

**Mobile Area Transportation Study  
Technical / Citizens Committee Meeting  
July 22, 2009, 10:00 a.m.  
SARPC Training Room**

**TCC/CAC Members Present**

Bert Hoffman  
Thomas Hughes  
Jennifer White  
Bill Metzger  
Bryan Kegley  
Donald Watson  
John Murphy  
James Foster  
Ricky Mitchell  
James Foster  
Joseph Threadcraft  
Steve Perry  
Gerald Alfred  
Ginny Russell  
Hunter Winton  
Lindsay Hutchisson  
Russ Wimberly  
Sandi Forbus  
Jackie Glasgow  
Cheryl Holifield  
James Jacobs  
Nick Amberger  
Sam Rawls

**Guests:**

David Yarbrough  
Judith Adams  
Jimmy Lyons  
Don Powell  
Edwin Perry  
Chris Miller

**Staff:**

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

**TCC/CAC Members Absent**

Margie Wilcox  
John Bell  
Tywanda Jackson  
Betty Donald  
George Crozier  
Mary Mullins  
Randy Delchamps  
Tom Briand  
Casi Callaway  
Jennifer Denson

Mr. Wimberly called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

The first item on the agenda was to review the FY2010 UPWP.

Mr. Kevin Harrison asked if everyone had a folder and had signed the sign in and sheet. The first item on the agenda is to review the FY2010 UPWP. That is this item in your folder. This is basically our budget. The original document is about 83 pages. Ya'll will get a copy of that before the MPO meeting that is tentatively set for August 12<sup>th</sup>. This has been reviewed by ALDOT. I'm awaiting comments from the

Federal Highway Administration. I want you to pay attention to Task 8 that is a new study that we plan on doing next fiscal year. It is an ITS interstate detour routing study that we plan on doing with PL funds. If there is a crash on any interstate in Mobile, the result of this study would be how to reroute that traffic in case of this. We are doing that on the behalf of ALDOT. That's the only planned study we are doing this year. Last year we had three separate planning studies. Three separate consultants going on at once. Like I said you will get the UPWP in the mail prior to the MPO meeting, the full blown document. ALDOT had one comment and I'll present to ya'll the TCC. They wanted ALDOT Transportation Planning office to become a member of the TCC. I'll leave that open for discussion. I recommend we don't do that. That changes our quorum and they actually don't have travel policy so I don't see where it would do any good to have a member on our TCC from Montgomery. Besides that is our responsibility, not theirs. We don't necessarily have to adopt this, but I wanted to review it with you and you'll get a copy of it next week.

There was no discussion. Item number three on the agenda was to review the TIP amendments.

Mr. Harrison said there are a couple of items that I have under the TIP amendments. The first one, the pack of letters in your folder. ALDOT requested that the TIP be amended. First there are some guests in the room. I just want to briefly go over the MPO planning process. The MPO, every urban area over 50,000 people has a MPO, a board that votes on every federal transportation dollar that comes to the area. There are three basic plans. There's the long range transportation plan that is a 25 year long range plan. Any road project that requires federal assistance has to be derived from that long range plan. Then there's the TIP, that's the short range, 5 year plan. Any transportation project requiring federal assistance has to be included in that short range plan and then there is the UPWP which is basically our budget. That is a very brief summary.

ALDOT has requested that these five projects be included in the TIP that the MPO will vote on August 12<sup>th</sup>. The first one is National Highway System Funds, partial base and pave from Walter Tanner Road to Glennwood Road for \$409,000. The second is a city project for sidewalks on University Boulevard. That is a transportation enhancement project that is with stimulus money for \$100,395. Another one is US 43 sidewalks in Saraland. It's another Transportation Enhancement project with stimulus funds for \$394,885. The next one is National Highway System Funds and this for \$1.75 million. This is PE for US 45 adding lanes to the end of the four lane in Prichard all the way up to West State Street beginning the four lane in Citronelle. That's PE for four laning all of US 45 in the county. The last one is the state's discretionary funds. The division wide spot repairs planing and resurfacing. These are projects that will go before the MPO Board on August 12<sup>th</sup> to be included in the TIP. We don't necessarily need a vote, but if there is any discussion.

Mr. Wimberly asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Donald Watson said just one question. I missed the first one Kevin, the \$409,000 for Tanner Williams, is that also stimulus funds.

Mr. Harrison said no, that is not.

Mr. Watson said that is not.

Mr. Harrison said there are only two stimulus projects and that is the two sidewalks. Those are transportation enhancement sidewalks.

Mr. Watson said okay, thank you, that's all.

Mr. Steve Perry said Kevin are these something that just came up or why are we getting a request.

Mr. Harrison said actually the stimulus projects, if ya'll have received email from the MATS at sarpc.org that we have 5 days to comment on, those are called level of effort projects. That's basically what these are. However, because they are stimulus, Federal Highway Administration is requiring that they have the approval of the MPO.

Mr. Perry said there's only two stimulus.

Mr. Harrison said correct.

Mr. Perry said what are the other three?

Mr. Harrison said the other three are just regular pots of money that is spent at the state's discretion that they are asking to be included in the TIP.

Ms. Russell said the state asked that they be put in there.

Mr. Harrison said correct and that is what you have here in front of you.

Mr. Wimberly said when you say asked, yes, they asked, but in order for these projects to be done, they have to be, by federal mandate, be included in the TIP. It's kind of like an ask, forced type of situation.

Mr. Harrison said so we as a TCC are reviewing it now so that the MPO can vote on it on August 12<sup>th</sup>.

There be no other discussion on the projects to be added to the TIP, Mr. Harrison introduced ARRA TIGER applications.

Mr. Harrison said some of you may be aware, TIGER is part of the stimulus money, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Transportation Investments Generating Economic Revenue.

Someone asked

Mr. Harrison said \$1.5 Billion pot of money, its FTA, Federal Transit Administration money. Applications for this money is due September 15<sup>th</sup>. The purpose of this money is to generate jobs and increase infrastructure. We have several potential applications. Only public agencies are involved and this included MPO's. In fact, the federal register further defines MPO's as eligible recipient of the money. The MPO got approached by International Shipholding to, on their behalf, apply money for two vessels and they are here today. I told them I would give them five minutes to present to us. I do have some questions about it, but they would like for the MPO as an eligible recipient of the money, to, on their behalf, apply for the money for vessels. This is Sheila Dean with International Shipholding.

Ms. Sheila Dean said first of all, I want to personally thank Kevin for all of his work and efforts over the last two weeks. He has shown a lot of patience with me because there have been a lot of issues that we need to go through. He has also given us the opportunity to be able to speak to you in a very quick fashion on an idea and concept that we have that we feel qualifies for the TIGER grant program. Due to this being such a quick presentation because we appreciate that you all have a lot of other issues to discuss, we will be glad to be available later. Kevin has the contact information if you additional questions or comments. This is Mike Cameron who is also with International Shipholding Corporation and we will be glad to be there, you name the time and date. For those of you real quick who are not aware of International Shipholding Corporation, we are a publicly owned company on the New York Stock Exchange and we recently relocated our corporate headquarters to Mobile in April of 2007. We have roots that date back to the late 40's and we do have

worldwide presence in the transportation of cargo. As 12/31 we owned and/or operated and leased approximately 31 vessels worldwide carrying all types of cargo and commodities and it's composed of many different types of vessels. One of our primary subsidiaries is CG Railways which I hope you are familiar with because CG Railway has made it's base at the Port of Mobile and two of the ships are moving freight in and out of Alabama on a recurring basis. Again for those of you who do not know us, over the last two years since we have been here, we have basically contributed to this community about \$50 million and that involves not only vendors we have dealt with but with charitable organizations that we are involved with. We just wanted to make sure that you all understood what we've done since we've been here. We have a great idea that Michael is going to present to you and the objective again is to benefit the local economy. Thank you.

Michael Cameron said as Kevin said earlier the TIGER grant program is a set aside of about \$1 ½ billion out of the original stimulus package of \$787 billion that was passed by Congress. We've been looking into this now for a little over a year in relationship to what is known as the Marine Highway program or short sea shipping. We all know the problems that we see on the highways today with these big rigs, the number of big rigs. We also know the problems with pollution, congestion. We also know the problems with the rigs with injuries and the hazmat cargos. We also understand and realize that there is significant problems with the infrastructure within the United States. The highways, the bridges themselves are all in a very bad need of repair and we all know that is part of what this TIGER grant money is deemed set aside for. The problem is that when you start looking at repairing this stuff, for example, some of you may or may not know, that the estimated cost to build or construct one lane mile of interstate highway and I say build and construct that is to maintain it as well, is \$34 million. That is a significant amount of money for one lane mile. We've been looking at the short sea version of this. Congress as you all probably know built the interstate system. They also basically in a round about way built the railroad system many years ago before they privatized it. The waterway system that we have along the east coast and west coast of the United States and the US Gulf is significant. There can be a lot of freight moved on that. Our idea and we've talked to the Maritime Administration about this. They are absolutely convinced that the Marine Highway System can be jumpstarted with the TIGER grant funds. What we can do with that is we are working with two or three ports on the East Coast right now to get them to put in TIGER grant applications right now through their own MPO's in order to do the necessary port infrastructure that they need to do to accommodate the vessels. What we are trying to do now is go through the MPO here and have them sponsor ourselves and Atlantic Marine to construct the vessels that will be required to be able to connect these ports. Part of the structure or part of the requirements, I guess you could say the eligibility requirements, is that it refers to connectors. Connectors being in this case, ships. We are going to build these ships and what we want to do is use Atlantic Marine because Atlantic Marine has the expertise and they have the experience in building ships in what is known as a modular approach. This modular approach would require that not only Atlantic Marine be involved but there would be other shipyards in the US Gulf involved. In my conversations with the Maritime Administration, the wider the net we throw here to create the jobs in the various shipyards and to spread this economic money, again it is a big plus in the approval process under the TIGER grant program. Our idea is to basically put this system in the East Coast on the I-95 corridor. The I-95 Corridor the I-5 Corridor on the West side of the United States are two of the most congested areas in the United States. When you at for example, they are talking about widening the I-710 that runs between LA and Long Beach, the cost to widen that thing about 4 lanes is something in the neighborhood of \$5 ½ billion. It's an enormous amount of money to accommodate all this additional traffic. What we are trying to do is convince Congress and this is starting to get legs in Congress, it's not just a fly by night thing, everybody starts to realize that with the growing population and with the growing need to put trucks on the highway and move consumer goods up and down, we are going to have to either expand the existing highway system, expand the railway system or find another alternative. What we are trying to do here is put together a small program to put in front of Congress that hopefully they accept and again move forward to moving some of these big rigs off of the highway and onto the water. What this is going to do, is it's going to create jobs at Atlantic Marine, it's going to obviously have a trickle down effect to suppliers within the area as well as along the gulf coast

where we are going to have to modularize to build these ships. We want to build a very simple ship, very similar to the CG railway ship which Jimmy is familiar with. It's going to be roll-on, roll off type. We're going to have combination called roll on vessel. We will take roll on, roll off which will take these trucks off the highway and at the same time we will be able to carry containers. Additionally, we've been talking to a number of trucking companies. We've met with probably 4 or 5 of the big trucking companies out there. They are not opposed to doing this. As a matter of fact, they are looking for ways to reduce their costs and this in effect will reduce their cost over the long haul because they won't have as much capital investment back into the trailers and back into the trucks nor will they have the ongoing maintenance and repair. The trucking companies are starting to come around to this. They are like anybody else, they are like okay, if you build it, and we'll come type approach. Right now, somebody's got to take that leap of faith and get out there and so we've been looking at this now for over a year. We've been in serious discussions with the House Transportation Committee, with Congressman Oberstar; we've been in discussions with the Maritime Administration. They are all in favor of doing this, it's just that right now, we're going to take a shot trying to see if there's not some way that we can get funds through the TIGER grant program to jumpstart this program. If we don't, we're all going to be seeing more rigs on the highway.

Mr. Harrison said Mike, let me ask you a question. You said that you are asking other MPO's to apply for this money on your behalf.

Mr. Cameron said no, not on the ship side. On the terminal side.

Mr. Harrison said because I do have questions, and you and I talked about this. About whether that project to ship build is actually an eligible project. I've got a lot of questions, and really the decision for whether the MPO is going to apply on ya'lls behalf is going to come from the MPO. I would like a recommendation from the TCC today, but there's still so many questions out there. Ownership of the boat. If the MPO is the recipient of the money, then the MPO, in my opinion is going to be the owners of the boat.

Mr. Cameron said well, the MPO will not own the vessels because what we are going to do is put together a program or an application so that the MPO will be able to get a certain amount of funds, but the balance of the construction cost of the ships will be done by private investment, i.e. International Shipholding, through our loan programs or whatever.

Mr. Harrison said as far as grant administration, I guess, that would have to be done through the MPO.

Mr. Cameron said that's correct.

Mr. Harrison and then we have the Davis Bacon Act, the Brooks Act, everything else that involves Federal Transit Administration money. I really have questions about this project.

Mr. Cameron said that's understandable. What we are trying to do right now is at least get it in front of the MPO and give them an opportunity to look at it. We will be more than happy to address each one of your questions. I know you guys are stretched for time here so if you could get us a list of your questions, we will be more than happy to go through it. But I again spoke to the guy at the Maritime Administration last night specifically and this guy was involved in crafting the language that went into the TIGER grant Federal Register notice. He specifically told me last night, that vessels, construction of vessels for the Marine Highway System, would be eligible under the TIGER grant program.

Mr. Watson said I have a couple of questions. Let's use the word sponsorship, MPO sponsorship. You talked about housing the grant. What does that mean in terms of.....

Mr. Cameron said let me see if I can answer your question differently. We as a private entity cannot put in the application. We need a federal, state, or local, or MPO to do it.

Mr. W said that's what you are talking about.

Mr. Cameron said yes, we actually can't do it.

Mr. W said it's a mechanism to get the grant going.

Mr. Cameron said that's correct.

Mr. W How much money are we talking about?

Mr. Cameron said depending on the cost of the vessels and everything like that, we are talking \$30 to \$40 million per ship.

Ms. Russell said how much are you asking for.

Mr. Cameron said \$30-40 million.

Mr. Wimberly said per vessel. So if we build three ships, we are talking about roughly \$100 million.

Ms. Russell said so your application to the MPO is for..

Mr. Cameron said it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$100 million.

Mr. Watson asked could you equate that with jobs.

Mr. Cameron said yes, when we looked at it originally as far as constructing vessels, about a year ago, we went into this mode of really researching this, we had the Maritime Administration give us some economic data on how many jobs they thought it would create both directly and indirectly as well as what it would contribute to the GDP of the area and at that time we were thinking okay, what if the ships cost \$60 million a piece or an \$180 million investment. What they told us was that the direct number of jobs created would be about 1400 and indirectly there would be a total of about 6900. The contribution to the, as they call it, the overall GDP would be about \$500 million and there would be a breakdown as to how much that would contribute to federal taxes, state taxes, so on and so forth because there is a trickle down effect. If you double that, figuring the cost of the ships, \$120 million, your looking at \$360, we are looking at a significant increase. I don't thing the number of direct jobs would change because these ships would be built in production, but the GDP would probably change.

Mr. .... said you are talking about the ships actually being built here in Mobile.

Mr. Cameron said the ships would actually be built in what is called a modular approach. Part of them will be built here in Mobile; part of them would be built probably in a shipyard in Mississippi, part of it in Louisiana. Like the American heavy lift ships, all these modular's would be pulled together in actual physical construction or putting this megawatt thing together for a lack of a better way to explain it, would be done here at Atlantic Marine. The only reason we are using Atlantic Marine as they are already in the process of doing that with American Heavy Lift so they understand the modular approach.

Mr. Wimberly said so the MPO would read that Kevin's staff would be the administrator of the grant. Who's going to write the grant?

Mr. Cameron said we are actually in the process right now of getting somebody out of Washington and tagging somebody to help us write this application and put all this information together. Once we have that person on board, we are going to give them all of our facts, our figures, all of our findings and everything and let them help us craft this application.

Mr. Wimberly said what's the deadline.

Mr. Cameron said September 15<sup>th</sup> is the deadline.

Ms. Dean said Kevin has really expressed the serious concern with the that is upon us, not only in writing the application, but if we are so fortunate to be a recipient, the administering of the receipt of funds, reports, etc and what we said on behalf of International Shipholding and Atlantic Marine and I'm sorry that since we've only been here two years you really don't truly know us, you can stand behind what we tell you. We're committed to being a major person in that process. We understand that lack of workforce and lack of the expertise in this area. We are going to take that burden from them. I hope we can put your concern aside for those manners.

Mr. Cameron said let me make one last comment, too, here. This whole concept of the short sea shipping and Marine Highway to get the trucks off the road, as you all know, there is a big push in Congress right now. There's big push by the Obama Administration right now to clean up the atmosphere, the carbon footprint aspect. Again, these trucking companies, I met with four or five of the big major trucking companies, they see that coming, they've actually told me, what you're proposing and what you're talking about doing, we see it coming, it's just a matter of time. They understand they have to clean up the atmosphere; they've got to reduce their carbon emissions. Our idea here when we talk about building these ships, the proposal initially is to use diesel, electric engines which would significantly reduce the amount of carbon footprint because you are talking about one ship holding 200 plus trailers so you're taking 200 trucks off the road running up and down the highway so you're reducing your carbon emissions. We want to go one step further than that and without getting into detail drawings and design, we want to look at probably using gas turbines and using natural gas or LNG, something that which basically eliminates your carbon footprint. So, this is why this is very important and this is why it's obviously being looked at hard in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Harrison said Mike, I don't disagree that it's a good project, but I've got questions. I have to question the liability of responsibility of the money.

Mr. Cameron said I understand.

Ms. Dean said and Kevin.

Mr. Wimberly said Donald has a question first.

Mr. Watson said it's kind of off the subject of your project which is really interesting me, but it's about the efficacy of the problem of this program. How will this program take one trailer off the 710 Freeway?

Mr. Cameron said well for example what will happen is that is these trucking companies instead of using long haul drivers and driving that trailer; let's use the I-95 corridor for example. From say New York City or New Jersey down to Jacksonville. What he will do is drop that trailer in a port facility up there, New Have, Bridgeport one of those two that we are looking out which is just outside the city, drop the trailer in a yard, we would then put the trailer on our ship and bring that trailer all the way down the coastline. So he's not driving it down the coastline and then we would drop it in a port facility say Jacksonville or Savannah or

Brunswick, he would have another regional driver to pick it up there and take it to Atlanta or wherever it's got to go. That's how you get them off the road.

Mr. Watson said which would effectively only remove trailers from the road on the two coasts.

Mr. Cameron said that is correct.

Mr. Watson said the Long Beach Freeway, the 710 we talked about, moves containers and I'm a little bit familiar with that, they move containers to warehouses in the middle Los Angeles area. From there they are distributed on trucks throughout the country. Those trailers would still have to get from the harbor and to those warehouses.

Mr. Cameron said that's correct.

Mr. Watson said and they are going to do it, unfortunately on the 710 Freeway. That was a bad example to use.

Mr. Cameron said not necessarily because there's also waterways in there, at some point when you go to the west coast and what we are focusing on right now is the east coast, but I brought up the west coast only because that is another great need that the trucking companies keep pointing out. But over there you've got inland waterways, rivers, and streams. They are talking about using tugs and barges over there so it would be a little bit different mechanism. What we are talking about here is, if you want to call it a pilot program for lack of a better word. Something to jumpstart this thing, to get something out there in front of John Q. Public and Congress and get them to realize that this will work. Right now, it's been talked about, it's being used sporadically with tugs and barges and everything, but the trucking companies themselves are telling us that on long haul tugs and barges don't work. You can't use an ITB system down the eastern coast of the United States because of the weather conditions. You need reliability. You need to be able to sail on a given day no matter what the water, or sea state is.

Mr. Harrison said Mike we've got a lot on our agenda and we have some other questions.

Mr. Cameron said I would be more than happy to answer any questions at a later date.

Mr. John Murphy said I see it as opening up another door. As we understood Tiger Funds were set up for transportation and all means of transportation, but to start building ships. We don't build the trucks that run on the highways, we build the highways. We don't build the trains that go on the rail, we build the rails. I'm just a little concerned with opening the door of using funds as hard as we have had in times of getting funds to build highways with. There so much need out there and to see those funds used in a different manner. I'm not against the project at all. It sounds like a great thing and we think some transportation corridors need to be opened up that way, but the use of these funds is a real concern for me in that area.

Ms. Ginny Russell said I know that you all have concerns and certainly the responsibility at SARPC you have to make sure that they follow the letter of the law, but to me this creative economic development. It is looking at a different way, maybe it's not what we've always done in funding, but it certainly transportation concerns are huge in this area. This is a creative, different way to try and get some traffic off the road and create jobs in our community. If TIGER funds can be used for that, if they are applicable, why not try something different. It's competitive I assume.

Mr. Cameron said yes. We've looked at it on a cost per mile basis comparing what we want to do with the ships and the cost compared to what the truckers are currently paying and one of the other aspects, just quickly, when you start talking about this, you also have a number of national interest involved. Not only a

pollution aspect, but also reducing our dependency on foreign oil. Again, these trucks are not burning diesel. You've only got one ship burning it. You talk about building roads and building railways what we are talking about here, is basically the same concept building a ship and opening up a third avenue.

Ms. Jinny Russell said I just want to say that I think our port and our shipyards have sustained this community through the economic recession and they are important employers and I would encourage us to support this.

Mr. Wimberly said let me brings this to, I don't want to say close, but just to continue our discussion about the purpose of the TCC. This is a recommending body, this is not an approving body and what we need to do as a group is to consider this project because this is a project that this particular MPO of this ...has never undertaken before, of being a grant recipient per se. Not only for this innovative project. The MPO meets on August 12, tentatively, to act on recommendations not only about this project, but other things that are going to take place today. Assuming that this project has merit by this body here, it will be presented to the MPO on that day or whenever that day is. Traditionally, the TCC has not voted on issues. We've come to a consensus. We can handle this project recommendation today either on a consensus basis or on a voting basis. Let me just bring it up, just by a show of hands right now, not calling this a vote, who would recommend this to the MPO for a positive consideration? Who would not recommend this? Who doesn't care?

Mr. Hunter Winton said I would say there definitely needs to be some more concrete numbers put together as far as economic impact.

Mr. Watson said we certainly don't have enough information to recommend it.

Mr. Winton said if you could show that the economic impact would be significant enough, I'm sure that..

Mr. Harrison said keep in mind it's just a grant application it might not get funded.

Mr. Winton said it's not worth the time and effort if it's not going to impact our area.

Mr. Wimberly said the other thing is that they have a deadline of September 15<sup>th</sup> which is looming here.

Mr. Murphy said I would like to use \$100 million to build some more roads around we'd create a lot of jobs.

Mr. Perry said we don't have a pool of TIGER money that's allocated to the Mobile MPO.

Mr. Harrison said no. It's \$1.5 Billion and as a matter of fact, no state is going to get more than 20% so about \$300 million is going to go to the state of Alabama, roughly. Now there are other applications that we have to review today.

Mr. Perry said as I understand International Shipholding offered to write the grant so we don't have to write the grant, if we can be revenue neutral to SARPC in the grant as far as the administration and we are not operating out of a pool of money, I don't .....

Mr. Harrison said we're not revenue neutral in the grant administration because the money's got to come from somewhere because this isn't a little task.

Mr. Perry said true being within the grant. Normally a grant you get administration.

About 4% is what I understand.

Mr. Perry said I don't see the downside.

Mr. Murphy said is ALDOT applying for these TIGER funds. Does anybody know whether ALDOT as a whole is applying for them.

Mr. Glasgow said not that I am aware of.

Someone said aren't ya'll applying for it through the counties for all the ready to go bridge projects.

My understanding is that they are applying for bridge work that is ready to go.

Mr. Murphy said statewide bridge replacement program so this would be in competition with that.

Mr. Cameron said yes, it would be in competition for that but also, my understanding from the Maritime Administration is that each individual project would stand on its own when the application goes in. Therefore, let's say for arguments sake the State of Alabama, the MPO, and everybody put in \$300 million worth of projects, for arguments sake which \$100 million of that is what we are looking for, at the end of the day each one of those projects will be voted upon or approved or disapproved by the department of transportation. Whatever is approved or disapproved is the money is specific to that particular project so if the Department of Transportation says you know what, we're going to fund \$100 million for the ship construction, we're not going to fund but 50% of the money for the bridges. The money that goes to build the ships cannot be reallocated anywhere else. It's specific to the particular project.

Someone said unless it can't be spent. There's a very tight timeline of I think 24 months to spend it.

Mr. Cameron said either spend it or commit it.

Someone said I think it's complete the project.

Mr. Cameron said it's a gray area.

Mr. Wimberly said in the interest in time, I guess we need a vote one way or another.

Mr. Harrison said if I could say, if the project is eligible because I have spoke with MARAD and they have told me it's not eligible.

Mr. Cameron said the guy you spoke to works for the guy that I spoke to.

Mr. Harrison said we need to get all of that squared away.

Mr. Wimberly said let's assume it's eligible right now.

Mr. Harrison said let's assume that my questions were answered as far as liability, responsibility, ownership of the boat and grant administration, I've got a lot of questions, all of that is worked out. Then I think we need to have a vote.

Mr. Watson said do we have to recommend up or down on this body.

Mr. Harrison said I would like the recommendation go to the MPO.

Mr. Wimberly said yes.

Mr. Murphy said in the past we didn't vote because we weren't as formal as we are now, I think we need to vote.

Mr. Nick Amberger said I think we are put in an impossible situation to make a \$100 million decision based on a 5 minute presentation while I agree with the merit of it, but I think there are certainly questions that this group wants answered before they could say. If it is in competition with other projects that is limited by a statewide pool, that would have a bearing on our recommendation. If it's not, I think that would have bearing also. I don't see how it is appropriate for us to provide a recommendation.

Mr. Cameron said to address your economic issues and your job creation issues; I have a two page write up that was done by the Maritime Administration themselves when we looked at this over a year ago as we were trying to figure out how to get at that time subsidy money. What we were trying to do was go to the Maritime Administration to get money to offset the extreme costs of building ships in the U.S. As a result, they did an economic study for us based on a certain price tag. I can give that to you, but bear in mind that price tag was based on \$60 million per ship. Now we are talking in the neighborhood of \$120 million per ship.

Mr. Wimberly said why don't we do it this way, instead of having a vote, yea or nay, on whether or not to recommend this to the MPO today, let's say, I won't say table it. Let's say ask the gentlemen and the lady to come back when the MPO meets with a little longer time and some more numbers.

Ms. Russell said Russ you're talking about August and they've got a September deadline.

Mr. Wimberly said I know that. The MPO is going to be August 12 or somewhere around that timeframe anyway. Unless we have an MPO meeting tomorrow, I'm assuming that they are going to move forward with putting the grant together, regardless.

Mr. Cameron said yes, we are going forward with it.

Mr. Wimberly said let's come together and have a joint meeting of the TCC and MPO whenever that meeting is and ask them to come back with some updated numbers and more numbers for consideration to answer your questions and then we can everybody at the table at the same time.

Mr. Thomas Hughes asked isn't there a way that you could put some sort of package together to get out to everyone. From the aviation side, I'm seeing with EADS/Northrop Grumman as a possibility in the future.

Mr. Cameron said you give me a list of what it is you're looking for specifically because there is a boatload of information out there.

Mr. Harrison said if you give me something and when I send out my notice to the MPO, I'll send it with that.

Ms. Dean said anything that you all wish to see from us, Kevin will be in touch with me and we will put it together and we will distribute that document back through Kevin to you all.

Mr. Wimberly said as a consensus, we are going to have them come back when the MPO/TCC meeting meets again around August 12<sup>th</sup> to make a larger presentation with some more background information prior to that for consideration by the MPO.

Everyone was in agreement with that.

Mr. Harrison said we also have another ARRA TIGER application. The Port Authority is applying for that money for a intermodal container terminal facility. They are the applicant, they are the recipient. There application is pretty much done and they are requesting that TIP be amended in the outer year to include their project. Jimmy Lyons and Judith Adams are here today to briefly talk about the project.

Mr. Jimmy Lyons said the ICTF is an integral part of the Choctaw Point. It is part of the original plan that we put together in 2000. The original plan includes a container terminal, a ICTF, which is an intermodal container handling facility that they basically take containers from the marine terminal or trailers from the street and puts them on rail cars and vice versa. The third element is a logistics park. We've got some additional property. The Choctaw Point project in general was included in SAFETEA-LU, \$20 million; we just got the last \$5 million increment so the project is under construction. The whole idea of it is to take trailers off the highway and put them onto rail cars, match it up with trains, dedicated trains that run between different points in the United States. I had a long conversation with the senior marketing officer at Norfolk Southern yesterday. They have announced a large intermodal facility in McCalla, Alabama near Birmingham and they are interested in discussing running trains between here and Birmingham where we could take not only containers that move in and out of the container terminal but also taking trailer traffic that originates in the Mobile area and put it onto intermodal trains. Trains take trailers and containers. We've got the project under construction right now. We're doing the dike work for the land fill is virtually complete. We'll start the first phase of the land fill in about two weeks with the dredge material that we are dredging from the Pinto project. Then the second phase of the land fill will be done using some of the dredge material that will be generated with the turning basin. As far as the construction schedule, we are under construction. We have the facility engineering at 95% and the rail bridge connector is at 95%. We could probably go to a 100% and have those out for bid, when, Joseph?

Mr. Threadcraft said a couple of months.

Mr. Lyons said a couple of months we could have them out to bid and under construction and be completed well within the 24 month deadline to put a project in service. We have a third element which is a bridge that will connect the container terminal. The engineering contract for that will be let within, well it will be approved by the next board meeting. We've got the project ready to go, it's under construction. The total project cost that we are using now is \$95 million so it hits right in the sort of sweet spot for the TIGER grants. It's ready to go. It connects the marine terminal to the railways and it eliminates highway traffic so environmentally it meets those objectives in the ARRA program. We think it meets everyone of the objectives that are stated in the program. We've got it, like I said, ready to go. It's going to have a tremendous impact; the bigger impact will be with the warehousing and distribution. We have enough room in and around our property for probably a million to a million and a half, maybe two million square feet of warehouse and distribution space which will be a huge job generator here. We are working very closely with the Mobile Airport Authority who also has property said aside for warehousing distribution that will also benefit from having this intermodal facility.

Ms. Judith Adams said it will help Baldwin Economic Development because we have sites there as well.

Mr. Lyons said yes, we've got sites over in Baldwin County, Mobile County for warehousing distribution that are going to all benefit from having this transportation asset and it's obviously going to help the container terminal grow. It's a well advanced project; meets the criteria and we think will generate a tremendous benefit to the greater Mobile area and the entire SARPC region.

Mr. Harrison said and what we are going to ask the MPO to do is to include this project into the outer year of TIP. Remember, I said at the beginning there is a long range plan and there's the TIP. The TIP is the five year short range plan. Those first four years of the TIP has to be balanced for funding. That last year is

actually a wish list so typically we don't need approval from the MPO to include a project into the outer year because it is a wish list, but I would like a recommendation from the TCC for the MPO to include that project because it is a grant application. Normally, we don't do this, but this is a pretty strong application.

Mr. Lyons said we are doing all of the grant application work.

Mr. Harrison said they are the grant recipient.

Ms. Adams said yes, we are the direct. It does not flow through DOT or any other organization.

Mr. Wimberly said it will also be presented at the next MPO/TCC meeting also.

Mr. Perry said but you just need it to be on a MPO list to check a box on the grant.

Ms. Adams said correct.

Mr. Watson said I think that we should do so.

There was a second.

Mr. Wimberly said all in favor say aye.

No one was opposed. Mr. Wimberly asked Mr. Lyons and Ms. Adams if they could be at the next meeting. They responded that they could.

Mr. Harrison said moving along the next item in your folder is a five year schedule of funds. It has an 'A' on the top of it. As of a couple of weeks ago, this was the MPO's pot of money, the attributable funds. This is the pot of money that the MPO gets to spend. A couple of weeks ago, we had the balance in 2010 of \$15,000 so we were running a pretty tight budget. Although a couple of weeks ago, you notice on the second page this annual allocation, the first year, 2008, is 8,489,883 and then the next year is 7,795,144, that was 8.4 so they reduced our attributable funding. That left us with a negative balance of \$1 million in 2010 and \$1.4 million in 2011. That was actually as of last week.

Mr. Murphy said do we know why we got reduced.

Mr. Harrison said I spoke with Federal Highway Administration about that. I was always under the impression that because we have 317,605 people in the Urban area... We have been exempt from all of the recessions that the state has had several rescissions and the MPO money has always been exempt from those except for this one. Now our MPO money is subject to this last rescission so we've got a reduction in our money.

Mr. Murphy said and who made that decision that we were included in the rescission.

Mr. Harrison said I don't know.

Mr. Murphy said was it state or was it Federal Highway.

Mr. Harrison said it was federal. I want you to, this sheet of paper right here, Don Powell with the division was kind enough to meet with Mobile County and the City of Mobile who has the projects in the attributable funding schedule. We came up with a list of more realistic dates for all the projects. I am not going to go over all of these projects, but they are in red as to what is a more realistic date for each one of these

attributable funding projects which brings us to the next piece of paper. It is schedule 'B'. If you take schedule 'A' with the operating deficit and apply all of the projects in red, the result is schedule 'B'. All the italics, all the funding amounts in italics, are those projects on the legal piece of paper in red. This is what we are left with. The outer year, if you turn to page two of 'B', you will notice the balance in 2011 at the bottom is \$2,571,433. These changes are going to be presented to the MPO to make. I would like to spend that \$2 ½ million. Now it could be with some of these projects that we just moved into the outer year, this 2012 year, but I would like a discussion on how we could further spend the 2 ½ million. I don't want to leave a balance of \$2 ½ million in the outer year. I want to show that we are spending all of our money. Is there any discussion on what projects we might want to move up from 2012 to spend that \$2.5 million?

Mr. Murphy said I'll start. The McDonald Road project that we've got here, you're saying, that would really be more than what you need because we're not going to be able to get to the construction, but on the Three Notch Road project, number 10, you could move those two items up. It would seem practical to be able to do it in 2011. You've got PE in 2009 and we are not doing any right of way until 2012, that's a long period of time for design to go. Seems like that ought to be able to move up.

Mr. Harrison said, Monica, take those two projects 884,000 and 416,000 multiply it by .96 and put it in 2011.

Mr. Murphy said the main one would be right of way, Kevin. You could probably leave the utilities there because right of way would take at least a year. I hate to wait on right of way that long.

Mr. Harrison said alright just do right of way.

Mr. Harrison said okay, now we have a surplus of \$1.7 million.

Mr. Metzger said Kevin instead of doing that how about doing the Dauphin Street, McGregor, #14.

Mr. Harrison said what part of it.

Mr. Metzger said the right of way and preliminary engineering.

Someone said you said instead of.

Mr. Metzger said instead of doing that previous one.

Mr. Amberger said I don't think you can do that. He's saying after he's done that, there's still a balance that he has to eat up. I think he is saying inclusive with that. He still won't get the 2.5 when you add those other pieces in there.

Mr. Harrison said say that again for McGregor, Dauphin Street.

Mr. Amberger said at least the PE.

Someone said move right of way and utilities or what.

Mr. Harrison said for McGregor.

Mr. Powell said are you saying move the PE up into fiscal year 2010.

Mr. Amberger said we want it late 2010.

Mr. Harrison said project 14.

Mr. Amberger said project 9 and project 14 moving the PE's, both of them up a year.

Mr. Powell said leave the right of ways where they are.

Mr. Amberger said what happens when you move the PE's up.

Mr. Harrison said we have \$2.6 million now.

Mr. Amberger said your number went up.

Mr. Harrison said yes, we lost 4%. The balance went up to 2.6. The cost estimate reduces by 4% every time it moves up. It adds 4% every time it moves back.

Mr. Amberger says we started with a balance of 2.5 and we are trying to get the balance smaller so we move the jobs.

Mr. Harrison said all I did was move PE. I haven't done anything else yet.

Mr. Metzger said how about the right of way.

Mr. Amberger said the only way to get your balance down is to move some things from 2012 up.

Mr. Harrison said okay, if we move right of way up, we have a balance of \$677,000.

Mr. Powell said did you move both right of ways up.

Mr. Harrison said no, just McGregor.

Mr. Metzger said what about Dauphin. Do we have enough to do Dauphin also?

Mr. Harrison said yes, I've got \$428,000.

Mr. Murphy said Bill, what is that project. I'm not familiar with the Dauphin Street project. What are you going to try and do there?

Mr. Metzger said add a lane through there on both sides.

Mr. Murphy said but the McGregor one is for McGregor Avenue right.

Mr. Metzger said McGregor is from Dauphin to Airport adding a lane through there and Dauphin Street is adding a lane from about Sage to past the hospital out in that area. Dauphin is probably the heaviest congested area we have in the city.

Mr. Murphy said are you taking the median out.

Mr. Metzger said we've got quite a bit of existing right of way there. We can do most of it. The right of way there, is pretty improve radiuses and do some tie in but we own the right of way through there enough to put an extra lane through there.

Mr. Foster said Kevin on the sheet with the red markups, the second page, it talks about Demetropolis Road Extension Interchange Feasibility Study, it's got delete. Is that a recommendation to delete?

Mr. Powell said that is kind of something we discussed and I thought I took it off the spreadsheet and maybe the copy I handed out yesterday had it back on there.

Mr. Foster said so it's still in.

Mr. Powell said I think what we may have discussed, Kevin, correct me if I'm wrong, is maybe changing the description of the project.

Mr. Harrison said that project is City of Mobile requested that project be included. That actually requires an interchange justification study which federal dollars can't be used for. I guess it's got to be local dollars to do that interchange justification study. Something can still be done there. I don't know what, but the City is requesting that project stay in there.

Mr. Murphy said alright Kevin so the two things you moved to make me square is you moved the right of way for project 10.

Mr. Harrison said I have not moved that. I moved it back. Right now, we have project 9 and project 14, the PE and right of way went up a year.

Mr. Powell said so you moved PE and right of way of both of those.

Mr. Harrison said we have a balance now of the last year of \$400,000.

Mr. Murphy said Bill, is the \$2 million right of way number, you said all you needed was radiuses, do you really need \$2 million for that number.

Mr. Metzger said engineering came up with that number. I'm not sure exactly how they come up with those numbers.

Ms. White said it is Dauphin Street is where we already have all the right of way, not McGregor.

Mr. Harrison said so you need the \$250,000.

Ms. White said yes for radiuses. That's what he was talking about.

Mr. Amberger said in all likelihood this will adjust again when some of these jobs hit the streets. If moving that right of way up on project 14 moving it up a year, adjust that number and satisfies the concern, I don't see a big objection to it. The reality is that once these jobs get let, we're going to be readjusting again.

Mr. Murphy said our concern is that we've got a project that we already have authorization for PE work, but we are not getting right of way until 2012. Don't make sense to not have that right of way up there a little bit earlier on that project 10.

Mr. Harrison said what if we moved the right of way and PE for Dauphin Street and PE for McGregor and moved just the right of way for Three Notch. In other words, if we exchange Three Notch right of way for McGregor right of way. We have a million and ½ now. I would like for it to be under a million dollars, that 4<sup>th</sup> year. Next year, we are going to have to update this plan completely.

Mr. Murphy said what you got left Kevin.

Mr. Harrison said 1.5.

Mr. Murphy said if you've got 1.5 left, you can move the construction of number 8 over into there, construction and utilities for number 8.

Mr. Harrison said we have \$400,000. Either way if we move the #8 utilities and construction up a year or the right of way up for McGregor, we are still within \$400,000 of that outer year.

Mr. Murphy said one other question; we're still using the numbers up in 2009 that has some effect on this that were there. Those projects have already been bid and are under construction, can't we adjust those numbers to real numbers.

Mr. Harrison said those numbers are adjusted.

Mr. Murphy said are these adjusted.

Mr. Harrison said the ones that are authorized. Now, Old Shell and Airport both have state money tied to it, so that's not the total project cost.

Mr. Murphy said that's what I was saying, that's why I was questioning the number, 6.4 million for construction. It was 2 ½ million of state money involved there. The bid was right at \$6 million wasn't it? But these are supposedly the new numbers?

Mr. Harrison said those are the numbers that the state gave us.

Mr. Murphy said Jackie do you know if those have been corrected because those look like the same numbers that we have been looking at for the last couple of years.

Mr. Powell said it is likely it was let. When you open up CPMS and it says that the estimate is 6.7 and you double click on it, then it will talk about how much is state and how much is the match. I thought you were right. I thought it let for 6.7 million and then you take off our share, it could be less.

Mr. Murphy said yes I was thinking that number is probably a million or million and ½ less than what that number is right now.

Mr. Harrison said I've got that construction federal was 5.18 million so that's a total attributable amount for Airport is 6.4.

Mr. Murphy said but that does not include the state's 2 ½ million.

Mr. Harrison said that does not include the state 2 ½ million. Is there a percentage that the state tacks on to the construction amount?

Mr. Murphy said yes, they add 21%.

Mr. Harrison said that might be what we are looking at. You've got the same problem on Old Shell Road.

Mr. Murphy said yes, I was looking at both of those. The numbers looked high to me that's why I was wondering.

Mr. Harrison said alright, we have a scenario right now that leaves \$400,000 in the outer year. If everybody is happy with that, we can present this to the MPO.

Mr. Murphy said I don't think it has any effect on any numbers, Kevin, but can we move #11, the PE over into 2010 instead of leaving it in 2011. I don't think it has any real effect to your numbers.

Mr. Harrison said it would lower the cost estimate.

Mr. Murphy said I mean negative effect. We can just get that PE work started a little earlier. It's not added anything into that three years.

Mr. Harrison said yes, that hardly changes the numbers. Are there any other discussions or any other modifications to the funding schedule?

Mr. Watson said so you've got it down to the \$400,000 now.

Mr. Harrison said yes.

Mr. Powell said so what were all of those changes again just so that I'm clear.

Mr. Harrison said starting with project #8. Utilities and Construction were moved up from 2012 to 2011.

Mr. Powell said let me ask you a question, I must have missed that one. Brian, Mr. Murphy, we can acquire all of that right of way within one fiscal year.

Mr. Murphy said we were thinking we needed to move the right of way up to 2010.

Mr. Powell said because we're fixing to start that PE now.

Mr. Murphy said right and you're only talking about a 1/2 mile of road.

Mr. Powell said

Mr. Kegley said it's only .4 miles. It's a short project.

Mr. Murphy said Kevin I guess I failed to ask you about that one, but the right of way, move it to 2010, it's the same number. It won't have an effect on your total number.

Mr. Harrison said alright. So project #8, the right of way, utilities and construction all moved up a fiscal year. Project #9, Dauphin Street PE and right of way moved up a fiscal year. Project #10, the right of way moved from 2012 to 2011 and Project #11 the PE moved up from 2011 to 2010 and the PE for #14 moved up from 2011 to 2010. We've got a positive balance.

Mr. Wimberly said any other discussion of this. It's under a million dollars. It's about \$450,000. Kevin would like a vote to recommend these changes to the MPO.

Mr. Watson made a motion with a second by Mr. Murphy. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda was the long range plan.

Mr. Harrison said the next item in your folder is the pretty, colorful map. This is your homework. I am not going to go over this too much in detail, but the very last page is a comment form. Our staff met with each one of the cities and with the county. We talked about the 2007 number of households in each city and what the projected growth is going to be for the year 2035. We used that data coupled with linear regression analysis from the census for households and the department of labor statistics for employment per industry, per NAICS code. The first map is household growth in the study area. It is estimated in the year 2035 that we will have about 200,000 households. This is the change from 2007 to 2035 based on meeting with those cities and linear regression. The retail growth, the same thing, from 2007 to 2035.

Mr. Perry said Kevin was to retail growth mean.

Mr. Harrison said retail employees, sorry. So the number of retail employees per zone. Each one of these, these are not streets, these are actual traffic zones.

Someone said they're not census tracts.

Mr. Harrison said no, they're actually traffic zones built from census block data. Next is other, and that's a whole bunch of different types employment, manufacturing and what not. Now this table that you have here, part of this is, you've got zone number, 2007 households, future households and then the same for retail employees, service employees and other types of employees. If this involves your jurisdiction, I want, and the last page is actual zone map and zone numbers. I would love any comments from ya'll, if you know any projects that the traffic zone needs to be bumped up for households or employment or bumped down for households or employment. Please let me know by these comment forms. Again we are dealing with the year 2035 so we are talking some guessing and I think we do have a pretty good guess estimate. You've got two weeks to look at this and give me back any comments. So you do have some homework. Are there any questions on that?

Mr. Wimberly said if they don't comment what happens.

Mr. Perry said do you get kicked off.

Mr. Harrison said no, then I'll accept the data as reviewed with no comment.

Mr. Perry said Kevin can you send us these electronically. Is that possible?

Mr. Harrison said it's possible. The next item in your folder, if you take the travel demand forecast model, I just validated it to 2007 ground counts, the traffic counts all over the county, validated my travel demand forecast model. This future socioeconomic data that I've just given you on the pretty maps, once it is put back into the travel demand forecast model, this map is pretty much what year 2035 is going to look like if we don't build another road between now and year 2035. This is the no build scenario. All the roads that are under construction or completed that were part of the current plan, remember at the beginning I said the 25 year long range plan, this is it right here. These are the roads eligible for federal assistance in the year 2030. We are updating this to 2035. It's now time to start developing projects to test with the travel demand forecast model to try to fix all this mess. A lot of these projects that are on here are going to remain in the long range plan, some of them have already been constructed; US 98, Hillcrest Road, Nevius Road Extension, Grelot, Airport Boulevard, Old Shell Road. A lot of these are either underway or under construction. What I need from ya'll is what projects as a TCC would like to see tested in the travel demand forecast model. I do have a comment form in the back. I'll give you two weeks to go over that as well or we can discuss it now if anybody would like to discuss any projects that they would like to see added to the next long range transportation plan.

Mr. Murphy said Kevin we've got a couple that we would like to propose. We've just got maps that show them if we can just pass them out, then we'll send it back to you formally too with your comments. We're looking at a connection right now Snow Road, McFarland Road. The paved section of Snow Road, McFarland Road ends right now at a road called Doris Lane. In looking through somewhere taking advantage of the new interchange at McDonald Road to tie something to the north besides just McDonald Road, we just started looking at a possible route and found that we feel like we can build about a 4 ½ to 5 mile connection between the end of Snow Road down to McDonald Road at Old Pascagoula Road and that 5 mile connection would end up with a route that runs from Interstate 10 all the way to the new 98 by just making that short connection in there. We think that would be an advantage to the system. I see that you got a lot of red going up Schillingers Road and this route would take some of the load off of Schillinger Road. In the same respect going south, ALDOT has just completed the 4 lane divided highway down to ½ mile road from that same interchange and that's what showing on your map that's heavy. It's green down to ½ mile road and then it is showing red down there so we think we need additional lanes to carry all the way down to the Bayou there on Padgett Switch Road. The other connection that we are proposing is right now, we have under construction what we call the Hillcrest Connector which is a road that extends from Hwy 90, Nevius Road which is also the extension of Rangeline Road, that connects to the interstate there in Tillman's Corner, we're building a road now over to Hillcrest Road and we would like to show that connection carried on out past Cody to at least Schillinger as another east-west corridor. Right now between Cottage Hill Road and Three Notch Road are your two main east-west corridors in that Southwest area where your maps are showing a lot of growth both commercial and residential. There is a three and ½ mile gap of east-west connectors there. This road would give us another east-west connector about midway, a little bit more than half way, down between Cottage Hill and Three Notch and a direct access to another interchange that we think is important to add into it.

Mr. Harrison said does that follow the creek.

Mr. Murphy said it's actually south of the creek.

Mr. Harrison said that was a project that was on two or three long range plans ago.

Mr. Murphy said yes, it's been a long time. Those are the two things that we are going to ask that be added into the program. To look at, at least and run some numbers on to try and address some of the red out in the county.

Someone said Kevin the big bold red line that you got coming across, is that basically just the interstate that you are looking at.

Mr. Harrison said that's I-10 and as a matter of fact, the projections for our external-external, those are the trips from Mississippi to Montgomery from I-10 are supposed to more than double. Not just for vehicles, but for trucks as well. Trucks are supposed to double and a half between now and 2035. That's just going through Mobile that has nothing to do with Mobile. Actually, this red does include a separate truck element. We validated our truck movements and we have forecasted our truck movements as a separate mode of transport included in that red line.

Someone asked we know parallel to the interstate, we've got Highway 90 and Old Pascagoula Road that runs basically parallel to the interstate, is that also red?

Mr. Harrison said its red and green. This map up here, those projects circled in red are the projects that have construction in the first four years of the TIP. The one's 'X' are the ones under construction now. Those obviously will not be included in the next plan because they will be over. The ones in red have construction in the four years. We do have PE in the TIP for some of those projects. If you notice from 65 all the way to

the state line, that's this big red line right here so that's a project that will be included in the next long range plan, that's a given. The bridge is a given. The outer loop has to be tested. I-65 actually has PE in the first four years north of Industrial Parkway so there are some projects that will be a given when it comes to testing the long range plan.

Mr. Wimberly said are there any other routes that want to be considered today before you make your written comments or email comments back to Kevin.

Mr. Harrison said and if you do have new alignment, you can submit it to me on this form or just draw a line on here. We're not talking about purchasing right of way. A line on this map is a corridor and that all it is so if it goes over Big Creek Lake, that's just a corridor.

Mr. Watson said Kevin is the widening of US 45 off the table inside the Mobile city limits.

Mr. Harrison said I don't know. I think PE was started for that years ago. The division might know more about that. At one time there was a PE project for St. Stephens Road up to 65. I don't know if that project ever got started. Do ya'll know?

Mr. Glasgow said there is a project for alignment up to Celeste Road.

Mr. Harrison said right and that's on this north part, if you look at the green line south of Industrial Parkway, that is where the four lane stops at the school on the 45.

Mr. Watson said Jackie, what I was asking about was in the city limits of Mobile as opposed to Prichard, Saraland, those areas up there.

Mr. Glasgow said no.

Mr. Harrison said Mr. Watson, this map if you notice green in a lot of cases trumps red for some reason. I know that 45 in the city limits is a thin line so the problem is that some of the roads that we have in Prichard are under capacity so their green line might actually be overlapping 45. 165 in particular has capacity that might be over top of 45. Does that make sense? Put that is a project that is in the long range plan that we can test.

Mr. Watson said it has been for awhile, but 45 would actually fall in that green area there. Okay.

Mr. Harrison so again two weeks. I'll give ya'll two weeks to submit these comments back to me.

Mr. Murphy said so out of this Kevin when it goes to the MPO, just adding roads that's not something that MPO will actually vote on, whether to add these roads into your study or not.

Mr. Harrison said from all the projects that we have, not only from the last long range plan, but the projects that are going to be submitted to us, we're going to produce umpteen alternates of projects. We're going to test the network as a whole. When we become nonattainment for air quality, our networks not going to be able to increase our vehicle miles traveled which is going to be a difficult thing to do which is going to happen next year, but I'm going to present the MPO and the public with a lot of, I don't know, last time, we had about seven different alternates. One time the Press Register did a survey for us which I will request from them again, but the phone number where all the different alternates and projects the people can call in and vote like American Idol or something, but it will be road projects. That's good information to go to the MPO as to what the public, what scenario of projects that the public likes. We'll come up with our own scenario of projects. At one time I think we even had a freeway going down Airport Boulevard if you

remember that. We had a bridge, 6 lane freeway over the top of Airport Boulevard. The public was actually 'iffy' on that one and then actually did not test, the overall network statistics, were not as good as some of the other alternates. So you've got some more homework.

Mr. Powell said Kevin can you send a PDF of this one as well.

Mr. Harrison said yes.

Mr. Hoffman said can you be sure to explain the air quality issue at the actual MPO meeting so that the elected officials understand what impact that could have, if any.

Mr. Harrison said you don't want to wait until after the official designation.

Mr. Perry said I think we've got, obviously we clobbered it this year, we've still got next year, is really the decision year and then you've got like two years after that before the governor writes his letter, I think.

Mr. Harrison said March 10<sup>th</sup> is the EPA designation that we probably will be nonattainment for air quality.

Mr. Perry said I think we are only two years, but I could be wrong.

Mr. Harrison said it's a three year average and I don't think we will have enough wet and windy weather which I don't want wet and windy weather as far as hurricanes.

Mr. Perry said we've already hit it for this year and we hit it for last year, but I don't think we did in 07 after they changed the rules so I think we've got one more year.

Mr. Harrison said well I was told March 2010. This long range plan is due to the Federal Highway Administration February 2010. Right after that, March 2010, if we become designated for nonattainment of air quality then this whole long range planning process will have to be redone. It will be for the whole county. We will no longer have a study area. I'll don't know if ya'll were aware of that, but we will model for the whole county, for Mobile and Baldwin County. Are there anymore discussions on that?

Mr. Wimberly said the next item on the agenda is old business. Is there any old business to be brought to the committee?

Mr. Watson said let me assume this old business. I was out of the room when this was discussed. On the list of items it says hold on the Fillingham Street widening, why.

Mr. Powell said that just means leave it where it is. It doesn't mean put that project on hold.

Mr. Watson said okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Harrison said I think that is for next year. Is that right?

Mr. Powell said we are trying to get it let in December. We've got some issues to work out with the Corp of Engineers, but plans are 90%, 95% complete.

Mr. Wimberly said any other old business. Is there any new business? I do have one item of new business, but any other.

Mr. Harrison said Dr. Eichold couldn't come in and actually Dr. Crozier is his appointee to this committee, but he asked that everyone receive this information. It says, I'm sorry neither George Crozier nor I can attend the meeting, but I hope this issue can be discussed, entered into the minutes and the long range plan. There are opportunities to improve environmental impacts. They would like for us to discuss what was printed in the Bay Journal an opportunity for Mobile County to improve. I haven't read this, I was just handed this so Dr. Eichold and Dr. Crozier that ya'll as a TCC Committee Member, review this information. So if everyone can please review this by the next meeting.

Mr. Wimberly said is there any other new business before I kind of give you some news. Some of you may be aware that there is an entity out there called the Southern High Speed Rail Commission. It originally consisted of representatives from Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi dealing with the High Speed Rail Corridors in our area. Just as of last week, the State of Texas has passed local legislation to join the Southern High Speed Rail Commission as part of a member state dealing with high speed corridors. In our particular area, when I say our area, Alabama's area, there are two corridors of mention, both originating in New Orleans, one coming through Mobile and going into Atmore and Jacksonville Florida. Another one again originating in New Orleans, going through Meridian, going to Tuscaloosa, Birmingham and on into Atlanta and so on. The reason why I am bringing this up is that about three months ago, the agency that housed the Southern High Speed Rail Commission was the New Orleans Regional Planning Commission. That organization has elected not to house it anymore. Accordingly, the High Speed Rail Commission solicited for bids to house the commission. South Alabama Regional Planning Commission submitted a bid, submitted a proposal as did the Birmingham Regional Planning Commission as did also the Regional Planning Commission in Gulfport, Mississippi. SARPC was selected to house the Southern High Speed Rail Commission. What that entails essentially is managing their books, paying their bills, and arranging meetings for the Commission at this juncture. It does not entail as originally done by the New Orleans Planning Commission, it does not entail any transportation planning or expertise provided to the Commission. The Commission elected to simply strip out the transportation planning side of that requirement and just SARPC to do the administration and logistics of housing the organization and then later on whatever comes about with the transportation planning side of it, that's at their pleasure whether they hire. What they had was an executive director who provided oversight of the transportation planning and right now they are just kind of doing it in-house as commission members. I personally think this bodes well for our region in terms of representation for another mode of transportation in our region and it's something that we've been involved with, SARPC, has been involved with for a great number of years. We do have local representation on the commission. Ms. Elizabeth Sanders who is executive director of the Downtown Alliance is on the commission and I have attended meetings in the past staying abreast with their thrust. There is \$50 Billion being set aside in terms of stimulus money for the 11 high speed corridors by the current administration. This again, this suits us well in possibly latching on to some of that money in looking at rail issues in our region. I just wanted to pass that information on.

Mr. Harrison said and along those lines, I would like to present ya'll with the idea, some of the other MPO's in the country have written resolutions from the MPO's supporting rail projects. I don't know exactly the effectiveness of that, but we would like to do a resolution of the MPO supporting rail lines through Mobile.

Mr. Wimberly said I think that's a good idea. Let me just give you a little background. The High Speed Rail Commission passed a resolution on June 26<sup>th</sup>, supporting for example, the Amtrak, the reinstatement of the Amtrak Sunset Limited from New Orleans to Jacksonville through Mobile. The latest plans that I am aware of with the Sunset Limited coming through Mobile still doesn't look good in terms of times. As you are probably aware, the Sunset Limited came through Mobile somewhere around two o'clock in the morning, arrived at 2:00 in the morning and departed somewhere around 3:00 which really conducive to passenger usage. Right now the schedule still doesn't look that good. It's still kind of an off time when it comes through Mobile. In addition to that, the City of Mobile's Maritime Center, part of their construction is going to be allocated towards providing some sort of terminal space for Amtrak for trains to come through there so

again, it's something that we need to be aware of and I highly recommend that the MPO also come up with a resolution supporting rail transportation in and through Mobile. In addition to that the Montgomery MPO has submitted a stimulus application for a \$600,000....Any further discussion? What we will do is as part of the discussion, we will develop a resolution for presentation to the MPO when it next meets somewhere around the 12<sup>th</sup> of August and then put that on the agenda. All in favor say I.

Motion passed.

Mr. Wimberly asked for any other new business.

Mr. Perry said Russ, in thinking about that and what we heard over here were two proposals for maritime movement of cargo; we may want to consider the same sort of thing there.

Mr. Wimberly said in terms of resolutions.

Mr. Perry said yes.

Mr. Wimberly said multimodal. We could put it all in one resolution.

Mr. Perry said I think keeping them separate.

Mr. Harrison said now we are doing that with the Ports project. The port is going to have a resolution saying that the MPO approves this project so much so that we are including it in our five year schedule of funds.

Mr. Perry said I think something broader Kevin that says we support you know whatever the right term is, maritime, water based transportation whether it's passenger or whether it's freight just to again get it clear that we are looking at more than just highways.

Mr. Wimberly said you want a separate resolution, separate from the Port Authority's application. You want one just for maritime?

Mr. Perry said blanket support, like we are talking about blanket support for rail.

Mr. Harrison said well I don't know. We can do that, but we're following other MPO's in this rail resolution.

Mr. Perry said let's get out in front of some other MPO's.

Mr. Wimberly said is that in the form of a motion.

Mr. Perry said it can be.

Mr. Wimberly said is there a second.

Ms. Forbus said I second it.

Mr. Wimberly said there's your second. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Murphy said what does that open up. I guess I'm concerned. I still have some concerns of this presentation that was put before us. I don't want anything to be adopted that looks like I'm in favor of their

presentation so I'm a little hesitant to support just a general, I'm all for anything that we can help the maritime systems with as long as it's not taking funds from programs that already exist.

Mr. Harrison said well how do you want your resolution worded. Actually this rail resolution will be the first resolution by the MPO in the history of the MPO of supporting something, not financially. Most of the resolutions from the MPO are we collectively got together and we feel that this money should be spent this way with a dollar amount. This is a first, this rail one.

Mr. Wimberly said yes, this would be a concept resolution.

Mr. Harrison said this is just we support.

Mr. Perry said to me, we need to support more things than roads and sidewalks and that's all I've heard in my year hanging out here except the two things about maritime today.

Mr. Wimberly said to answer John's concern, would your resolution have any mention of that particular project.

Mr. Perry said oh, no. I'm talking general concept. We think to unload, to improve the ability to move in this country, we need to use water, just like we use asphalt.

Someone asked what does that do to like the airport.

Mr. Harrison said keep in mind we've got a freight element to our long range plan. I don't need a resolution to tell anyone that. Mobile is doing one of the more advanced freight models for our size. I just don't know about the openness of a maritime resolution like that.

Mr. Perry said if we want to think about it and talk about it the next time. There's nothing pressing on it. It's just an idea that I think we need to broaden our thinking a little, but I'm willing to withdraw my motion until the next meeting.

Mr. Wimberly said okay. Just my personal opinion, I agree with Steve. I think the MPO needs to have a more multimodal perspective. If we are going to look at things from a national perspective and even an international perspective we are going to have to look at things like air, water, rail and who knows.

Mr. Murphy said we agree as long as we are looking for new funds to fund those new ideas, not taking away from funds that we are already struggling to get.

Mr. Harrison said and we are looking at that. In our long range plan, we are going to have a freight element that we are going to be able to model all of it. It's going to have a rail component, a water component, a truck component. We are there.

Mr. Watson said I think all he is saying is that we need to put it in a formal resolution so that this body or the MPO is on record as being supportive of different modes of transportation other than sidewalks and streets. Along the same lines, and I talked to Kevin about this last week, we are planning on building a bridge over the river that won't have capacity for light rail. I think that is very shortsighted thinking. We need to put rail everywhere that we possibly can. Now that he says there are funding problems and that probably can't happen, but somebody smarter than I could have thought about this during the first oil crisis, we're going to eventually be moving a lot more people and goods by mass transportation than we are by one person to a car. I hope he does go forward with the motion. I would like to see us vote on it.

Mr. Wimberly said our seconded just departed.

Mr. Watson said then I will re-second it.

Mr. Wimberly said any further discussion. I just want to say in part of the discussion, the MPO meeting is going to be pretty heavily loaded next meeting with two presentations, long range plan, and attributable funds to be reconciled.

Mr. Watson said are you recommending that we hold it until the following meeting.

Mr. Wimberly said I would recommend that we would hold it.

Mr. Perry said I am willing to do that. I would ask that staff before the next whatever this meeting is, have a draft resolution for us to look at.

Mr. Harrison said and the rail one, we are following suit with other MPO's.

Mr. Perry said yes, rail is completely understandable.

Mr. Harrison said re-authorization of the transportation funding bill, \$500 billion and \$50 billion of that is specifically going to those corridors with rail.

Mr. Perry said yes, and that's a very narrow focused resolution that we want to support high speed rail.

Mr. Harrison said that's right. That's the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. Perry said what we are talking about is much different.

Mr. Wimberly said we are talking about some generalities so let's, are you withdrawing your motion.

Mr. Perry said yes.

Mr. Wimberly said any other new business.

Mr. Murphy said I guess I missed the old business but how are we doing with ARRA projects. That deadline date is coming up. Is everything working alright?

Mr. Harrison said as far as I understand it, yes. If ya'll remember, we sat in this room and we gave any body that had their preliminary engineering to be funded with the ARRA stimulus money, we were to give them four months to have a consultant hired. That definition is giving a notice to proceed to the consultant to start work. As far as I understand.

Mr. Powell said basically what's happened today, is I did some checking today, Prichard and Satsuma both received their notice to precede this morning so their consultants are starting work. The Creola project the paperwork for notice to precede began this morning so that should be taken care of within the next week or two and as far as I know, Chickasaw, they have one last person that has to review, I don't think they are going to have any markups and if that is the case then their notice to precede paperwork will either start today or tomorrow.

Mr. Murphy said that's good.

Mr. Powell said so the four PE projects should all be fine.

Mr. Wimberly said anything else. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Motion to adjourn was made. Meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

---

---

Chairman, TCC