

**Mobile Area Transportation Study
Metropolitan Planning Organization and
Technical Citizens Committee Meeting
February 24, 2010, 10:00 a.m.
SARPC Boardroom**

MPO Members Present

Mr. Russell J. Wimberly (non voting)
Mr. Vince Calametti
Mr. Joe Ruffer
Mr. Tyrone Parker
Mr. Norman Walton
Mr. Bill Metzger (Rep. Hon. Reggie Copeland)
Ms. Betty Donald (Rep. Hon. Ken Williams)
Mr. John Murphy (Rep. Comm Mike Dean)
Mr. James Jacobs (Rep. Mayor Davis)

TCC/CAC Members Present

Mr. James Jacobs
Mr. Don Powell
Ms. Ginny Russell
Ms. Betty Donald
Ms. Casi Callaway
Ms. Sandra Forbus
Mr. Nick Amberger
Mr. Gerald Alfred
Ms. Margie Wilcox
Mr. John Murphy
Mr. Bill Metzger
Mr. Randy Delchamps
Mr. Bryan Kegley
Ms. Lindsay Hutchission
Mr. James Foster

Guests:

Mr. Shaun Capps
Ms. Alice Lewis
Mr. Harrison Rue
Ms. Anne Choate
Mr. Michael Meyer
Mr. Robert Ritter
Mr. Chris Miller
Mr. David Yarbrough
Mr. Edwin Perry
Mr. Ricky Mitchell

MPO Members Absent

Mayor Don Nelson
Mayor Stan Wright
Councilman William Carroll
Mayor Sam Jones
Mayor Byron Pittman
Mayor William Stewart
Hon. William Troy Ephraim
Mr. Mark Bartlett (non voting)
Mr. Robert Jilla (non voting)

TCC/CAC Members Absent

Ms. Tywanda Jackson
Ms. Jennifer White
Mr. Hunter Winton
Mr. George Crozier
Mr. James Foster
Mr. Thomas Hughes
Mr. Bert Hoffman
Mr. Tom Briand
Mr. Bryan Kegley
Mr. Steve Perry
Ms. Jennifer Denson
Mr. John Bell
Mr. Sam Rawls
Mr. Donald Watson

Advisory Members Absent

Ms. Alfredo Acoff
Mr. Craig Thomas
Mr. Cornell L. Tatum
Mr. Dave Harris

Staff:

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

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Russ Wimberly in the absence of Mayor Jones.

The second item on the agenda was to approve the minutes of the January 13th MPO meeting. Motion made by Mr. Joe Ruffer and seconded by Norman Walton. Motion passed.

The third item on the agenda was to adopt the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan as proposed by the Mobile MPO TCC/CAC.

Mr. Harrison said in your folder you will find a resolution to adopt the 25 year long range plan. You will also find the executive summary of the plan and a brochure detailing the projects of the plan. Ya'll have been mailed the full blown document and the executive summary. I just want to briefly go over a timeline about the long range plan. February 2005 was when the last plan was adopted. We have to adopt a new plan every 5 years. It's about to be 4 years, once we become nonattainment for air quality which is most likely going to happen. Throughout 2005, ALDOT conducted our area wide Mobile counts. We have 840 stations in Mobile County. The black tubes that go across the roads, those are traffic counters, that data comes back to us. That was in 2005. Half of those counts were before Katrina. The other half of the counts were after Katrina. There was no way I could validate a travel demand forecast model to counts that were before and after Katrina. In 2007, ALDOT redid all of our coverage counts – the 846 around the county and those were done for the purpose of the model validation. 2007 is the base year for the model. In 2008, the Congestion Management Process was conducted which is Chapter 11 of the Long Range Plan. We used GPS transponders and rode every road, arterial and freeway, some minor arterials, a minimum of 6 times in each direction and we also had intersection projects as part of the Congestion Management Process. 2008 data collected by Traffic Analysis Zones. Households, we took the building permits from every city and Mobile County from 2000 and tabulated them by Traffic Zone and added them to the 2000 census. The number of employees were physically verified by address from year 2007. 2008 to 2009 we received the traffic counts that ALDOT collected in 2007 and our model is validated to the counts. Our model validates with statistics and are well within the federal guidelines. August 2009, we met with the mayors and planning staff and the county, to help develop our future forecasting socio-economic data and to solicit future projects. The forecasted socio-economic data was based on trend lines and when we met with them, we had aerial photographs and we used each governing agencies insight as far as future growth in both households and employment. November 2009, the TCC met. The forecasted data was reviewed and discussed in November and projects were solicited for the Long Range Plan. Forecasted households for the plan year 2035 is 200,000 households in the study area. Right now, 2007, we had about 155,000 households. Forecast number of employees is 250,000. In 2007, we had about 184,000 employees. January, the projects for the future year were developed. If you look at your executive summary in your folders, pages 4 and 5. This is the recommended Highway Element of the Long Range Plan. These are all projects. None of these projects have changed since the public involvement process started. Page 5 is a table of projects. If you look at the far column that has a "P" on it, those are priority projects. The way these projects were developed is all projects with priority one have some form of the project in our TIP now. Our 5 year schedule of funds 2008 to 2012, you've got either PE, right of way or construction in the plan. If it's a priority 1 it is already in the 5 year short range plan. Priority two projects, those are projects that are already set up. They are in the system. They've been talked about in the past and they already have project id numbers, in the system, waiting to be done. Some of those priority two projects have been there for years. Priority 3, these are new projects and it includes an arterial loop using Snow Road and it includes a section of US 45 and a section I-10. We also tested a freeway alternate which basically took all of the resources from priority 3 and created, it went to the right of way and widening of I-10. All I-10 projects that you see under priority two now, those are within the current right of way. I-10, based on the counts that we received from ALDOT, Montgomery, which we are bound to use ALDOT's projections, I-10 at the state line

increases about 3 ½% per year and that puts about 109,000 cars at the Mississippi Alabama state line in the year 2035. Using those projections, I-10 needs to be about 15 lanes and 65 about 8 lanes to the state line. The Freeway alternate was unrealistic and really is considered as the visionary alternate in the plan. Page 7, briefly the transit element. We recommend some fiscally constrained projects and rerouting structure and some visionary projects like the Intermodal Terminal Complex and Passenger Terminal for Ferry and Rail. Bicycle/Pedestrian, we list some new routes, but all new roads have to have some type of bicycle/pedestrian facility or have a good reason not to have it. That's in the plan. The Congestion Management Process, again that is using the GPS to conduct the travel time study and not mentioned in the Executive Summary is the Environmental Justice which all projects in the plan have been tested to have no detrimental affects on travel time to low income and minority populations. January 13th, the joint MPO/TCC meeting, I reviewed all these projects with the MPO and the TCC. Invited everybody at that meeting to attend the public meeting on February 3rd. February 3rd, we had a public meeting which we had a good number of attendees. WE had about 60 people attending it. We had pretty good press coverage from the TV, newspaper and radio. The plan has been distributed for about 2 weeks in 43 different locations around the county. We've done presentations, a group of developers, Board of Realtors, Commercial Property Group and Optimist Club. Also in your folder, past that and this might take awhile. Summary of all written comments. 15 MPO members or their proxies, after hearing these comments, they have the ability to table the long range plan based on the comments. This packet is the summary of written comments.

Mr. Harrison continued, we had two received last night about 5 pm and we had about 5 pages received about an hour ago. We are going to review all of these comments now. Turn to page 2, the first page is a summary of all the written comments, a summary of what I am about to go over. Page 2 is some of the verbal comments that we received at the public meeting. They are all good questions. Some of the school had some unsafe crossings. What could be done to improve signal timing. This happened right after the girl got hit on Azalea. That was actually quite a few comments. That's really a safety issue. What type of fuel does the WAVE transit use or what type of fuel do they intend to use. Where will the end of the new bridge be on the east side of the river? We are not sure yet, that's still under EIS. What can be done the safety of bicycle and pedestrian users and how can we change driver's perception of cyclists? Socioeconomic projections don't take into account the current economic downtown. That's correct, but 2007 data is what I'm bound to use. The counts, the households, employees, the data that ALDOT gave us, everything is 2007. Was PARCA data used? No. There's a comment about adding bike lanes to fat roads and restriping bike lanes and another one about the surface on the bike routes. Tom will go over bike comments in just a second.

Page 3 we had comments that suggested that we include an urban diamond interchange for Canal Street and Water Street. That's really a safety project, not necessarily a long range transportation project. It's actually an interchange replacing a interchange.

Page 4, we had a public comment from the hearing. Several comments about I-10 crossing must have a light rail facility which I don't disagree with. It's not financially feasible. Fix the west end of the tunnel. Previous comment on that. Get waiver and have I165 end at I-10 on East side of River using existing Africa Town Bridge. Have open/speaking comment period and rapid transit through multiple counties. I don't disagree with that.

Page 5, a comment in support of the plan. Page 6, a comment supporting the plan. After the packet, there's a couple of comments here. One is from Dr. George Crozier. I believe that the plan as presented is flawed by the use of outdated travel data and assumptions. A study released by the Brooking Institute – the Road Less Traveled, in 2008 provides data indicating that Vehicle Miles Traveled in Alabama declined through 2007 and 2008 by 3.8%. Even if there is projected growth for

an area, the MPO seems to be inexorably committed to solving congestion problems by expanding roads. Dr. Croozier has a lot of good comments here. I am not going to continue to read that one.

Number 2, the use of the City's Greenway Plan is a useless red herring in the bicycle/pedestrian debate. Those plans are of largely recreational value and don't do much in support of transportation corridors. Federal support is in the legislation to support this and other alternatives to widening roads but the plan does little more than pay lip-service to those initiatives.

We'll get into the bicycle discussions in just a second.

Comment number 3. The very idea that the MPO will digest, incorporate, and /or respond to comments, between the closing of submission yesterday and their voting which is what ya'll are doing today is an affront to the public comment process, unless of course there is none. Administrative procedure is fundamental to the process of allocating resources and public input should be more highly respected.

I sent ya'll the comments that we received from the public hearing with the second notice for this meeting. Like I said before, the MPO has the power to table this recommended plan.

Comment number 4. The plan seems terribly short sighted in proceeding down the usual path of expanding roadways and encouraging continued automotive transportation with the imminent reduction of the air standard threshold to the point that region will be non-attainment.

We are going to be non-attainment. January 6th, EPA is reconsidering the designation to between .6 and .7. Right now, we are in attainment for air quality.

Mr. Wimberly said let me interrupt you there Kevin, to reiterate, the MPO has the authority to table the plan, but the MPO also has and there is a requisite to amend the plan once it's passed. So once we become nonattainment, the plan will have to be amended to adapt to that so everybody think about that as we go.

Mr. Harrison said right, August 2010, EPA will have the final designation for whatever the standard is going to be for ozone. Right now, we are probably over what is going to be the new standard. A year from August, the state will have a year to come up with a budget for emissions and a year after that we will have a year to come up with a plan to meet those budgets.

Ms. Casi Callaway said

Mr. Harrison said when we become a nonattainment area, a road, as I understand it, and I'm new to this, if a road project increases VMT, that calculates into increased emissions. We have to budget those emissions according to the state's plan.

Ms. (inaudible comments)

Mr. Harrison said if we don't miss the budget for emissions, what would happen. Like in Atlanta, they stopped all federal transportation funding because they didn't meet the budget.

Mr. Harrison said we've got a comment from Dr. Eichold in your folder. The above is referenced Long Range Plan is based on point estimates for various future time periods and thus has a high probability of being in error. Highway road usage is down for the last two years. As you have

mentioned at meetings, Mobile County will soon become ozone non-attainment and the plan does not adequately address how to resolve this problem. The hub and spokes proposal is weak in detail and overall it lacks a formal energy conservation plan. Alabama has one of the highest highway traffic fatality rates in the nation and lost lives could be significantly lowered with a highly effective mass transit system which the plan lacks. Alabama has been listed as number two in the nation for obesity and this plan does not have any details on how to retro fit the county for sidewalks, bike path and creating walkable cities. Building more roads creates highway congestion and urban sprawl; things a good plan should avoid. As you and other know, \$288.5 million for I-10 Bridge is not a realistic cost and this item should simply be deleted. It is very important to provide truthful, accurate data to the Federal Government. The public input process is important and not just a box that needs to be checked. Not having the document available at the time of the public hearing, not allowing people to speak in an organized forum, sending written notice of the hearing that arrived two days prior to the event and a two hour time limit to ask questions for something that reaches 25 years into our future is administratively simply wrong.

All good comments. The \$288 million is the current cost of the bridge. It stops at the study area boundary which is the county line. It does not include the widening of the Bayway. Our study area boundary says the Mobile Urban boundary stops at the Mobile County line. We had a public hearing, we had a good attendance. I asked everybody for question or comments at the public hearing and you received all those that came from the Public Hearing. We have quite a bit of bicycle and pedestrian comments.

Mr. Piper said page 7 is the first of the bicycle pedestrian comments. We had quite a lot of these. I'll try to make these quick. The first one is from Kemper Sarrett. He is an avid cyclist who lives in Midtown Mobile. He liked the plan and said it was a good start and applauded our efforts. He wants to see wider shoulders on roadways, designated bike lanes and more signage. He would like to see separate paved bike lanes in certain places. He thinks that public awareness of bike safety needs to be increased, automobiles sharing the road. The next comment was from the Medical Society of Mobile County, page 8 and 9 they want to promote bicycle and pedestrian routes that allow communities to utilize these transportation alternatives and to reduce obesity. They encourage the development of complete streets. A complete street being a street that is designed for all modes of transportation, bicycles, pedestrians, automobiles, transit. They would like to see a review of existing neighborhoods, business section and school locations retrofitted to include various transportation modes. And a master plan with a funding mechanism that provide walking and bike paths.

The comment on page 10 is from Phil Hooper. He is the owner of the Bicycle Shop in Mobile, the Eastern Shore Cycles in Daphne and the Bike Shop in Foley. He thinks the long range transportation plan has very little priority for walkers, runners and cyclists. He says that many non-cyclists meaning automobile drivers, don't feel that the cyclist have the right to use public roadways which the state law says that they do. He thinks that motorist awareness needs to be increased for bicyclists. Having safe pathways would promote more people to use them as a means of transportation to work, school or other destinations and not just for leisure activity. This can help to reduce motorist traffic, reduce automobile exhaust pollution and improve overall health of people who choose to walk or ride on these safe, legal pathways.

The next one on page 11 is from Marian Pfeiffer who says we need provisions for bikers and for runners in our planning commission. Alabama is the most obese state in the union and our children also need this option as well as adults.

Page 12. These comments came in from SmartCoast and it's also Mark Plotz from the National Center for Bicycling and Walking. They've been down here aiding Smart Coast and looking at the area. There's overall comments and about 8 pages or so of comments behind it. The first one is with those exceptions to routine inclusion, which appear on the front page, must be banished to the appendix. It's talking about the plan identifies, it says that all transportation projects, all road projects, have to include a bicycle/pedestrian component unless there is a reason for omitting them. He's saying that those exceptions need to be not on the first page. He would like to see health and equity featured more prominently. He says this is a bike plan but only about 10% of it applies to pedestrians. There needs to be more consideration for pedestrians, not just bikes. If you depend on federal funding for bike/ped to do everything, you will not get there. There needs to be more local thought in the projects. The plan calls for greater coordination among local jurisdictions and agencies. He goes on to say that he doesn't see a listing of the MPO members, but it is in the beginning of the document.

The current conditions are very non specific. Talking about how many miles of bike routes or trails are in the study area. That is in there now and there are a number of bicycle routes so those things have been added.

The next page is the Smart Coast comments. The Long Range Plan is missing a comprehensive approach to the development of a fully integrated, connected transportation system across and between modes for people and freight. It goes on to list the planning factors. The long range plan does attempt to address all of these planning factors. It is heavy on automobiles. And they say it needs to be focused on more alternate modes of transportation.

The next one, #2. The Long Range Plan does not detail the public involvement, public review or public outreach process. That is contained in our public involvement procedures which is a separate document that pertains to all documents that we put out and that is available on our website along with the long range transportation plan. Those things are not in the long range plan, but they are in the public involvement procedures. Then it goes on to list some examples. It gives some examples of the Nashville area MPO and the Northern New Jersey MPO public involvement procedures and long range transportation plans.

#3. The report does not establish and describe the data collection process that would provide a comprehensive or reliable account of existing facilities or needs analysis. It says that we need a facilities inventory. There is a facilities inventory in the plan. An annual count program, a pedestrian level of service and bicycle level of service and crash analysis which has been done. It is limited because we are limited by what we can do. We can't make everything available such as where the crashes occur. That data is protected, but it does identify the number of crashes in the city, the county and the state. The number of injuries and fatalities. That was added probably after they saw the original rough draft. Then it says there are not page numbers on the document which it does have page numbers. I think they were looking at an older version. It says some bicycle routes are planned in conjunction with road projects in the Transportation Improvement Program. This sentence was taken out of context. The way it was written was unclear and it's been rewritten. It was identifying not all projects, but talking about a list of projects that followed. Some of those were going to build with road projects and some were going to be built separately as a stand alone project.

The current plan states that "bicycle and walking are viewed primarily as recreation activities" It says that we should change to say that "bicycling and walking is viewed by some as only recreational but in the underserved areas, these are utilitarian means to get to work, shop, and worship. It is the intent of this plan to increase the amount of safe bike and pedestrian paths for both recreational and utilitarian usage. This change has been made and that language reflected.

The next one is about current conditions for existing and potential facilities were assessed during a windshield survey. This is not a true user survey. There needs to be visioning workshops, scheduled and purposeful interaction and cooperation with biking, walking and running groups, a survey of WAVE users and feeder neighborhoods to determine service needs and coordinate with school districts so that 2 mile catchment areas around schools constitute priority areas for investment as walking zones. It goes on to say in order to facilitate and promote ridership; almost all of the WAVE transit System's buses are equipped with bicycle racks. Actually all of the WAVE Transit Systems buses are equipped with bus racks so that was inaccurate. It then goes on to say 'encourage street design layouts in residential areas that discourage through traffic and high speeds.' It says that statement should be removed and it has been removed. It gives a link to a complete street sight at the Birmingham MPO website. Then it says 'develop community activities, such as rallies, rodeos, bikeathons, and family bike rides to increase community awareness and ...to raise funds for local bicycle projects.' They didn't like the raise funds for local bicycle projects. They said that bicyclists are entitled to the same consideration as motorists and shouldn't have to raise funds for projects. 'To raise funds for local bicycle projects' has been deleted. We intended that statement to encourage activities to increase safety and awareness of bikes on the roadways so we took out the bit about raise money for local bike projects. It goes on to say that a comprehensive plan should include information on the following. I won't read all of that to you. These are all very good comments. It looks like in the future we are going to have to do a comprehensive stand alone bicycle pedestrian plan not just a part of the long range transportation plan but as a separate document. I think the federal regulations are going that way so all of these things that are suggested for a comprehensive plan will be taken into account.

It then goes on to talk about the 2025 plan. I think they mean the 2035 plan. It says it doesn't address the issues of Safe Routes to School and lists several things about the Safe Routes to School program that need to be included in the plan. There needs to be a bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee developed. That sounds like a good idea. Pubic outreach recommendations. We do have a website that we post all of our information on, we do that already. Then it goes on to say that local governments can and should be encouraged to develop neighborhood plans to provide details on connectivity and gaps and infrastructure in poor repair. It goes on that the plan states that the 'Mobile Area MPO is neither in non-attainment status now, nor is it anticipating non-attainment status in the near future.' This is incorrect. I think they were looking at an older plan or something because the current draft plan says the exact opposite of this. I don't really know what they are talking about. Then the last thing talks about the Congestion Management System, Chapter 11 of the plan. It talks about the intersection at Azalea Road and Cottage Hill. It makes some suggestions of how to improve this intersection. Things that should be considered; putting in a crosswalk, putting in an island and reducing the width and length of the lanes to slow traffic and good intersection lighting that allows enough time to walk across. Put in better and wider sidewalks and upgrade pedestrian facilities at the intersection. This intersection is primarily a "School Zone" not an "Auto Zone" and it should be treated as such. That's all we got from Smart Coast.

Mr. Harrison said and the last one, we received about an hour ago. An hour before the meeting.

Mr. Piper said yes, I haven't even had the chance to go over all of this. It's pretty long. There's a lot of good recommendations in it.

Mr. Harrison said the deadline for comments for last night.

Someone asked who they were from.

Mr. Piper said I can't think of the guy's name. He's a local cyclist.

Mr. Harrison said and ya'll have these 5 pages of comments in your folder. Like I said, we haven't had a chance to review them. We got them an hour ago and the deadline was last night for public comments. These are all good comments. I would like to pass them on to the sponsors. A lot of these are safety, operational comments talking about fountains and signs that are beyond the scope of a 25 year long range plan. It does say other alternates being considered to reduce the vehicle miles traveled. Yes we do have transit in the plan, but realize that transit is maybe one maybe two percent of the VMT, is considered in the plan.

Mr. Piper said there's also a transit development plan that the WAVE develops that is a comprehensive transit plan. There is a section of the long range plan that is devoted to transit, but the transit development plan that the WAVE does is much more comprehensive and I think has a lot of things in it that folks want to see as far as a transit plan.

Mr. Harrison says those are all the written comments that we have except for one comment from Mobile BayKeeper who would like to present to the board.

Mr. Wimberly said before you get up Casi, this was out there by the sign in sheet. Casi signed it. Is there anyone else who would like to address the board in addition to Casi? Okay, Casi you got it.

Ms. Callaway said thank you so much for reading all the comments from all the people to everyone. That was helpful. I'm not going to do that with mine. They are in your packet so I'll just give you the highlights of them. I have to admit that the more you talk and the more you read other people's comments the more I wish I had included in mine and they are a little bit based on some of the things you said so I'm going to address those separately. When you said Environmental Justice you said it was projected and studied for impact to travel time. Is it studied for the impact to quality of life? That is what I think people would be concerned about. I appreciate the 2007 is our baseline, but planning includes and this is a longer bit of my discussion, planning includes planning for the decrease and I don't see how you've done that so that's another main chunk. Safety, you said safety was not included in the plan in reference to the diamond interchange, yet their approach to projects and planning were because of safety primarily including the outer loop, the new bridge, Hwy 98 and other things so I'm not exactly sure....

Mr. Harrison said can we address these comments one at a time.

Ms. Callaway said I can do them one at a time. We can have a long discussion if you'd like to. If you don't mind the big picture of this and the comments that we made, I have 12 different particular points in here all those statistics dating back to 2007 and that data, the increase in vehicle miles traveled, and when you point that some increases for example, the traffic on I-65 and in Saraland, Celeste Road, is going to dramatically increase from 54,000 to 105,000 vehicle AADT, Annual Average Daily Traffic. Yet you don't discuss under any circumstances from Saraland south. How can part of a road be increased, more than doubled, yet the immediate south of that isn't increasing at all.... You don't talk about I-65 and what's happening with I-65. In a conversation with Kevin he said it is already over capacity. We've got roads that are over capacity that don't make the cut and roads that are near capacity we're concerned that we are taking millions of dollar to build which is the Bayway Connector Bridge. Wetlands impact are given a nod but they are not addressed as far as planning when we have seen dramatic problems that we are working to avoid in the future. You are going to see major outpouring from the community and watching those incredibly closely. You need to look at it. It needs to be part of what you do (inaudible) 65 didn't make the cut and it is already over capacity,

yet I10 is just beginning to be overcapacity and we are already talking about widening it. Air pollution. Again, this really goes to planning. We will be in nonattainment is a fact. The numbers, if EPA increases the number from 6 to 7, whatever number is upcoming, we are barely making the .85 parts per million, we are barely making that today, but tomorrow we will not be making the .7 or whatever new number that will be approved by the EPA. This plan is flawed because that information has not been taken into account. As far as bike bath planning, my organization organizes a triathlon, we didn't mean to, but we do and I have access to all 5 bike organizations in this community. We work with them daily. >>>>>she organizes a race called ride yellow that has thousands of participates and yet they weren't included on this discussion on any of the bike/ped planning information. Outside your resources there is so much that PARCA and that's with a "C" has done. That organization is not as much transportation research, as done a little bit in a vacuum, but great research that is not included. The REMI model seems to be the only model that is used in some of these which is outdated and there are some great new models out there. The comment process. Russ, I greatly appreciate you ability to say that we can adopt it and amend it but you've got some actual, significant comments that are very pointed and very detailed and you have no ability from 5:00 last night to 10:00 this morning to incorporate them. Frankly, ya'll know that I am co chair of theReform coalition and I didn't think there was a worse way to do a comment that ADEM, but they give me 30 days to submit a comment and they may respond to me in 30 days or they may respond to me in 6 months, but they address every one of my comments and then they pass the permit. What you have the potential to do here is simply here us talk and then throw it out the window. That doesn't feel good. That is not a public comment process. Finally and then is the planning thing. I will probably read to ya'll a little less that I'm usually comfortable doing. Planning isn't what this document does. You've got a 25 year plan. You are assuming no changes in the future. You're assuming that we are going to grow today the way we grew in 2007. Same vehicle miles, same job increases, same economy, same everything. You are not including the economic downturn. You are not including air quality changes. We need to be addressing that in this plan. This plan needs to say we will be in nonattainment by this date and this plan. Therefore, we need to make these changes. That has to happen and has to be incorporated. Otherwise and again, please understand I got involved in Hwy 98 very late by commenting in 1999. I was asked where I was 30 years ago when that transportation was put in place and I was 4. I'm telling you this now because we have a chance to change. We have a chance to do better. You have a chance to do better and pass a plan, create a plan that plans for a better community. Let's incorporate the comments and then let's look at this thing again. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Harrison said if I can address some of those comments. As far as air quality, right now we are in attainment. To do this to the ozone standard that you are talking about is a lot of work that we are not required to do right now, that we don't have the staff to do right now. Now, the next long range plan, we are going to be required to do it and we are going to do it.

Ms. Callaway said this is not a plan. Planning requires figuring out what is going to happen tomorrow and addressing it.

Mr. Harrison said and that's what we've done by the plan. As far as I-10, you mentioned 65. The tunnels are already at capacity. So is 65. We can do something about the capacity problems at the tunnels. We can't do anything about the capacity problem at 65. That is too big of a project and we are fiscally constrained. This plan, we have \$743 million over the next 25 years projected out. \$281 million of that is going to be the bridge. We don't have enough money to fix 65. There's not enough room to put lanes on 65 south of Celeste Road. As far as the PARCA data, I tried to look at the PARCA data once you mentioned it in the public hearing. That data as far as I can find goes back to 2006 and our data is actual data. We have physically verified all these new houses by building permit, physically verified the location of all these employees.

Mr. Wimberly said if we use an organization like PARCA or any other organization for data, would we have to get permission from the Feds to do that.

Mr. Harrison said probably not. Our public involvement process is the federally approved public involvement process. We had a public hearing three weeks ago. Our public involvement process says we put it out 43 different places around the county, they had two weeks to review and we are following the federally approved public involvement process right now.

Mr. Wimberly said any other comments.

Mr. Calametti said yes I would like to address some of the I65 comments. I agree that it is at capacity, but there are other things that we can do with our roadways rather than just you know, if its uneconomical to expand and increase lanes we can make our roadways more efficient through the use of for instance Intelligent Transportation System, ITS. There is a project right now that is already in the system that will go on I65 from I-10 up to state route 165. It's a resurfacing project but it also we proposed to add on to our existing ITS system. ALDOT, our forces, have already put in conduit and fiber optics, but I proposed that this project will increase our highway advisory radio system; we'll put in VMS signs to advise the traveling public of travel times as a goal. If you are at Airport Boulevard and you want to get to I-10 if there is a wreck, it'll advise you there. The MPO has funded our next study that will give us set detour routes. If there is an accident on I65 just north of Dauphin, it will have a set scenario of where that traffic will be moved to. There is work for I65 planned. It's not just building new roads to improve efficiency, but we do think we can make some of these roads more efficient. So there are plans for I65.

Mr. Harrison said also Casi to address some of your other concerns. The downturn, the economic between 2007 and 2010, our trend is from 1960 to 2035. I don't disagree with you that there is a downturn although when we are forecasting this data that is a hiccup, in a trend line forecast to 2035. I reviewed all of this with the TCC and CAC of which you are a member of, in November. As far as VMT being reduced, actually Mobile County gasoline consumption is going up, not down.

Mr. Wimberly said Kevin, is there a regulatory time constraint attached to this plan.

Mr. Harrison said the long range plan has to be adopted every 5 years. If it's not adopted....

Mr. Wimberly said that's my next question. If it's not adopted, what happens or what does not happen?

Mr. Harrison said no federal transportation projects can be authorized until we have an adopted long range plan.

Ms. Wilcox asked what our five year deadline is.

Mr. Harrison said it's really February 2010. I don't know how strict Federal Highway Administration can be on that because we are here today and we are working on a solution. So now when we become nonattainment for air quality which is going to happen, we'll be required to do it every 4 years instead of every 5.

Mr. Wimberly said so it was due February, now?

Mr. Harrison said it's due now.

Mr. Wimberly said and you don't know whether or not if we break that window if we adopt it next month or the month after that what will happen.

Mr. Harrison said I don't know.

Mr. Wimberly said as I said earlier, the MPO has the option of tabling the plan. The comments we received I think were very good. Some of them have been incorporated when we had the chance. Some we just received as you said, today and yesterday. Again, good comments. So you have the option of tabling or adopting. What's your pleasure?

Someone said and you can always amend it later on.

Mr. Wimberly said that's right and you can always amend it later on.

Mr. Harrison said it's not a fluid document like the Transportation Improvement Program is. It's not a concrete document. If you recall, February 2005, we adopted the plan and had to come around 2 months later and amend the plan for State Route 188 and I-10 and 90 in Grand Bay. So it is an amendable plan.

Mr. Wimberly said another question. If it's adopted here today, does it get further approved by the Feds later on?

Mr. Harrison said it's actually under review process with ALDOT and the Federal Highway Administration now. And we have received comments from them.

Ms. Wilcox said I can remember 20 years ago when we would have these plans, put them out and nobody would read them and nobody would make comments. First of all I would like to thank everybody for the incredible work and detail that went into making the plan and then also in turn the people that read it and submitted very thoughtful comments. I have said some of the same things over the past 20 years that sometimes we could do a better job and by being challenged to improve, I'm not taking any of this personally. I think we are being challenged to improve our process and I would like for us to rise to that challenge. I'm personally for making the bike paths and walking. We do have an epidemic of obesity and there are reasons, external reasons, the way we've made our communities have contributed to that. If there's anyway that we can take into account some of these comments and put them in that plan, I think that would be a great step towards improving ourselves overall. I know the hard work that ya'll do. I mean, I've worked with ya'll for 20 years. Twenty years ago, your comments just would not have been received as well as they are. I can tell you that with my personal experience things have greatly improved with this organization and I know that 20 years we want to be able to recognize it for even being better. That's all my comments.

Mr. Wimberly said thank you Margie.

Mr. Harrison said as far as the bicycle pedestrian plan, this plan has to be fiscally constrained. We are recommending what needs to be done. It's really up to the sponsors, the people that are going to match these federal dollars; it's 80/20 on capital improvements. It's up to the City of Mobile, it's up to Mobile County, it's up to all the cities in the study area. There is some separate funds, Safe Routes to School, the Transportation Enhancement funds, Community Assistance Preservation; all can be used

for bicycle pedestrian improvements. Those are competitive funds. Not really part of a fiscally constrained plan.

Ms. Wilcox said and I will tell you having been a part of the Northwest Florida Regional Planning Council, one of your sister organizations, they did take the lead about 3 years ago and held meetings to show the sponsoring agencies, when the people had a vote, when they envisioned roads, they'd give them pictures of roads, what do you want this intersection, with real live examples, there were votes to make better intersections and to encourage the people that they voted in to office as their mayors and as their county commissioners that that was what they wanted to see for their future. I don't know how much, but I'm sure that it was a very costly planning activity, but the planning council over there did take that lead and I participated in those activities.

Mr. Harrison said we have in the plan on every arterial, in the dark green, on the executive summary and the brochure is required to have some type of bicycle pedestrian facility if it's federally funded.

Someone asked and if there's not one.

Mr. Harrison said if there's not there has to be good reasons. That can't happen until the PE, design for the project.

Mr. Calametti said actually Kevin, and you and I have talked about this several times. It's in the environmental document process that every mode of transportation is studied; bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle. It's not up to, ALDOT is one of them, it's not up to the matching organization, what they want to put in. If there is evidence that those transportation, that bicycle and pedestrian use those routes, they have to be accounted for to get federal funds. It's not up to the agency. If you ignore that, you are not eligible for federal funds and rest assured, we are and everybody that is doing environmental documents following the NEPA laws, we are having to dot our 'I's and cross our 'T's. That is not an easy document now to get approved. What has happened in the past with all the other documents, there's been no control, but these documents are being scrutinized.

Mr. Wimberly said okay, back to the question at hand. What is your pleasure?

Motion was made by Mr. Joe Ruffer and seconded by Norman Walton.

Mr. Wimberly asked if there was any further discussion.

Ms. Wilcox asked who is eligible to vote. Just the MPO, not the TCC?

Mr. Harrison said just the ones with the blue folders.

Mr. Calametti said I would like another comment on it. Kevin, we don't know whether we are going to be outside our time frame if we do table this to review these comments further.

Mr. Harrison said I don't know. We have a representative from Federal Highway Administration that might be able to better answer that.

Mr. Capps said that would be up to Mark or Dave.

Mr. Wimberly said let me ask this question. Are there any other MPO's that you are aware of that have failed to meet the time constraints.

Mr. Capps said not yet. Everyone has a different date.

Mr. Wimberly said I have one more comment. I think Tom's comment about forming or doing a stand alone bike/pedestrian study and analysis is very cogent and in forming some sort of body to handle that is something that we will need to look at in the future. Questions been called. All in favor say I.

Motion passed with no opposition.

The fourth item on the agenda was to consider an update to the 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program as proposed by City of Mobile and Mobile County for Airport Boulevard Intersection Capacity improvement study with attributable funds.

Mr. Harrison said if you recall, at the January 13th, MPO meeting, we had adopted a balanced Transportation Improvement Program. We had a small surplus of funds in 2011 and the City of Mobile and Mobile County would like to do some form of Airport Boulevard Intersection capacity improvement study. They could probably go into more detail on that. It's for \$200,000, 80% federal, 20% local which will be jointly done between Mobile County and the City of Mobile. Bill do you want to speak to that?

Mr. Metzger said yes, like he said it's a joint project between the city and the county. It will go all the way from Florida Street to Snow Road and evaluate that whole section of what we could do to approve capacity through there. Primarily, its improvement will be at intersections although there could be other things considered such as circle road or bike lanes or other improvements that could be added. We will do a full fledged scope and evaluate this. After we get these recommendations we would come in and add these recommendations to our MPO list so we could actually do some improvements on it.

Mr. Harrison said I have one question. Administratively, ALDOT wants to know would one of ya'll be able to take the lead on that? Instead of having two sponsors, have one sponsor.

Mr. Metzger said the city would like to take the lead if we can because the majority of it is in the city but we are open either way if the county really wants to do it.

Mr. Harrison said is it okay if the city takes the lead on the project?

Mr. Walton asked wasn't there a study done on this a long time ago.

Mr. Harrison said there was a study done in 1991.

Mr. Walton said and they concluded probably the same thing we are going to conclude this time.

Mr. Harrison said well yes and no. There are some things, new intersection technologies that weren't around in 1991, continuous flow and stuff like that.

Mr. Wimberly said this modification requires a formal resolution. Is there a motion to approve?

Motion made by Mr. Ruffer with a second by Mr. Calametti. Motion passed.

The fifth item on the agenda was the MPO briefing on climate change.

Mr. Harrison said ya'll may recall from previous MPO meetings and TCC meetings, we discussed this somewhat in detail. Federal Highway Administration approached us to be the pilot MPO in developing planning policy and climate change. January 13th meeting, we voted on it. MPO agreed to be that pilot MPO. We have the pleasure of having Mr. Rob Ritter with Federal Highway Administration here and his team from all over the country, climate change study experts. We have actually formed a work group from the TCC/CAC of about 20 folks, not just members of the TCC/CAC, to be the climate change workgroup. We've got our first kickoff meeting today at 1:30. Ya'll are welcome to attend if you are not a part of the climate change workgroup committee. Rob and his team are going to quickly brief us on what the study is.

Mr. Ritter said thank you for the opportunity to be here. I would like to first thank you for your previous vote and willingness to work with us on the Gulf Coast Phase II Study. I'm going to take a couple minutes of your time just to talk a little about what we know, what we think about climate change, who we are on the study team and a little about the Phase 2 study. As Kevin mentioned, we are going to go over a lot more detail in this afternoon's meeting with the working group. I don't want to take your time with a lot of detail. Just introduce ourselves, let you know who we are, and what we're going to be doing over the course of this three year study. My name is Rob Ritter. I'm from the Federal Highway Administration Headquarters office in Washington, DC. I'm a team leader for the Climate Change and Sustainability Team and project editor for this study. I want to introduce a couple of key people in the room. We have a very talented consulting team that's working on this project for us. There's heavy competition for this work and we selected a combination of ICF International and Parsons Brinkerhoff, two large engineering and climate change consulting firms. The project team is led by Ann Choate who is in the back. She's our project manager, executive project manager. Mike Myer sitting next to her. The other person in the group that I just want you to see a face on is Harrison Rue. Harrison is going to be leading our task on public outreach so you will be talking with him about, making sure we are getting full comments and your consideration through the study.

A little bit of a background on transportation and greenhouse gases. Transportation after industry is the leading source of US greenhouse gases and represents over a quarter almost 28, 29% of all greenhouse gas emissions in the US. The US transportation sector represents over 5% of all global greenhouse gas emissions. The US Transportation Sector is a significant part of greenhouse gas and climate change discussion.

You can see here on the chart that about 80% of US transportation greenhouse gas emissions come from surface transportation from cars and trucks on the road. When we talk about climate change, we generally talk about two sides of the climate change question. One mitigation and the other adaptation. I think it's important to be sure that we are talking about the same thing. Transportation activity, our driving, our shipping, our transit rail results in greenhouse gas emissions for the transportation sector. When we talk about greenhouse gas mitigation, that's an effort to reduce the amount of emissions coming from the transportation sector going out into the global atmosphere and causing climate change. Mitigation is the slowdown of the emission that goes into the atmosphere. Greenhouse gas emissions exist in the atmosphere, live in the atmosphere for over a 100 years so what's out there now was being emitted and produced today is causing the climate to change and will continue to cause the climate to change over time. We need to reduce what is being emitted so that we can reduce the impact of those changes but we also need to address the changes in the climate that we know that are going to occur because of what has already been emitted and what will be emitted in the future. That is what we refer to as adaptation. Preparation and adaptation, planning work and dealing with these expected impacts. The purpose of the Gulf Coast study is to talk about adaptation. We are not here to talk about reducing our emissions. We're here to talk about what are we going to do to protect the

transportation system based on the emissions that are out there today and that are projected in the future. The purpose of the study is a comprehensive assessment of how climate change will effect transportation of the Gulf Coast area. Phase I was completed in 2008 and provided an overview of the impacts on transportation infrastructure basically from the Florida line over to Houston Texas so a broad range within the Gulf Coast Region. That phase, as I mentioned, was completed in 2008. Phase II which we are now starting is to focus on one particular region within that broad Gulf Coast area and that is here in Mobile with you all to develop a process for how we figure out what are the critical transportation infrastructure in your region and what is the specific climate effects in Mobile, what are the impacts going to be on that transportation infrastructure and what will do as a community to try and protect the infrastructure within in the Mobile region. As I mentioned earlier, this is a three year that will begin now and continue to 2012.

Just to let you know what we found in Phase I. We focused in on the Gulf Coast Region in Phase I as an example of transportation infrastructure across the country, but we came to the Gulf Coast region because of the importance of transportation here. Because of the wide variety of transportation assets. We were looking not only in the roadway system and the transit system but the freight rail system, the pipeline system, airports and the economic engine that transportation is here. We looked at sea level rise. We looked at storm surges. As you know, not only as the sea level rises that is permanent, the long time increase in sea level, but the storms that will effect the region are important as well as well as the increase in temperature which will have an effect on roadways and airports. What we found is pretty startling. In Phase I, just to give you a quick synopsis of some of the issues, it is projected that a reasonable estimate there will be a 2 to 4 foot sea level rise in and throughout the Gulf Coast region and that would be over the next 50 to 100 years. A 2 to 4 foot sea level rise with no protective measures in place, so what does that mean in terms of just looking at how far inland does it go. We are talking about a quarter of the interstate miles in the region being permanently flooded. We are talking about a quarter of the arterial miles, New Orleans Transit being flooded. 75% of the freight and nonfreight facilities in the ports. Three airports all permanently flooded. Of course, there would be temporary flooded associated with storms with portions permanently flooded but the systems become interconnected. Even if the bridge isn't permanently flooded, if the approaches to the bridge are flooded, you can't use the bridge either so that the potential for impacts are significant.

Here's another example that when we looked at a 18 foot storm surge which honestly when the research team was first developing this information, they proposed looking at a 18 and 23 foot storm surge and they were like no way are we going to see that type of storm surge in this region after Katrina unfortunately we know that is a very real possibility. You can see here, these are the rail lines after a 18 foot storm surge and you can see that there is a significant portion of the rail system that will be affected by that kind of a storm. So what are we going to do in Phase II now that we have that basic information across the Gulf Coast Region? Phase II, we want to focus on a particular, a single MPO and it's here in Mobile. The first step is to identify what are the critical assets. We are not going to be able to look at every bit of the transportation system in Mobile. We want to focus in on what are the most critical pieces throughout the transportation infrastructure and that's the question we are going to start with the working group this afternoon. We're going to evaluate and update projected climate effects. We've got climate scientists who have experience running the general circulation models that predict what the climate is going to look at in 50 to 100 years so we understand what the effects will be in the Mobile area. Then determining the vulnerability of those critical assets. What's critical, what the risk is based on our findings, vulnerability, develop some risk assessment tools and approaches and work with you to try and figure out the information and the tools that we are developing makes sense and is reusable with other MPOs. We can put together a theoretical process about how you go about identifying critical assets, how you go about determining vulnerability and how you go about doing a risk assessment. But what we want to do is work with you to make sure that process makes sense, it

works in your context and that we can then use that process to share with other MPO's across the county in the expectation that other MPO's will eventually be doing the same kind of risk assessment for climate change and the impacts in their communities. Of course we are going to be working with the stakeholders and the other assets holders around the Mobile Region. So some of the questions we are looking at what are the key transportation assets, how can we (inaudible) these assets to determine the critical transportation assets, what are the climate change affects projected in Mobile base on those effects and based on the impacts that we've seen and experienced, based on weather events of the past what kind of damage and risk and vulnerability of protecting those assets, what's the cost of protecting those assets and what's the cost of not doing anything of potentially losing those assets in case of extreme weather events and then what option do we have to try and reduce the vulnerability. Then of course, we are going to be pursuing answers to these questions, working with you, working with the working group, working with asset owners throughout the Mobile community to understand all the considerations that need to be involved to answer these questions. We want your involvement; we want to make sure we are working with you and the folks here. We want to know about the critical assets, about how the systems will fair when we do have weather events. We have our first meeting today and we appreciate the opportunity to brief you and work with the working group this afternoon. We'd like to come out, and we've talked with Kevin a couple of times, about opportunities to brief the broader community and get input from the community. There will be an opportunity potentially at the Spring Open House and in the future as we progress with the study. This afternoon we are going to go through a presentation much longer than this on the in-depth project goals and activities. And what kind of involvement we are looking for from local stakeholders and start talking about those key questions. This is my contact information. I'll be in close contact with Kevin. If you have any questions, the study team is here to try and answer some of those questions today, but if you have questions in the future, we look forward to the opportunity to work with you. I'll also mention that Mike Flood and Christi Willison from Parsons Brinkerhoff is also here working on some of the travel demand and other weather impact studies. That completes the group of us that are here today to talk with you. The consultant team goes well beyond those who are here representing it today. Thank you very much for the opportunity. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

Mr. Wimberly said I have a question. You mentioned pipeline assets. What did you mean by that specifically?

Mr. Ritter said we want to take a look at and work with the pipelines that are operating here in Mobile Bay, try to understand again, where they are, what the infrastructure looks like, particular weather effects and then...

Mr. Wimberly said are you talking about utilities?

Mr. Ritter said the gas pipelines.

Mr. Wimberly said primarily gas, okay.

Mr. Ritter said we know there's not a lot of pipeline involvement in the MPO so we are meeting with a number of other folks while we are here today and in the future so we get information on the other assets that are operating.

Mr. Harrison said some of ya'll have been hand picked to be on this workgroup committee so we'll see you at 1:30 but if anybody else wants to be a part of this workgroup, ya'll are more than welcome to attend.

Mr. Wimberly said thank you. We appreciate it. Continuing on with the agenda let me just lump number 6 and 7 together. Is there any old or new business to be considered?

Mr. Ruffer said I have a question. Have we gotten any update on the rescission?

Mr. Harrison said on the rescission? Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Walton said isn't in the new bill. The new jobs bill? Doesn't it address the rescission?

Mr. Calametti said I don't know.

Mr. Harrison said Shaun do you know about the rescission.

Mr. Capps said are you talking about the House bill?

Mr. Walton said no, the Senate bill. Wasn't it addressed in there?

Mr. Capps said I don't think so. I did read something in the ASHTA newsletter the other day, but I don't think it was addressed in the Senate.

There was some other inaudible discussion about this.

Mr. Walton said that should be returning hopefully. I know it's got to get together.

Mr. Murphy said when are we going to be able to address the TK swap of projects.

Mr. Harrison said as ya'll know January 13th we adopted or updated our 5 year TIP. That is going into building the STIP, the state's TIP. All the other MPO's in the state, they have to adopt their TIP in order for that state to create the State TIP and until that's done no projects can be authorized. Until after that's done, after all the MPO's in the state have adopted their TIP's then they'll introduce the TK project.

Mr. Murphy said another question is ARRA money, it's subject or make all of them.....this coming Friday.

Mr. Powell said all the rest of them let Friday so we're a month early.

Someone said and I understand that this is one of the MPO's that did not lose money.

Mr. Murphy said with the lateness of the letting are we still going to be able to do the swapping of the money from one project to another.

Mr. Harrison said at the last MPO meeting we have a resolution to give us the authority to do that.

Mr. Murphy said I know, but March 1 is the deadline for authorization and I was just wondering whether or not we were going to be able to get that swapping done before March 1.

Mr. Powell said it's not before it. The money just has to be authorized.

Mr. Harrison said so that can happen after the project is authorized.

Mr. Wimberly said are there any other items for discussion.

Ms. Wilcox said at the last meeting part of the projects that were approved was a surf shuttle for Mobile Bay Transportation and at the time I didn't really go into detail waiting for it to be approved. We are linking; this will be one of the first public-private partnerships between transit. We will be linking the outer areas of the county for people that genuinely have no transportation alternatives to come into the GM&O and link with the WAVE to go. Pretty soon we will be announcing the implementation of that, but since Ms. Callaway has left, I hope she gets to read the minutes. This project was probably envisioned 20 something years ago so to say historically at the last meeting ya'll did something that I didn't know would ever be possible and I wanted to take the time to thank ya'll for that and to hopefully prove to ya'll in the next year, the success of that program. The other part of that is the Access Yellow so we have the wheelchair accessible taxi cabs, but most of your relatives or people that you know that are disabled and on a limited income so the other grant was to give vouchers for half price taxi rides. For those of you with friends and family limited, or reliant upon a wheelchair, this has opened up a lot of transportation opportunities to go to dinner and just be able to go out and have a good time. I hope to be able to prove to ya'll the success of that program as well. And thanks to the WAVE.

Someone asked what the total value of the grant is.

Ms. Wilcox said Mr. Alfred help me on that one. One of them was about \$70,000 in matching vouchers and the Surf Shuttle was about \$44,000. Surf Shuttle on Tuesdays will start in Dauphin Island or the Bayou and just bring everybody in like at 6:00 am, we link up, go to the doctor and after lunch at 1:00 take them back. On Wednesdays it will go to like the further points west and bring in and on Thursdays it will go to the furthest point north and bring in. One day a week for those people that genuinely tell you that they have no transportation, there is a \$5 option to bring them in and take them back out. It utilizes our existing transit dollars in the city to further that trip.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

Chairman, TCC

Chairman, MPO