit a need that is in this plan. It is updated. It is online. You should have received a link to review it. It has been adopted by the Rural Planning Organization and the SARPC board and requires adoption by the Mobile MPO. Tom Piper did this document. Tom, do you have any further notes on that.

Mr. Piper said we have been doing this since 2006. It is for the 5310 program and the JARC program. If you want to apply for this money, you have to address a need identified in this plan. We have to do the plan in order for that pot of money to be available.

Motion to recommend approval made by Ms. Marjorie Wilcox with a second by Mr. Dennis Sullivan. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to review report of the Mobile MPO Pubic Participation Process. (No Resolution)

Mr. Harrison said this next item is Public Participation Plan. Before we do that, Monica is going to give a Public Participation Report which is required yearly.

Ms. Williamson said for public participation we use public notices in the newspaper, a Facebook page, website and e-newsletter. This past year we had 5,177 visits to our website which is an average of 431 visits per month. Our weekly newsletter is sent to 544 individuals. In the past year, we have sent out 46 newsletters. The Facebook Page has 130 followers. Public Notices were placed in the Mobile Press and the Lagniappe for each of the TCC/CAC meetings and the MPO meetings. We had a total of 7 public notices this past year. For public review in FY2020, we had our UPWP, the TIP and the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan. With the Long-Range Transportation Plan we also had an online survey that was completed by 146 respondents. We had 16 citizens attend MPO meetings and 2 citizens attend TCC/CAC meetings during FY 2020.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of modifications to the Mobile MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP), which outlines the public involvement procedures for the Mobile MPO transportation documents, to include the Limited English Proficiency Plan, Resolution 21-006.

Mr. Harrison said in terms of the public participation plan which is online, a couple of big changes that were made. Covid kind of screwed everything up. Last year, we had a long-range plan and in the middle of public involvement, City Halls closed, public libraries closed which is where documents are available for public review. We made some changes to one, account for virtual meetings. Page 8, this section was added to accommodate for quarantines, hurricanes, unforeseen events that could happen. We removed City Halls and Chamber of Commerce for places to put documents. No one is going to these places to review documents so we added the virtual public involvement and we removed some of our areas to get the public documents. Every time we have a review of a document, we have to physically go and put the documents in these places with comment forms and then go back and pick them up. It seemed effective in 2019, but now it is different. Once thing we also did was remove the requirement of the UPWP which is our budget. The budget is always online but to go out every year with physical documents at these places and never had any comments so quantifying the effectiveness of public participation, it is not effective to put that out there. The Limited English Proficiency plan was updated with numbers to reflect the 2019 American Consumer Survey. Those are the changes to the public participation plan. By March 10th, we will have reached the requirement for the 45-day public review. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. anybody has any questions about public participation plan?

Mr. Rhodes asked if there were questions? If not, we need a motion to recommend approval of resolution 21-006. Motion made by Ms. Margie Wilcox with a second by Mr. Nick Amberger.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of a modification to the 2021 Unified Planning Work Program.

Mr. Harrison said this is modifying the unified Plan work program to include a mobile area major road plan. So, as you all may recall, every so often we have carryover funds of our PL pot of money that money can only be spent on planning documents. It can't be spent on capital, it cannot be spent on operating. We do have a little bit of money left over. And generally, we like to do a third-party study that benefits everybody. Some of the past examples was the ADA transition plan. We did the Mobile Nonmotorized Study for Downtown. We've been asked by the county to a Mobile area major road plan. This really stems from the City of Mobile pulling back their planning jurisdiction to the City limits. Now what we can do is have a major thoroughfare plan in and some connectivity to those municipalities in the urbanized area and change their subdivision regulations. So, everybody will be on the same page in terms of a major thoroughfare plan. So, this is the actual changes in the UPWP, section 3.8.1.3 for \$75,000. And really, this is the language for a road plan including regulatory components, current practices, case studies, and guidance from Mobile County and the municipalities within Mobile County to include for methods and tools for preserving right away in the context of expediting environmental clearance process and review of how corridors are prioritized, designated and adopted for management and preservation. This is also changing the document. You can see here \$75,000 has been included for 3.1.1 in the plan. That's the modification to the UPWP to account for the project.

Mr. Rhodes asked any questions? If not, we need a motion to adopt resolution 21-007.

Motion to recommend approval was made by Mr. Nick Amberger with a second by Ms. Margie Wilcox.

Mr. Harrison said really quick, I'd like to get this done. This will be added to the 2022 UPWP. I am looking at a time frame from May to May. Hopefully, we can start the consultant selection process as soon as the MPO meeting happens on March 10th.

Motion to recommend approval of Resolution 21-007 was approved with an abstention by Mr. John Murphy.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval of updated performance and transit performance measures.

Mr. Harrison the next item is Resolution 21-008. This is performance measures. I'll seen these before. What I have decided to do is just do an annual resolution adopting these performance measures. The MPOs in the State of Alabama agreed to adopt the same performance measures and targets that the state has adopted. There is PM1 which is safety. PM2 which is bridge and pavement performance management and PM3 which is which is system performance. Then we have two here further for transit. FTA transit state of good repair and then down at the bottom, FTA safety performance measures. And those numbers come directly from the Wave for transit. So, each one of these targets is on a rolling average. So, for example, number of fatalities 961, that's actually based on an average over the past five years. That's the target and the range is per vehicle miles traveled. That also was a five-year rolling average. So, because it's a five-year rolling average, that number does change. And the targets were supposed to move those targets. We've met all these targets. The only performance measures and as a consequence for not meeting the targets is the safety. And as I understand the numbers I don't think will met the performance measure number of fatalities target. I don't know if ALDOT is on the line, ALDOT Montgomery. The consequence is potentially is that the safety money the state gets. Right now, 20% of that money is flexed over to different funding categories, different federal funding categories. If you don't meet that target, and I think ALDOT may be waiting on federal guidance on this, 100% that money will be used for safety. That's bad news for wherever it was flexed but good news for the safety projects. For those municipalities out there, that do have safety projects, I imagine they have to get them into the HSIP plan to get funded. If we didn't meet our targets, then we will see quite a bit of safety money in that the MPOs around the State of Alabama can use. I think ALDOT is waiting on federal guidance on that, because that just happened. We are going to do this every year. We've all seen this before and most of them stayed the same minus the safety PM1 targets. And I'll try to answer any questions, if anybody has any questions, concerning these targets?

Ms. Wilcox asked how many fatalities? I may have misunderstood what I'm looking at. The number of fatalities, 961. That's all over the state? I can't even imagine we've had that many fatalities.

Mr. Harrison said that's correct. That is all over the state. Which is why I don't think, I'm not exactly sure. I need more guidance on that.

Mr. Piper said that's a three-year average, right? I mean a three-year count?

Mr. Harrison said a five-year average. That's a five-year rolling average. So, if I'm not mistaken, 2016, 17, 18 19,20, is that number. That's why it's a bigger number. It's the first time that we haven't met the criteria so we just have to wait on federal guidance.

Mr. Fair said Kevin, this is Bryan Fair. Well, you're right. It's a five-year average. And we're setting a target here. So, this isn't necessarily the number of fatalities statewide in a given year, although it is it is more than you might think. But this is our target we're attempting to make in 2021.

Mr. Harrison asked did we meet that target this year?

Mr. Fair said our safety section, John Michael Walker, our state safety engineer is in discussion with FHWA right now to get the official word, from FHWA who comes and looks at our program and decides if we've met the targets, the performance targets, for these different measures. And they have not told us officially yea or nay. But it looks like the conversations are wrapping up from what I've just heard.

Mr. Harrison said then Brian, every MPO in the state is adopting those same performance measures, excluding that last transit. The transit safety performance measures is specifically for the Wave Transit.

Mr. Fair said that's right. Yes. Correct.

Mr. Harrison said okay. Does anybody have any questions while Bryan's here?

Mr. Fair said for the last several years, this is has been a big endeavor for the state to come up with these targets.

Motion to recommend approval of Resolution 21-008 was made by Ms. Margie Wilcox with a second by Mr. Dennis Sullivan.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval to a modification of the Mobile MPO Bylaws creating a MPO Vice Chairperson, Resolution 21-009.

Mr. Harrison said this resolution pertains to Vice Chairman positions on both the MPO and the subcommittee, the joint technical citizens committee. This is a request of the MPO chairman. A lot of MPOs have a Vice Chair. We have never had one because nobody's ever asked for one. Mayor Stimpson requested that the MPO have a vice chair. And so basically, this is a resolution to modify the bylaws. And I've included 5.2 up vice chairman, a couple of things about the vice chair is just like the chair, it's got to be an elected official. It can be selected by any member, any voting member of the MPO. And the nomination. For Vice Chair within that process, and nominations are put in here to be heard by the TCC CAC chairman. We can potentially have a spot where we have a new Mayor, and we don't have a chair or Vice Chair. So, I've put in the MPO bylaws that the nominating and nominations will be heard from the TCC chairperson, which is generally the executive director of SARPC. So, the TCC chairperson, will hear nominations and proceed with the voting for a chair and a vice chair. Vice Chair again has to be elected official, just like the chair. So that's the resolution for this excerpt from the MPO Vice Chair.

Mr. Rhodes asked is this for the TCC or the MPO?

Mr. Harrison said this is a resolution modifying the Mobile MPO bylaws, the following resolution, modifies the TCC/CAC bylaws.

Mr. Rhodes said the chairman of the MPO as everyone knows, is Mayor Stimpson. And vice chair would also be an elected official.

Mr. Harrison that's correct, by the whole 60-member body. There are members of MPO that are not elected officials like the Mobile County Engineer, the Wave transit, ALDOT, SARPC position so anybody can make a nomination for the vice chair but that Vice Chair has to be an elected official. The term of that position is long as that elected official is an office which is the same as the chair.

Mr. Rhodes said I would recommend Mayor Dr. Rubenstein he certainly highly interested and involved.

Mr. Harrison said when this happens first after the bylaws are adopted, we can call for nominations for vice chair.

Mr. Rhodes said okay, so this time we need a motion to adopt resolution 21- 009

Motion was made by Ms. Margie Wilcox to recommend approval of the update to the MPO bylaws with a second by Mr. Amberger. Motion passed.

The next item on the agenda was to recommend approval to a modification of the TCC/CAC Bylaws creating an MPO Vice Chairperson, Resolution 21-010.

Mr. Harrison said this is the same thing. It's modifying the bylaws for the TCC/CAC for a Vice Chair.

Motion was made by Ms. Margie Wilcox to recommend approval of the update to the TCC/CAC bylaws with a second by Mr. Amberger. Motion passed.

The next item on the agenda was a discussion of FHWA Notice N4510.851, CRRSAA funds for 2021: \$3,193,942 Highway and \$55,000 Transit 5310 funds.

Mr. Harrison the next item on our agenda does not call for resolution. This is something with the CRRSSA money. And this is this just came to it from the past couple weeks, this particular thing down here 460,000. That just came to us this week. And this is one if you recall, last year, the 564. came to us special allocation that went straight into the STP Attributable funds. We discussed it at the TCC meeting and we elected to just add it to the pot of money. This is coming across again \$460,000. This money is for charging stations. We're still waiting on guidance for this money. It is for charging infrastructure along corridor ready. We received over a million dollars for this. ALDOT, I don't know why.

Ms. Wilcox said on a state level as I understand it there, they've already selected some charging stations along I 65. corridor and is this specifically to our area. And the only question that I had on a statewide level is that if Tesla had funded their own, it's kind of interesting. Are we giving grants how are we picking the winners and the losers on this? I mean, it certainly can't be a state-run organization.

Mr. Harrison said and we've received no real guidance. This is the guidance. this is what I received.

Ms. Wilcox said I'll send you what I got which kind of list some more information. I'll send that to you. I'll send it to you.

Mr. Harrison said okay. And ALDOT might need this. It's not just Mobile. It's all the MPOs in the State are kind of scratching our heads. What are we supposed to do with this: It's a million dollars of federal funds and we can certainly spend it, but it was it's coming to us as 100% funding for charging infrastructure.

Ms. Wilcox said I understand that as well. And I think there's going to be two charging stations in Mobile. I think there's going to be one in the north Mobile area. And I can't remember off the top of my head where the other one is, but it was two decent locations, but it is being fully funded.

Mr. Harrison said okay and perhaps this is that money. We're waiting on more guidance on this. This is coming straight into the STP attributable, which is thankfully Alabama is getting clearing 71 right here. And I'm 16 point 5 million is going straight to over 200,000. That equates to. And I want you to read right here for costs related to preventive maintenance, routine maintenance operations, personnel, including salaries, even pay some debt service payments on certain set of things. And this money can be used for in terms of per capita is that comes down to Mobile MPO, we get \$3.1 million. This money is 100% money, that does not require a match. As I understand it. We are still waiting on guidance for this. This particular federal guidance came out a month ago, but we're still waiting on how we can spend it as well as ALDOT Montgomery is waiting on further guidance. I would recommend is if \$3.1 million of 100% money if the Mobile MPO can have a process. This is a chance for some of our smaller communities that really don't have the funds to fix the preventative maintenance routine maintenance type projects. I know Prichard, Bayou la Batre, Creola, Chickasaw, they would all like the opportunity to get 100% to fix some of these things. I know there is a pothole in Satsuma that needs to be taken care. I know there's things in Bayou la Batre that needs to be taken care of this is an opportunity for 100% funding. This is all of the guidance I have on this. Y'all have been given the link. And I really don't have any other information on this. And I like some discussion from TCC members. What do you think of that idea of having an application type process for \$3.2 to open it up to the smaller communities that typically don't have projects funded by the MPO. Dennis, I'm sure, Chickasaw y'all have potential projects that you all could use 100% funding for?

Mr. Sullivan said Oh, yeah, definitely.

Mr. Harrison said Frank, I'm sure there's things in Bayou la Batre as well. So, then that's the idea. Any questions on that? Question questions?

Mr. Murphy said Kevin does have a limitation as to what type roads has to be spent on?

Mr. Harrison said I don't know that answer. There is federal guidance and there is some interpretation of guidance. So, there is off system limitations.

Mr. Fair said this is Bryan Fair again, I'll speak to that. The front office of ALDOT is busily working through the details of all the above to the regulations that Kevin mentioned. We are going through eligibilities to determine just all the details that need to be sorted out so that we can give some real guidance and not leave you guys in the dark. We want to wait,

but now that it's out there and anyone can Google it. We want to define it a little more. And so as soon as we know Kevin will know.

Mr. Piper said I would think it would be the same as attributable, but that's an assumption?

Mr. Fair said yeah, there is, right at the top, it says something about section. Well, it mentions a specific regulation that deals with Surface Transportation block grant. So, activities that are eligible for Surface Transportation block grants are generally eligible for this.

Mr. Harrison said right. For the purpose of this meeting for discussion, just took excerpts of that notice. So, the full notice, a link to it is online as part of the agenda. If anybody has any questions on it, or recommendations, or if you think it's a good idea, to open it up to some of our communities who typically don't have the match for projects.

Mr. Zoghby asked Kevin, what do we normally have for our match on most of our money?

Mr. Harrison said 20%?

Mr. Zoghby said what if we made it only that 10%? And got more stretch out of it?

Mr. Harrison said well, that's an idea. I'm certainly open to that, but some of the smaller communities may not have that match.

Mr. Zoghby said no, I'm fine with whatever y'all think.

Mr. Amberger said you know, anything with 100% match is always good, good for anybody, I just think, you know, you need to develop a process that various entities can apply for and try to get as many good projects as we can, I mean, the good thing, hopefully, within the room, hopefully, I don't think we have a problem collectively as a group spending that money. And, again, just find out what the strings are attached to it, which again, federal funds are probably going to have federal strings. So, if it starts becoming real estate, and some of those other things, you know, projects can get delayed. I think just making sure you've got good clean projects, I think is what I would be my main comment about it. Engineering and right away, could bog things down. But

Mr. Harrison said like, like Bryan with ALDOT said, this is still brand new to it. So, we're all still trying to figure out how we can spend it and the best way to do that.

Mr. Amberger said the two words maintenance and preventative maintenance that just brings joy to my ears that there's funding that comes with 100% for those items. I mean, that's, that's a very welcome, welcome change.

Mr. Rhodes said the need is there and the demand, I look for a lot of folks to want to try to get some of that money. And certainly, could be a lot of good projects that are much needed.

Mr. Amberger said let me make one more comment. And this is just an effort that I know that the City of Mobile is working on, it has to do with our traffic signals. And having a backup generator power. I mean, for the for the storms, where technology has gotten to where it's not overly expensive to have a backup system. And again, if you just think about, you know, we had a meeting this morning talking about hurricane season. I know it's nobody, nobody's favorite subject. But you know, the storm just put a tremendous demand on our public safety resources, if we have power go out to a to a traffic signal intersection. So, I'm sure that's pretty much the same across the board. So that might be something that the group collectively wants to look at other very worthy, worthy project. Oh, yeah. Then affects everybody. Yeah.

Mr. Harrison said really quick, we're talking about is down here, that federal funding the 460, for the CRRSSA charging money. It does add about a million dollar to the pot. This is your current funding schedule. A couple of things have changed. This dollar, this project, if you remember, was like \$20 million. So that's \$3 million less. This project McFarland is getting pushed out. That was item number two in the agenda and it looks like in 2023, \$18 million surplus looks like a lot of money but if you look in 2024 we have projects that we can't afford. So, we're already negative seven and a half million out in 2024. Celeste Road, McFarland or Three Notch we're not going to be able to afford both of those projects

in 2024. One of those is going to have to get moved out. We don't have to worry about that until the time comes. Our Congestion Management Project Process projects are lining up and getting spent. Government Street has been authorized and these projects are moving along. Does anybody have any questions?

The next item on the agenda was discussion of the I-10 Mobile River Bridge.

Mr. Harrison said we have talked about the Mobile River Bridge and y'all might recall neither MPO has the bridge in our fiscally constrained long-range plan. It is in the visionary for both MPOs and it cannot enter the TIP until it becomes part of our fiscally constrained long-range plan. Until ALDOT can give a plan that we can't enter into a long range plan the fiscally constraint, long range plan then we can immediately put it in the TIP. We're working on ideas and others are working on ideas. Dr. Eppley has come to us with a presentation and they are here at SARPC I'm gonna turn it over to them for a brief presentation

Dr. Eppley said thank you. My name is Don Eppley. I'm an economist from USA recently retired. I have two people with me John Ramos, who is from Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce recently retired Joe's also an engineer, and Steve Russell. Steve is from the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce, also an engineer and also recently retired. We started working back in August of 2019 after ALDOT came to town and made its proposal. What we wanted to do was to generate our own intelligent response. Can you see the PowerPoints? If you look at the PowerPoints, we also have a report that is posted on your site. There's a summary on page two about halfway down, it summarizes the PowerPoints. And I'll go through these pretty fast. We to solicit opinions and recommendations from up to 30 to 35 people now who have some responsibility to this project. We asked for opinions suggestions, what they thought needed to be done. Next step to get this project moving. In data, we have some costs of yours. We have future traffic counts. We have some revenue, projected collections, we've made our projections on revenue. We put together our own Excel tables, starting in the year 2025. Relate I was laid out having a table to take a look at while I was there, it appeared to be that what was coming in before Christmas was somewhat repetitious. So again, to look for consensus, what is the consensus and all of this information and data and analysis that we'll need to carry forward. That's what we're doing in the PowerPoint. So that's our message today. The first point we need to make here, so there's still some confusion out there. So, what this project is all about. We're recommending, and what we found is that we need to stick with the original ALDOT proposal they made back in 2019. This is one project with two parts. One part is to build a brand new, six lane bridge. And the second part is to build a brand new eight lane Bayway. The Bayway is attached to the bridge on the east side. It's important to us to remain with the current environmental impact statement. There are a lot of details in a lot of these recommendations I'm not going through for the sake of time. Point number two, needs to deal with all of the three routes that exist today. We're recommending that everything that is free today should remain free tomorrow. That means there will be no user charge ever on the Wallace Tunnel. Second point, in regards to the Wallace Tunnel is to seriously consider removing it from the I-10 designation. Now, for everybody out there, that is a commuter going either direction Eastern to Mobile, or Mobile to Eastern Shore, and you concern about paying a user charge, there would be none. That is a free choice. And that's important to the whole project.

The second point has to be with the bridge and the Bayway. This is where the I-10 traffic truly belongs. We don't know for sure until we hear from ALDOT that there will be a user charge. By the way, in our analysis, there's no such thing as a toll. It is a user charge. If you as the driver elect to use it, there could be a fee. If you elect not to use it, the you pay no money for it. It's correctly described as a user charge, user fee. If there should be a user fee our analysis shows basically cars and pickups should have a charge of approximately \$2. That's an average of \$2. Please don't take away that we are recommending \$2 because we're not. We're recommending an average of two dollars. That means there's room for some fees will be higher and some fees will be lower. It could be a whole range of charges. ALDOT can work all that out, they have staff and the personnel to do that. For all other vehicles, it will be approximately an average of \$10. An average again is that. There would be some vehicles paying more and some less. So therefore, between the two with regard to the transportation routes that are free and the fact, there may be a user charge on the Bridge and the Bayway, there is a free route for those people who are concerned about the charges. The last point is that this is a question that deals with money. So, we're still waiting to hear from the folks in Montgomery about the total budget will be and whether or not a user charge, in fact will be needed. After all, could build a few new billion-dollar bridge if they wanted

to do it as long as they pay for it. Now, why are we here? What are we asking him to do? What we asking you to evaluate? What we would like to do is determine whether you agree or disagree. What we'd like you to do is consider this as a four-page report. And this is a way to take some action on a report circulated among other groups and generate a consensus. Our groups main goal is to get this project going. We have three citizens in the community who see the future economic development. After all, you're talking about a potential \$2 billion project in this community. What better time to see an economic impact for small businesses. We'd like for you to put a cover letter on this report, consider it to be a reasonable approach for discussion, send it to ALDOT in Montgomery and let them determine what comments are feasible. They've got the staff to look at it all again and then issue them an invitation to come back to the coast and give us a new proposal primarily on financing. That's what we're asking. That summarizes everything we have to present. Does anyone have any questions you might want to ask? There's also another PowerPoint, of how can contact us. If you get home and have a question, or you have a point to make, or have any data you can offer us, this is how you contact us. And we encourage you to do that. I might add that, as this project, we were asked a number of questions about the entrance at the west end of the Wallace Tunnel. We have tried to answer those questions with a series of questions and answers. So, we do have a report on questions and answers. We will leave it with Kevin, if anyone would like to look at it, to see it more detail, and so we'll be glad to visit with you about it. So, if you're on the eastern shore, and you asked me what I take to get to the airport, bridge, some restaurants or tournaments, or whatever, we have a series of questions that goes through the questions and answers with regard to that. We're not in the design business, we approach this project primarily from a rendering side. So, we tried to answer those questions as their rules that we can recommend and which are designed for the region. Thank you for your time, it's always a welcome time to visit with a group. Thank you.

Mr. Harrison said does anybody have any questions for this? The bridge report that he's talking about is on our website, the meeting page, both this PowerPoint and a bridge report on that site. I know we have an MPO meeting March 10th. If ALDOT were to present us with a project with cost estimates and funding, staff here, would have to modify that long-range plan. Several things, we would have to do. If the volume changes, travel times change, environmental justice will have to be reviewed, updated and several things in the long range. It would have to be advertised, receive public comment, federal approval before the MPO can see it and technical citizens committee. That is certainly not going to happen by the March 10th meeting, but you know, the summer, if ALDOT does propose something to us, we're certainly ready and waiting for that to happen. So, anybody have any questions?

The next item on the agenda was old business.

Mr. Harrison said this is not necessarily old business. Anthony Johnson, on our staff provided some preliminary traffic findings about what COVID did to our traffic, and this is our interpretation of ALDOT Traffic data. So, you all know the timeline. March was the shut down, and we had to stay at home and safer at home order. What he did was a statistical analysis in terms of travel volume, speeds, and crashes. And he looked specifically, at these 18 sites that were averaged in order to create the data. And this was from March through October 2019 and 2020. It's interesting that the stay at home order in April, the volume of traffic reduced throughout the entire study area as compared to 2019. With Hurricane Sally, you can see what happened with Hurricane Sally, it was very low as well. We are almost back on track to where we were in 2019 in terms of traffic volumes. This is an average of those 18 locations. Again, as you can see, it's almost 50% reduction, on average of all Mobile County. I think that was true on the Bayway as well, in terms of their permanent counters. In terms of speed, Anthony used the national performance management research data set and this from that same time period, you see how COVID affected our speeds. You can see some really big dips. Hurricane Sally, you can see our travel speed was reduced as well. In terms of crashes, we used the Care data, critical analysis from the state and our overall crashes are down. In terms of our safety performance measures, it's probably going to be pretty good next year, but this data is not in the five-year rolling average until 2022. The overall number of crashes are down as compared to 2019. So, Anthony did a good amount of work on this. This will be online if anybody has any questions concerning that. Now something I do want to mention, just came to us this morning, is we have an announcement from the US Census. The US Census has changed their criteria for an Urban Area. It is in the preliminary notice says the minimum density for an urban cluster is 4,000 instead of 2,500. Where the delineation process, what some of this means is, we're just gonna have to see the numbers when they complete this. Bayou la Batre is part of the urbanized area. I

don't know how this is going to affect that. I was hoping that Grand Bay as part of an urban cluster would become a part of the Mobile Urbanized area. it doesn't look like that's gonna happen. And potentially this could change the Eastern Shore MPO. It's 50,000 people. I don't know if this is gonna do to some of the smaller MPOs in the state. I just got this this morning, I thought I would pass it along. It may affect our STP attributable funding is that there's a per capita funding. If our urban area changes. our populations may change. But more importantly, we're going to have to change our study area boundaries, which changes would be required to be voted on by all in terms of federal funding. So that's the Federal Register. If anybody wants that link, just email me. It's pretty big news. They will be receiving comments the next several months, and I can assure you will be a lot of comments pertaining to this. They changed the criteria for an area so the proposal it's not set in stone yet. They're just looking for on these concepts.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

Chairman, TCC

Date _____