

**Mobile Area Transportation Study
TCC/CAC Meeting
May 19, 2010, 10:00 a.m.
SARPC Training Room**

TCC/CAC Members Present

Mr. James Jacobs
Mr. Don Powell
Mr. Tom Briand
Ms. Betty Donald
Mr. Bryan Kegley
Mr. Sam Rawls
Mr. Nick Amberger
Mr. Gerald Alfred
Ms. Margie Wilcox
Mr. John Murphy
Mr. Bill Metzger
Mr. Donald Watson
Mr. David Yarbrough (Rep. Thomas Hughes)
Mr. Bert Hoffman
Ms. Jennifer White
Mr. Ricky Mitchell (Rep. James Foster)
Mr. Bob Harris

TCC/CAC Members Absent

Ms. Tywanda Jackson
Mr. Randy Delchamps
Mr. Hunter Winton
Mr. George Crozier
Mr. James Foster
Ms. Ginny Russell
Ms. Casi Callaway
Mr. Russ Wimberly
Ms. Lindsay Hutchission
Mr. Steve Perry
Ms. Jennifer Denson
Ms. Sandra Forbus
Mr. John Bell
Mr. Russ Wimberly

GUESTS:

Mr. Edwin Perry
Ms. Wendy Allen

STAFF:

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

In lieu of the TCC/CAC Chairman Mr. Wimberly being absent, and the Chairman's proxy Mr. Chris Miller being absent, Mr. Kevin Harrison called the meeting to order.

Mr. Harrison said the first item on the agenda was review and discussion of the Unified Planning Work Program. This is the first thing in ya'lls folder. This is actually our budget. I've got to submit my budget to the state on June 15th. I'll then review it with the MPO. We actually have to adopt by September. So once I get comments and everything from the state, the UPWP will adopted in September. To review, a couple of items on here. It's basically the same budget. However, we are going to hire a new employee. This new employee is going to be a modeler. As ya'll know, we are going to become nonattainment for air quality and one of the requirements of that is we have to run a detailed air quality model, a EPA model called MOVES. The input to that model is

pretty detailed. One of the things our travel demand forecast model is now validated or calibrated to our traffic counts, but we are going to have to calibrate our model with travel speed which we don't have yet. This new employee is going to be a full time modeler for us. If you look at item number 6.1, Long Range Transportation Plan, \$37,000. That was \$63,000 so it was about \$25,000 more. Our long range plan is done. We finished that up this fiscal year so next fiscal year, we don't need as much there. That \$25,000 was kind of distributed against several different tasks. The first one, task 1.1 program administration and management. This was up from last time by a small percentage. We will most likely to an Airport Boulevard Capacity Improvement Study with attributable funds which is project number 15 up here for the city and the county. I have approval from the state to enter consultant selection for that project. I'm now waiting on funding agreements and we can actually start the consultant selection process for that project.

Mr. Powell said those agreements are at the city.

Mr. Harrison said those agreements are at the city. As soon as we get those funding agreements we can start the consultant selection process on that. It will probably go into the next fiscal year which will be handled by task 1.1. Task 2.4 traffic data 13,000. I need truck counts and this may change between now and June. I may buy vehicle classification counters or I might hire somebody to do it or I might ask the state, the city or the county to do them for us. Our air quality model and our travel demand forecast model is going to require vehicle classification counts so I need truck counts for our base year which will be 2010. I might buy the equipment and have one of ya'll do it or hire somebody to do the counts for us. Task 5.0 – Air Quality. Obviously we will become nonattainment for air quality so this whole task 5.0 is upped in the budget as was Task 6.1.1 Air Quality Conformity for the Long Range Plan which was upped because this new employee's task will be developing that Air Quality model. Task 6.2 remains the same. However, next fiscal year, we've got to develop a new TIP. This current TIP is 2008 to 2011. So next fiscal year, we are going to have to develop a whole new TIP. It shouldn't be that difficult because this schedule right here already is already balanced out to year 2018. Bicycle Pedestrian Planning went up slightly from last time and the Congestion Management Process, Task 6.6 went up by about \$10,000. Starting in October, our staff will be conducting travel time surveys with GPS units. We basically strap GPS units to our cars and drive all the principal arterials, freeways and minor arterials a minimum of six times. Then we've actually got a historical record of all the travel times on our major arterials. Task 8.0, Mobile ITS Interstate Detour Routing Study. That actually will probably start this fiscal year so this is just a carryover from this fiscal year to 2011. We've short listed three. We've shortlisted Sain, Volkert and Associates and Skipper. We've actually got our presentations on Monday. Our total federal dollars down at bottom, you see \$486,000. That's increased slightly about \$15,000 more than we had last year. This is to be presented to MPO and then after we've received comments from ALDOT and the Federal Highway Administration, we will adopt it probably in September. Does anybody have any questions on the UPWP?

Mr. Murphy asked how is the local share divided.

Mr. Harrison said the local share is actually divided through dues from the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission and it's a per capita basis. So the dues are per capita.

Mr. Murphy said per capita. Okay, that's what I was wondering.

Mr. Harrison said and even though we have \$486,000 in federal money, that's not how much we can spend because we are at the mercy of the dues collected. \$486,000 that's 80% plus the 20% share is just over \$600,000. That's not all we can spend because most likely we will not collect all of our dues. So we are at the mercy of the dues collected.

Mr. Murphy said well those that don't pay, don't get to vote do they.

Mr. Harrison said the MPO? That's a decision that the MPO can discuss.

Mr. Murphy said I've never heard that discussed at an MPO meeting. Maybe they need to know that some organizations aren't participating in funding it, they might not be able to vote.

Mr. Harrison said we can certainly bring that up. I'll go over that with our executive director. Are there any other questions about our budget for next year?

With no other questions, the next item on the agenda was the various ALDOT requested projects in the 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Harrison said item 2 you will find in your folder a review of the various ALDOT requested projects. These are items, several years ago, ALDOT allowed level of effort projects which ya'll received an email and we had 5 days to comment on these certain projects in certain funding categories. They are doing away with that now so we are actually going to be meeting a lot more on little projects like vans. The purpose of the MPO is that every federal transportation dollar that comes to the area, the MPO has to vote on. The first projects are 5310 vans for UJ Robinson and Citizens for a Better Grand Bay. The next letter, Section 5310, vans for Transit Volunteers of America. The next several projects, 5317, New Freedom and JARC projects, they are out of a competitive process handled through the WAVE Transit. Mobile Bay Transportation, Surf Shuttle and Access Yellow; WAVE Transit, Neighborhood Circulators; Transit Volunteers of America, Supportive Transportation; and we actually are getting about \$8,000 for Emergency Ride Home. On the next page, Mobile Association for Retarded Citizens and Independent Living Centers will be receiving vehicles. So those 5316 and 17, like I said, are the result of a competitive process. All three pots of money have to be part of our Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan which they are a part of. They have to meet certain requirements of it. Does anybody have any questions on those?

Mr. Harrison said the next item.

Mr. Murphy said excuse me a minute Kevin. You talked about the transit, but the first letter is \$20 million on a Welcome Center. We can build a lot of miles of road with that.

Mr. Amberger said with my old cap on as an ALDOT guy, I was kind of in charge of maintaining this thing, it's in deplorable condition and it gets a tremendous amount of activity.

Mr. Powell said and we're leveling it. The old one is going completely away. We are eliminating the sewage lagoons. We're going to have the cost of running water and sewage lines out there to it. It's going to be a nice facility once we finish it, but that's part of it is that we are taking that whole thing down and reworking the site plan just a little. I don't know that we are going to end up with 20, but that's our estimate right now.

Mr. Harrison said and that's Interstate Maintenance Funds.

Mr. Powell said I believe so.

Mr. Harrison said I apologize for that. That project as well will be as a resolution for the MPO to vote on the 23rd.

Mr. Amberger said stop in there sometime, it's in bad shape.

Mr. Murphy said I wouldn't doubt that but so are some of the roads. As long as it's interstate money and not any of the money that we can use, I don't have as much of an objection to it. That's just a lot of money for a welcome center.

Mr. Amberger said well that facility in the past in hurricane events is inundated with traffic from Mississippi, folks coming in there and it's kind of a, it's almost a bunker right now. I suspect in the ALDOT planning stages, it has some of those planning features added to it. I know they had out maps and all sorts of stuff that people who are evacuating have stop in there.

Mr. Harrison said any more questions about the projects to be presented to the MPO on the 23rd. So the last item is the big page that ya'll got. This is the normal size of it. I can barely read it so we printed out on 11 by 17 and it is also up there on the board. What happened was if you recall in January, SAFETEA-LU had fine print in the back document said that in certain economic times there could be a rescission of funds and that's what they did. They took \$3.8 million federal dollars from our attributable funds and just recently gave it back to us. In January what we did was we took project 8 through 14 and just pushed them way back so now what you have in front of you is my suggestion on what we should do and this is open to change. The final result of today will be presented to the MPO on the 23rd to vote on. A couple of things have changed. If you look at project #3, the right of way for Zeigler Boulevard, Forrest Hill to Cody Road, that was in fiscal year 2010. That got pushed back to 2011. The city thinks they can get the utilities and construction done in the same year. The right of way has a letting date of

November so the city thinks that they can get something done by August or September so we are going to leave that project in fiscal year 2011.

Mr. Powell said I spoke to our Right of Way folks, Kevin and we agree there's not a tremendous amount of right of way to be purchased. The kicker is that we are buying right of way from the railroad and we just don't know how long that is going to take. We are starting to try and make contact with them. Figure out who that person is that we are going to have to talk to because a lot of times that's 6 months worth of the struggle right there. Right now, theoretically, yes, it can stay, but a lot is going to depend on that railroad.

Mr. Amberger said the city intends to budget the match in our budget so we would like it to remain there.

Mr. Powell said Kevin, that project doesn't go to Cody. It goes to Athey.

Mr. Harrison asked to Athey.

Mr. Powell said yes.

Mr. Harrison said it went back and forth to Cody to Athey to Cody to Athey. Also what happened recently is project #5, Schillinger Road, US 98 to Lott. The right of way on that project got moved back from fiscal year 2010 to 2011. The county is not sure that one can be done in a year so construction and utilities we pushed back to 2012.

Mr. Murphy said I guess we need to bring up again Kevin that our TK commitment of \$4million is going to allow us to bring that project up some whenever we are allowed to show it.

Mr. Harrison said that's right. Is the right of way going to be able to be done in a year?

Mr. Murphy said there's quite a few parcels. I would think it would take pretty close to a year.

Mr. Powell said I would say at least a year. We've got a few relocates out there as well. We minimized it as much as we could, but I think at least a year.

Mr. Murphy said we would like to see the construction moved up closer to being in 11 when we get the TK money involved. Right now, you keep telling me we still can't show that yet.

Mr. Harrison said that's right and for those of you not familiar with what we are talking about; the county has been promised \$8 million from the state for what I guess is called ThyssenKrupp money. It will be \$4 million applied to Schillinger, US 98 to Howell's Ferry and \$4 million applied to Schillinger, 98 to Lott Road. That money is promised, but it's not in the system yet. As soon as that money is in system, we can start scheduling

it. I've been told that come October, our next fiscal year, they will have the money and we can start scheduling it then. That will obviously bring these projects up.

Mr. Murphy said it's a written agreement; it's not just a verbal promise.

Mr. Harrison said right, so we need to stick to them. Actually, next fiscal year is going to free up some of this attributable money. We'll be able to move more projects up in the schedule. Right now this shows up to the year 2013, but the schedule actually goes out and we're at a balance all the way out to 2018. That project Schillinger, 98 to Lott will stay in 2012. So what I basically did was move everything back up, project 8 -14, a fiscal year. Even though this TIP is 2008 to 2011, those are the only years that we have to have a positive balance, I hate to see that we have almost \$12 million in fiscal year 2011, but at the same time, we've only got \$300,000 scheduled out to 2013. I don't know that there is a whole lot that we can do about that. This is my recommendation. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Murphy said we can when we get that extra \$8 million. There will be a little more play room.

Mr. Harrison said that should give us more play room to move projects up. What we did is started to try and fund a lot of the preliminary engineering on these projects.

Mr. Murphy said we got to get some projects started.

Mr. Harrison said this will at least start projects. I heard a nasty, nasty rumor from someone that the Senate version of the next transportation funding bill might have in it that all preliminary engineering will be local dollars. Federal funds can't be used for that. If that happens, that's going to hold up a whole bunch of projects. I would like to see, now the next transportation funding bill, SAFETEA-LU; actually we have an extension until December. There's flashier items that the Congress has to deal with now, than that. I don't see any movement towards it so I think we need to get as many preliminary engineering projects underway as we can. Now, that being said, we do have \$340,000 and we might be able to move some of these preliminary engineering's up to 2010.

Mr. Murphy said Kevin, the number 11, the Three Notch Road, I mean number 10, Schillinger to McDonald, we are, as you know, it was in this year and it got moved back, we've already put out the RFP and got replies and we just stopped at that point when we had to shove it back. We would like to see that one up to this year because we think we can act on the RFPs that we've already received and try to get going.

Mr. Harrison said okay, then move utilities and construction from 12 to 11?

Mr. Murphy said yes. Don, I guess I should ask, the McDonald Road, it's been up there for months.

Mr. Powell said yes, I know. I keep checking on it. We're having problems with our environmental section is just slow with documents, reviews, everything and that's what we're waiting on is the environmental section. I've checked on your reviews probably five or six times and I'll do it again today. I'm also checking on Schillinger Road EA. That got resubmitted up to Montgomery a couple of weeks ago and I haven't heard anything about that review.

Mr. Murphy said we need to be already in the right of way soon so we can move that construction up and we can't do it until we get the agreement signed and it's been up there what, three or four months now?

Mr. Powell said at least.

Someone asked in ALDOT's office or FHWA?

Mr. Powell said it's in our office. Let me make a phone call and if I don't get an answer, then I'll give you some names.

Mr. Murphy said thank you.

Mr. Harrison said so that gives us actually, you know every time we change the fiscal year, we've either got to add or take away 4%, so if we move those two projects up, we know have a balance in 2013 of \$400,000.

Mr. Amberger said Kevin, the city on number 12 would like to move that one back to 2012, that interchange feasibility study. That might offset what the county is wanting to move up.

Mr. Powell asked Nick do we need that project in there at all.

Mr. Amberger said well, we're still having some debate on that.

Mr. Powell said I don't know that we can put another interchange out there on I10 where we are talking about.

Mr. Amberger said I think we would need some input from Montgomery probably up at Mr. Vaughn's level as to whether or not it is practical. I think at one time it may have been. Now it does look like some of the property that was going to be considered for that is going to be built into a commercial park.

Mr. Powell said and I'm just talking about FHWA regulations of where we can and can't put interchanges.

Mr. Amberger said right.

Mr. Powell said 193 is very close and we've got Halls Mill Creek Bridges.

Mr. Amberger said before the money would be committed, actually committed and spent, there probably needs to be some more guidance from them on what they would allow.

Mr. Murphy said is that adding some access to Riviere Du Chien crossing or is this just adding a new interchange.

Mr. Metzger said it would be a new interchange. It would add a frontage road on the south side. It would allow access to that whole area over there that is land locked from Navco, Riviere Du Chien even Rangeline where it can build a frontage road to connect the whole piece on the south side.

Mr. Murphy said and that's where that new commercial development just went.

Mr. Amberger said right. At one time we thought it was very possible, but I don't know now how practical it is because it has become. Every time they build a new building in that commercial park, the right of way cost is going to escalate. And over the creek and wetlands there.

Mr. Murphy said I guess the purpose is to tie all University's traffic to an interchange.

Mr. Amberger said and you relieve the Riviere Du Chien issue to with the people south. I think what I understand is that in years past there was an attempt to consider something at the Riviere Du Chien. FHWA was not interested in doing something there. This is just another attempt to try and give that area some relief.

Ms. Wilcox said as a TCC member, I would love to see that area get some relief. I would like to keep it in the plan until ya'll get some more information because traveling that area and access, and there may be access at Government and there may be access at Rangeline, but I think that would be an interesting fix.

Mr. Harrison said that projects not actually on the long range plan, but it has been on the long range plan for probably 20 to 25 years. We took it off this long range plan because we just didn't have the money for it. Actually, the state says, William Adams said you can't do it. So because he said that, we took it off the long range plan, but now if the city has an interchange justification study, we can put it back on the plan. But now if the city as an interchange justification study, we can put it back on the plan. Are there any other comments? We now have, since that project is moved back, \$389,000 in fiscal year 2013. Are there any other?

Mr. Murphy said you mentioned the Intersection Capacity. Where are we on that? Did ya'll say the contracts at the city?

Mr. Powell said the funding agreement with the state is at the city.

Mr. Metzger said basically, we got to take it back to the Mayor's office. We are still playing with the budget a little bit. Hopefully, that's going to be approved shortly and we'll get it going.

Mr. Harrison said and I have approval from the state to enter consultant selection for it. I would just like the funding agreement before we do that. For those of you that know, the Airport Intersection Capacity Improvement study is a joint study that we are looking at doing between the county and the city. They'll provide joint match for the project, \$200,000, and we'll look at all the intersections on Airport Boulevard. Maybe new technologies of intersections.

Ms. Wilcox said great job. Good idea.

Mr. Harrison said do any other projects want to be moved up or is everybody acceptable with this schedule of funds.

Mr. Murphy said do we have our \$8 million yet? I just don't want anything that is going to prevent us from being able to move that Schillinger Road project back up once we have that \$8 million available.

Mr. Harrison said once that \$8 million comes in the system, what that will do will take \$4 million off the \$12 million for the first one and \$4 million off 98 to Lott. That will free up \$8 million. All these projects we have 8 through 14 have utilities and construction all the way out to 2018 here.

Mr. Murphy said we would like to bring that Three Notch section in a little further when we get that too. That first Three Notch section.

Mr. Harrison said I don't necessarily need a vote if there's nobody opposing the projects. Is there any further discussion on that item? We all good? This will be presented to the MPO on the 23rd. We'll have a balance of \$398,000. We'll move up Three Notch, Schillinger to McDonald, PE from Fiscal Year 2011 to Fiscal year 2010. We'll move up utilities and construction, I'm sorry, the right of way to 2010 and utilities and construction to 2011. Is there any old business?

Mr. Amberger said Kevin before we start in old business; I want to bring up for discussion what we talked about municipal connecting lanes. I don't know how many people know what they are and if they are affected by them or not and kind of get a feel for where this groups sits on using these funds for projects on municipal connecting lanes. For those that don't know, Government Street, US 90, US 98, Springhill Avenue, and parts of US 45 are municipal connecting lanes. I know this, I'm one of the newer members to this group and I kind of wanting to gage where this group's positions are relative to spending and using these funds for improvements or projects on those roads. I wanted to have a discussion on it to see where everybody's position is.

Mr. Watson said define what this municipal connecting link is. What qualifies these particular highways?

Mr. Amberger said the state legislature a number of years ago, declared routes all over the state, a number of them in Mobile and the surrounding communities, where a US Route or State Route passes through a city limits. In that particular portion, ALDOT maintains the roadway surface. They maintain from the back of the curb to the back of the curb, the centerline of the ditch to the center line of the ditch. The municipality has responsibility for everything else primarily permitting issues relative to turn lanes and turnouts, drainage maintenance items. Basically ALDOT maintains the traveling surface. They don't maintain anything else. They're kind of hybrid ownership. I think we have to look at them that way because when you go back to the law and you read the law, it's written by a bunch of attorneys. It is real vague and it's not real decisive on who maintains what. What's evolved overtime is that ALDOT maintains the roadway surface, from the back of the curb to the back of the curb and municipalities maintain everything else and when these major failures are happening on some of these roadways, primarily drainage structure, big culverts, closed drainage ditch and such, they fall into this no man's land that the municipalities probably doesn't have the funds to address something because of the grand scale and the nature of the road. It's really more than what is customarily a road that's owned by the municipality. There are these roads that are kind of hybrid ownership because they are owned partially by the...I think it actually works out that the right of way is actually owned by the municipality, but the state actually has I guess the ownership and responsibility due to an act of the legislature, of the roadway itself. A number of the one's going through Mobile are in various states of disrepair. I think that the approach the City has had in internal discussions is that some of the items where these monies are being earmarked for capacity issues, the capacity issues that we're experiencing aren't necessarily additional lanes, but it's when you got a situation where it rains here and say it rains a third of the days a year, well a third of the days of the year, the capacity of some of these major routes are impacted because one lane or a portion of one lane on either side of the roadway is not passable. These are some of the routes that are leading to our hospitals and our very important facilities to the communities. It's a big subject. It requires a lot of discussion and consideration. It probably tilts the ship to a little bit different direction than it has been heading, but I wanted to put it out there. I felt it appropriate to put it out there and get the various affected entities input on it. I've actually had some discussions with Vince at ALDOT to see statewide how that is being done, and handled.

Mr. Harrison said statewide other MPO's especially smaller MPO's, nonTMA's, they use their attributable funds for maintenance issues, resurfacing. WE have not. It's not policy, but it is procedure that we don't use this money for any type of maintenance type issues. Likewise, in the history of this program, we've never funded anything on a shielded route which would be a double precedence setting to use this money on something like that.

Mr. Amberger said but there's no legislation or anything that says we can't.

Mr. Harrison said there's no legislation, but shielded routes have access to STP, funds from the state, NHS funds if they are on the National Highway System so there are several different pots of money that those routes would be eligible for. Grelot, University, Three Notch, these are roads that are funded with attributable money, MPO money.

Mr. Murphy said it's their only source other than local funds.

Mr. Amberger said I guess where the city's thoughts kind of are with that is that should these roads that have hybrid ownerships, hybrid designations, because they are local streets and they are shielded routes, we recognize that. Should they be excluded from those funds? Right now, it looks like maybe that because they have access to other funds, they've been excluded from this pot. Drive down Government Street, drive down Springhill Avenue, these are roads that affect the City of Mobile, they affect the other adjoining cities that are tied to us and some of the stuff on them is in pretty poor condition. The curb and gutter the drains beneath it, we have all gotten hammered on pedestrian features, sidewalks, bike routes. Some of that just may not be possible being incorporated into these jobs, but just on a local scale to tackle some of those issues with just local funds, it's going to be next to impossible, I think, for the cities to address them. It's a big subject. It has a whole bunch of arms and legs and fingers that go out in a bunch of different directions. I kind of just wanted to put it out there for maybe some more future discussion. I don't want to get anybody stirred up or anybody mad or anything like that, but it's certainly something that just because we've done something one way since 50 years doesn't mean that we can't change and do something a little bit better a little bit different.

Ms. Wilcox said that's my segway Kevin.

Mr. Alfred said I have a question. Would US Hwy 45, St. Stephens Road, be considered one of those streets?

Mr. Amberger said there are sections of it that are. You have to go back to the time which the legislation was approved and what the city limits were at that particular time. As the cities have grown and annexed the municipal connecting links, I don't believe that they change unless another act of legislature changes them. Trust me, for those of you that have to get involved in those, it's just a real bad deal. Employees change and you've got the new frontline supervisor dealing with a pothole issue or the new frontline supervisor dealing with a failed drainage issue, all it does is make everybody mad because they say I'm not fixing it because it's not mine. I'm not fixing it, it's not mine and the end result is that the people who we serve are the ones that are getting disservice because the problem isn't being fixed. I dealt with it for a bunch of years. I've sat on both sides of the fence. Blame legislature for coming up with these things, but it's tough to manage some of these.

Mr. Harrison said but what you're asking is, how long has Zeigler, Forrest Hill to Athey been in the system. Ten or fifteen years, maybe 20 years. It's been a long time and what

you are asking is to introduce projects that have other funding sources and it's the states responsibility to compete with the local projects.

Mr. Amberger said I'm saying just don't exclude those other projects from being considered. I'm not saying that a Zeigler is not more worthy. I'm not here to put that value on what project is more worthy. That's a job for this whole committee. I'm not going there, won't go there, will never go there. I'm just saying we've got some of the major roads that affect this community as a whole that appear to be because they are a hybrid ownership road appear to be excluded from the pots of money that might be able to fix some of the problems. I'm not saying to do it, I'm saying think about it, put it for a vote with the folks have the final say on it whether or not they should be considered or excluded. If they say excluded them, don't do it, you don't ever bring the subject back up again.

Mr. Harrison said does the county have any hybrid ownership roads.

The answer was no.

Mr. Amberger said it's going to be limited to municipalities.

Mr. Watson said well this particular committee member wants to see this on the next agenda of the MPO. I've been beating my head against the wall for the past 9 years trying to get something done with St. Stephens Road. I think if this is another pot that is available, I think we should look at it.

Mr. Amberger said I think any of the projects would still have to meet the same criteria.

Mr. Harrison said these projects have to be in the long range plan. They have to be the result of the travel demand forecast model process, the result of the transportation planning process. It has to enter the long range plan and then enter the short range plan. For US 45 for example, that is a project that we've recognized for years. In fact, at one point, the PE even started on that project. I'm not exactly sure what happened to the project, but if we introduce 45, it's going to compete with a lot of these projects that has been in here for years.

Mr. Amberger said Kevin, I think our point is that all the projects, no matter what they should be, should go through the same process. If they make the cut, they make the cut. If they don't make cut, they don't make the cut, but don't just exclude them because they are shielded or not shielded. I think that might be the biggest difference of how the city would maybe like to get considerations on. Put to a vote with the folks that have a vote.

Ms. Wilcox said I'm going to go there and I've passed out to some of ya'll. It's a segway for new business.

Mr. Harrison said I'm going to go ahead and I guess I have a motion to put it on the agenda of the MPO meeting. Second.

Mr. Watson seconded.

Motion was approved.

Mr. Piper said now the policy committee is going to say what does the TCC/CAC recommend and we haven't recommended anything.

There was some discussion.

Mr. Harrison said I would like to bring it up to the MPO for discussion. I don't think we are ready to have a resolution and have the MPO vote on whether to use these funds for it. I don't think we need one. We're not breaking any rules. There's no policy saying that we can't use this money for shielded routes so we don't necessarily need a resolution, but the MPO can discuss it.

Mr. Amberger said my point is when it comes time to present projects for consideration in the long range plan, the city because we have some change of though there, we may present some different stuff. If they make the cut, they make the cut. If they don't make the cut, well that's the price of playing the game.

Mr. Harrison said okay because this would be a good segway for the way we present projects.

Mr. Wilcox said I've now become a member of the TCC in Northwest Florida. That does not mean that I think everything they do, we should do. In my meeting that I first attended last week, they have prioritized as their TCC; they've set up this criteria that I passed out to you. It's still a work in progress. It's a draft. They have evaluated and scored points, much like when we do grants and RFP's. They weighted what they value as a community when they decide their priorities on roads. This is how they are developing their TCC's plan for deciding what projects go in 2035. I know this can't be decided today. I just learned about this and I wanted to bring it to ya'll right away. They've got a vision statement. I know we've got a vision statement. Ours could be 10 times better than theirs. I haven't compared them. I did like the way that they weighted and they decided. For instance, the hurricanes, initially they said the wanted 20 points, but then an engineer made a very good observation that you would never build your way out of a hurricane. We've got to concern ourselves with the day to day traffic and needs of the community so they reduced that at that meeting from 20 points to 10 and they redistributed their points you'll see to different areas. I don't know what our priorities, what we might decide we decide we want to do. But I threw this out as an example and I would like to see us as a TCC come up with those plans. Now, that being said, I believe, that some of the engineers like Joe Ruffer, John Murphy, the state guys that almost every one of these things you have up in your head and you do without even having to go through this exercise. But the amateurs like me and the other people that are new to this committee might need a path or some kind of measurement to get to where your 40 years of knowledge has already gotten you. I just throw this out as an idea. Ya'll can like it,

love it, hate it, I just wanted to throw it out and give us a way. I think it goes along with some of the things that we've been saying that we want to have a way to come up with what's important and I know that we've got needs that are unmet out to 2050 and there's projects I want to see happen in my lifetime so that being said, thank ya'll for your time. I think I was under 2 minutes.

Mr. Harrison said I don't disagree with this. I think it's a good idea for our long range planning process. You just kind of witnessed our priority process here and any of these projects on short range have to be on long range so they'd have points to it. The way that we just adopted the long range plan, the way those projects were prioritized, was actually pretty simple and actually the points could be determined I guess directly from this methodology. The first priority 1 projects in the long range plan were those projects that had some form of element of the project, whether it be PE, Right of Way, or Construction in the first five years. So they had some form of project in the TIP. Priority 2 projects were already in the system. So these projects, for example Three Notch, they're out in 2018 or the construction is, that was priority 2 projects. They already had a number, they were already in the system, ALDOT's already given them a project ID. Then, the priority 3 projects were basically, by the way Priority 1 and 2 projects are just about all of our projected funds that we had. Priority 3 projects were actually, I think we had maybe 200 million and we did Snow Road and that was our long range plan. We included visionary projects because once we modeled those projects; it wasn't enough to take care of the traffic so we included those visionary projects. That basically is our priority system now which takes into account level of service, project status, the project cost. Project cost sharing is not because everything is 80/20.

Ms. Wilcox said and I think a lot of that cost sharing was discussed because of who had the money to pony up right away so in their discussions the cost sharing had a lot to do with some of the discussions we had as well.

Mr. Murphy asked who does the evaluations.

Ms. Wilcox said the TCC.

Mr. Murphy said so all of us would have to vote on the weight of each one of these items.

Ms. Wilcox said well I think that the staff, like I said I'm very new to this, I just went to the first meeting.

Mr. Murphy said I am just asking.

Mr. Harrison said I imagine it is the staff.

Ms. Wilcox said much like, see like he has it in the top of his head. He can go through that, I can't. And some of these people in this room can't, but he can. So, yes, the staff comes up and does, I'm sure, weights and tells the participants what areas gets the most

points. But I think we've got to decide what gets the points. You can give the facts, but the TCC over there is deciding how many points to give each thing.

Mr. Alfred said it would probably be the way we do the JARC/New Freedom, Margie.

Ms. Wilcox said exactly. And I'm very familiar with that and I think a lot of people are.

Mr. Alfred said you know as far as us providing expertise for the committee as far as learning how to value proposals.

Ms. Wilcox said and let me say this again and I'll be brown nosing. Kevin, I'm never been more proud of you. I remember when you fell into this job. You do a great job so I don't want you to take a defensive posture.

Mr. Harrison said so you want to give me more work.

Someone said she wants to get some of the knowledge out of your head.

Ms. Wilcox said yes, I want your knowledge. You know you took over from somebody that had a lot of stuff in his head and you hit the ground running and did better with an empty computer than anybody I've ever seen. All three of ya'll did. What I'm saying is that it should be something that easily could be stepped into without, and when people retire, all the knowledge wouldn't have to retire with people that retire.

Mr. Harrison said I don't disagree with you. I think it's a good idea. The project environmental and social impacts that's going to have to come from a committee. That's going to be kind of a hard one. Obviously if we put an outer loop that goes over some of the tributaries of Big Creek Lake will get zero points.

Ms. Wilcox said so believe you me, they've cut out their Outer Loop too so they have had some of the same things. They had an Outer Loop, they chopped it off.

Mr. Harrison said but given that we just adopted our long range plan it will be probably 4 years maybe 5, because we are going to become nonattainment for air quality. Everything we do is going to be subject to an interagency consultation committee.

Ms. Wilcox said and I think they are under the same thing. They are going to nonattainment too. Wasn't some of this, and if not should be, have nonattainment and some component.

Ms. Allen said will this affect the environmental, social impacts? The nonattainment?

Mr. Harrison said yes and no. I mean environmental can mean a lot of things. It can mean environmental justice. If a project goes through a low-income or minority area and breaks that neighbor, that's one thing also.

Mr. Murphy said Margie, from what I understand, what you want is an actual, something you can look at how the project got evaluated. You are not saying push these particular items.

Ms. Wilcox said oh, no sir. All I'm saying is that this model.

Mr. Murphy said of weighting a project.

Ms. Wilcox said yes, we decide how we want to weight it. This was just how they did it. It's a process in doing RFP's; it's something that I can understand. It's broke down to my level of communication. Certainly, several of ya'll in this room have done grants and been graded on the same criteria so I was just kind of throwing it out there as a methodology that we can perhaps understand.

Ms. Allen said and I wanted to ask, I know I came in late, I'm sorry; I wanted to ask on the present projects that were selected, was there any consideration for the nonattainment issue in these or was it just longevity on the books?

Mr. Harrison said we didn't know we were going to become nonattainment status. In January, EPA came out with, they said we are going to redo our numbers so as far as December our numbers were low enough that we were going to be below the new standard. So, I mean our air quality is getting better; the standards are just getting worse. We didn't actually know that we were going to be nonattainment, so the answer to the question is no. They didn't have any consideration for that. But they will.

Ms. Allen said but what I'm saying is, is the MPO moving to incorporate that as part of the assessment for future projects because we will be coming into that and we might as well be proactive rather than reactive.

Mr. Harrison said we have to run an air quality model called MOVES provided by the EPA on all of our road projects. We have to calculate emissions of our road projects and we have to stay below a certain budget provided to us from ADEM.

Mr. Piper said so to answer your question, we have to be proactive. We can't not be. From this point, once we become nonattainment, we can't add a project without taking that into consideration.

Ms. Allen said right and you know my interest is the cycle, pedestrian and bicyclist, having access to the roadways so if that's a means and method to address nonattainment then that will need consideration on these projects.

Mr. Harrison said well actually, we can develop, I mean this is a suggestion, whether a project has a bicycle/pedestrian facility, can add a point to it. We can come up with something like, but the answer to your original question is no, our projects didn't have consideration, but from now on, once it becomes official and we've been given that letter that we are nonattainment, then we will have to start considering it.

Mr. Murphy said and then we will have the data. We don't have the data now to truly consider it.

Mr. Harrison said well that's another problem is that the data for this MOVES model. I'm going to have to get with ya'll. It requires how much fuel and what type of fuel from every point in the county. What type of vehicle – is it commercial, is it personal. What type of engine does it have. How old is it? Is it moving on a regular basis or is it standing still? All of these things. It's a hugely, intensive amount of data which is why we didn't do it in the past.

Ms. Allen said would be better to use what's been called precautionary principle in that you know it's coming down the road whether you wait on the data to be collected or not. I mean it would enhance the transportation system because incorporated projects for pedestrians and bicyclists, the roadways would be safer anyway because you would have to take them into consideration so it's not just nonattainment, its safety. Using the precautionary principle, to me it doesn't make sense to wait until you have the data. I mean that's some of this oil spill stuff....

Mr. Harrison said well our base year will be 2010 and we're not done with 2010. So our next plan that comes out will have a base year of 2010 so we can't collect data until 2010 is over.

Mr. Murphy said every project that we have that is going to have federal funds used is going to be required to address pedestrians and bicyclists. In the future whether we are nonattainment or in attainment, either way. Every one of these projects is going to need that consideration so we are addressing that issue.

Mr. Powell said yes, even projects that we already signed environmental documents; a lot of time FHWA does a reevaluation to include pedestrians and bicycles.

Mr. Murphy said whether they are built with a project or not is going to be addressed in every one of the projects. The need for the roadway doesn't change.

Mr. Harrison said is there any other new business? Old business? Friday is Bike to Work Day so everybody bike to work. We will see ya'll on June 23rd. Meeting adjourned.

ATTEST:

Chairman, TCC

Date _____

