

**Mobile Area Transportation Study  
Technical / Citizens Committee Meeting  
November 19, 2009, 10:00 a.m.  
SARPC Training Room**

**TCC/CAC Members Present**

Bert Hoffman  
Jennifer Denson  
Lindsay Hutchisson  
Jennifer White  
Bill Metzger  
Bryan Kegley  
Gerald Alfred  
John Murphy  
Don Powell  
James Jacobs  
James Foster  
Nick Amberger  
Tom Briand  
David Yarbrough  
John Bell  
Tywanda Jackson  
Chris Miller representing Russ Wimberly

**TCC/CAC Members Absent**

Margie Wilcox  
Sam Rawls  
Donald Watson  
Thomas Hughes  
Betty Donald  
George Crozier  
Mary Mullins  
Randy Delchamps  
Ricky Mitchell  
Casi Callaway  
Joseph Threadcraft  
Steve Perry  
Ginny Russell  
Hunter Winton

**Guests:**

David Yarbrough

**Staff:**

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

Mr. Chris Miller said my name is Chris Miller. I'm the assistant executive director with SARPC and I'll be chairing this meeting. I'll turn it over to Kevin Harrison.

Mr. Harrison said you may recall that we had a MPO meeting August 12<sup>th</sup> and at that time we had a balanced TIP. The attributable schedule was balanced. The TIP for those of you that are new to this is the Transportation Improvement Program. It's supposed to be a 5 year schedule of all Federal Transportation Dollars. It's like a checking account. It has to have a positive balance. It's hard to do because these projects go up in cost. We get negative balances and now they are taking money away from us. It is our responsibility, the TCC to keep this schedule of funds with a positive balance. That is why we are here today. After the MPO meeting in August, we submitted the draft TIP to ALDOT, received comments on it, submitted the draft to the Feds and while we were waiting on comments from them to adopt our Transportation Improvement Program, we received a rescission from SAFETEALU. SAFETEALU is the

Transportation Funding Bill and in the back pages in fine print it says in the last year of the bill, they can take back certain money. This is the second rescission. It is \$8.7 billion for the whole country. That translates to about \$3.8 million for the Mobile Urban Area that they are taking back for Fiscal Year 2010. Turn to your first item in your folder. The spreadsheet, FY 2010, that \$4.8 million included the 20% match of the \$3.8 million federal that they are taking away from us in 2010. If you look in the 2010 column under annual allocation, you'll see it has been reduced from \$7.795 million from the previous year to \$2.9 million for Fiscal Year 2010. That carries over and leaves us with a negative balance in 2011 of \$5.2 million. That's a huge deficit for the Mobile Urban Area. To give you the magnitude of the deficit, if we took project 8 through 14 and deleted them, that's still not enough money. We would still have a negative balance. One of the things we need to do today is figure out how to get a positive balance for all of these years. Some of you that have been doing this a long time remember we had a 4 year positive balance and then we had a wish list in the 5<sup>th</sup> year. They won't let us do that now. We have to have a positive balance; we have to have it scheduled out.

Ms. Forbus asked, Kevin, is there any possibility that we will have an allocation of stimulus funds to make up this difference?

Mr. Harrison said I don't see that. The stimulus money doesn't affect this. This money is called the attributable funding schedule. That's the MPO's money. The Mobile MPO gets about \$6.7 million of federal a year which translates with the local match of about \$7.8 million. We get to decide how to spend that. It's always been on additional capacity projects. It's our responsibility to keep a positive balance in this funding schedule. We have a couple of scenarios we can try to do to get rid of that \$5.27 million deficit in 2011. I really need input from ya'll. My first option is to delete projects 8 through 14. If you remember back in April we had some extra money. We had carryover. We found \$2 million and we added all these projects. These are all relatively new projects in 8 through 14. I hate to do that, but that's still not enough. We will still have a negative balance. We have to move project 6 back one year. That would give us a positive balance. If we deleted projects 8 through 14 and moved Zeigler Boulevard, Cody to Schillinger, every phase of the project back a year, that's option one. Option two, if we moved the construction for Zeigler, Forrest Hill to Cody which is a big ticket item, its \$10 and half million. If we moved that back a year and moved projects 8 and 9 back two years that would give us close to a positive balance. Option 3 we move projects 6, that's Zeigler, Forrest Hill to Cody, through 14, move everything back a year except projects 8 and 9, that's McDonald and Dauphin Street, move those back two years and the PE for McGregor back a year, that would give us a positive balance. I need input from ya'll.

Mr. Murphy said, Kevin if I could just ask a couple of questions first. We are trying to balance through 2014. Is that correct? Is that the 5 years that you are talking about.

Mr. Harrison said we were told to try to balance it out as far as we could.

Mr. Murphy said we are obligated to balance it 5 years. Is that correct?

Mr. Harrison said we are federally required to go 4 years and that's through 2011. We don't have to list projects out there, but we were told that if we put a phase of the project in, like PE, that we had to list it all the way out.

Mr. Murphy said I guess is this again another temporary effort that we are trying to do whenever the Highway Trust Fund passes that we'll come back and reshuffle all of this.

Mr. Harrison said I don't doubt it. As a matter of fact the 7.8 that we get comes from the Highway Trust Fund. I imagine when the next transportation funding bill comes out, that's probably going to go down. We will have to come back and revisit this. We have to come back and adopt it every year anyway.

Mr. Murphy said the last time we did a temporary shuffle, and I'm speaking for the county, we kind of allowed our Schillinger Road project, a big one, \$13 million to be shuffled back to 2014 and that project itself is the closest to moving forward. We are having our priority hearing next week. We want to move that back up some. When we get to the nuts and bolts of things the two Schillinger Road projects and the two Zeigler Boulevard projects are the projects that have been on this list forever and a day that are finally getting close to doing it, we need to work toward keeping those 4 projects in the proper order here.

Mr. Powell said I was going to say the Zeigler project and the Schillinger, 98 to Lott those are both... I think that we are hoping that we are going to have all of that done by early to mid next year.

Mr. Murphy said one other thing and we don't know how to show it yet, but the county has a commitment for \$8 million of public federal dollars other than the MPO dollars towards these two Schillinger Road projects. It's never been reflected and the way we did some other projects, Airport Boulevard and Old Shell Road, we actually showed it twice. Kevin asked me what funding category to put it in and I don't know what funding category to put that in. Even though we are showing \$13 million and \$8 million coming out of this pot, it really is \$9 million and \$4million.

Mr. Powell said yes, that's correct.

Mr. Murphy said it's hurting the adjustment here because it is not reflected. As you know, we have a written agreement for that commitment, but not a specific pot of money to give Kevin that that is coming from, but we have a written agreement signed by the governor.....so I guess I'm throwing it out, we want to make sure, if we need to reflect that to be able to get those two projects, we would like to have them in 2012 and 2013. That's what we are headed for and it looks like .....if this is going to phase the plan for awhile, I want to reflect that.

Mr. Harrison said until the Schillinger Road \$4 million a piece projects are in the system under a funding category with a number, we are still going to show a negative balance. Does that make sense? Didn't you just say that Zeigler Boulevard, we might be able to move that back a year?

Mr. Powell said I think so.

Mr. Bell said is that Zeigler, Forrest Hill.

Mr. Powell said yes, Forrest Hill to Athey.

Mr. Bell said well I would not like to see the project moved politically. The county commissioner and the councilmember from that particular district each have commented about how long it's been on the schedule and how long we've been working on this project so if that project is moved, we need some very credible information as to why it is being moved again so I can provide an appropriate answer. From the city's standpoint, I wouldn't like to see the schedule on that particular one adjusted again.

Mr. Harrison said is that going to be ready for construction by next fiscal year.

Mr. Powell said the only thing that is going to hold it up is the right of way. There's going to be a lot of right of way to acquire on that project and we are going to have to get a right of way from the railroad which is an animal in and of itself. We sent the document to FHWA twice. We've gotten comments back twice. We're working on our third batch of comments and hoping to get it sent back up in the next month or two. Right now, like I said this right of way project is set right now, I think for April. If we meet that, then it's a year and a half to acquire right of way, we are into 2012 anyway.

Mr. Amberger said do you know where the construction is actually scheduled? Is it the beginning of the fiscal year or is it the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. Powell said I'm not sure.

Mr. Amberger said one month can be a difference between a year.

Mr. Powell said if it is October 2011, it's still in 11. I mean if it's September it's still 11.

Mr. Amberger said and if you've moved it a month, it looks like you moved it a year.

Mr. Powell said that's correct. For balancing wise, it's a year, but in essence it's a month.

Mr. Amberger said is there anyway that you can find that out.

Mr. Powell said I can check on that.

Mr. Harrison said a \$5 million rescission is pretty good justification, I think, for moving projects back. If we have to move one project back. I mean option 3, we can move that project back one year and then projects 8 and 9, move those back two years and we might be close to a balanced schedule. Now when the \$4 million a piece for the Schillinger Road projects gets into the system and in the document, that will change things and we can come back and revisit that.

Mr. Murphy said how do we get it in the system. I mean we have a written agreement with the governor and the highway director.

Mr. Harrison said it needs a project id number. It needs to have a funding category to it – Other Federal Funds.

Mr. Piper asked is that 100% money or is it going to have a match tied to it?

Mr. Murphy said its \$4 million additional funds available for these two projects.

Someone asked can we use our STMPB number for the projects already.

Mr. Powell said no because that is what these projects are. If it's a separate funding category, you have to have two project numbers tied to it. Scan and email me that agreement. I probably have a copy, but can probably get it from ya'll quicker and I'll see if I can't have some discussions maybe with Ronnie Baldwin. If they need a project put in the system I can do it.

Mr. Harrison said I would need a project number because until that it's almost good faith.

Mr. Harrison said we are going to have to have a MPO meeting in December so we have a little bit of time. If that project gets in there, I mean, we can always come back and revisit this for \$ 4 million a piece. Are in agreement to try to at least move Zeigler back a year?

Mr. Murphy said can you state your first option again.

Mr. Harrison said the first option is to delete projects 8 through 14 and move Zeigler, Cody to Schillinger back one year. That leaves everything the same. That leaves Zeigler, Forrest Hill to Cody in 2011 that leaves Schillinger in.

Mr. Bell said does that achieve the goal or does it still show negative.

Mr. Harrison said that achieves the goal.

Mr. Bell said let's do that one then.

Mr. Harrison said basically these are new projects that we introduced in April because we found a couple million dollars.

Ms. Jackson said, Kevin, I do have a question. As far as the projects that are being deleted, will they ever be afforded the opportunity to come back on the list?

Mr. Harrison said yes, but it will require again the approval of the MPO. We are going to need the approval of the MPO to delete these projects so we will need the approval of the MPO for them to come back.

Mr. Amberger said 8 through 14 doesn't have any, they haven't really even been started for all practical purposes.

Mr. Murphy said 8 has an agreement.

Mr. Piper said we don't have to delete them. We can move them out. Can't we move them out to 2016 where we have a positive balance?

Mr. Harrison said what's the point.

Ms. Jackson said well they won't be totally out of the picture.

Mr. Powell said they still have a project id number.

Mr. Harrison said right now there within, if we start a project in 2011, I need MPO approval to go past that.

Mr. Murphy said we would be okay with that, if we can get you that agreement, then we want to bring that Schillinger Road project back in. If we can delete \$8 million by getting that project agreement done, we want to make sure that part of that agreement be that \$13 million slides back up to 2012.

Mr. Harrison said, John, that outside the years and can be an administrative change without the MPO. Anything that crosses that line from 2011 to 2012 requires MPO approval. So if we come back and Schillinger is now \$8 million to \$4 million and \$13 million to \$9 million, we can move that project up and still have a positive balance, it's an administrative change and we don't have to meet for that.

Mr. Harrison said, Tom, go ahead and delete the figures for projects 8 through 14.

Mr. Piper said so we are deleting them, not moving them?

Mr. Harrison said right.

Mr. Piper asked well now, like the PE for 8, do we want to leave that in there?

Mr. Powell said that one is authorizing and they are working on it. They have gone so far as having done the LET process.

Mr. Harrison said for McDonald.

Mr. Powell said yes.

Mr. Piper said so move the right of way, utilities and construction, move them way out, but leave the PE where it is?

MR. Harrison said you have to. You can't delete that project and then everything else deletes and then you have to move 6 back a year.

Mr. Powell said let me ask you this, you are deleting these, that's going to have MPO approval right.

MR. Harrison said yes. If you move it to 2012, you have to have approval.

Mr. Powell said so then what's the difference in moving them out like Tom said to 16, 17, 18, whatever. At least then, they are still in the system and they don't end up with a deleted indicator and we have an option at some point later.

Mr. Amberger said they can always be moved up.

Mr. Powell said we don't have to get it re-established.

Mr. Harrison we are not going to figure what year all of these projects can go in.

Mr. Amberger said like Don is saying move it all out to 2016.

Mr. Piper said they are going to be moved out.

Mr. Murphy said we are going to move them out of the current 5 years.

Mr. Powell said except for that one.

Mr. Harrison said then you have to move the right of way and utilities for Zeigler, number 6, move that back a year.

(Projects were moved around on the spreadsheet)

Mr. Harrison said are we in agreement?

Mr. Miller said is everyone in agreement? Do we have a motion?

Mr. Bell made a motion to accept with a second by Ms. Jackson.

Mr. Miller asked if there were additional questions.

Ms. Jackson said so we are just moving it from the 5 year plan.

Mr. Harrison said these projects, especially Three Notch projects and the McGregor, Dauphin Street Projects are probably going to get moved back as far as 2020.

Ms. Jackson with the exception of 6 just being moved back one year within the same 5 years.

Mr. Harrison said right. When the \$8 million for the Schillinger Road gets into the system and finalized, we can make an administrative change and might be able to move some of those projects up as long as they don't get pushed up to 2011, that can be an administrative change.

Mr. Alfred said so they can be incorporated back into the plan. If you take them all out right now, how will they be incorporated back in for justification?

Mr. Harrison said they are still going to be in the system, but they are going to be in 2020.

Mr. Piper said I think we can go to 2016 because on the spreadsheet now, we show a positive balance of \$3 million in 2016. With the projects where they are.

Mr. Murphy said the only problem is we have already put a RFP out for Three Notch Road. As early as next week, we are going to make a recommendation.

Mr. Powell said is that Schillinger and McDonald.

Mr. Murphy said yes. It takes so long to get an agreement signed and done. I didn't know whether we need to stop that process.

Mr. Harrison said we don't even have \$250,000 left.

Someone said we are going to have to move something else out.

Mr. Murphy said but again, if we can get that \$8 million straightened out, I'm hoping that we can make that administrative adjustment and bring that back in to at least, well we can't do 2011..

Mr. Piper said that would have to be the MPO.

Mr. Miller said I have a motion and a second.

Motion passed.

Mr. Miller said the next item is number 3. The Highway Element of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Harrison said I am the bearer of more bad news. This is even worse. This next item is a two page summary. I want to go over the first page with you. This is from the current long range plan. This is how we develop the future funding scenarios for the future years in the long range plan. Allocated federal funding amount, see 2003, that 5.8, it's now 6.7. The other statewide federal funding other than urban is still about \$600 million a year. The state gets about \$600 million a year non urban funding. Census data, we are still about 9% of the state. Estimated other federal funds it's still about 54 million so I haven't tweaked these, but a total estimated 25 year total is about \$1.8 billion. That's how much we had in the last long range plan. What that means is all of our road projects combined, we've got a budget of about \$1.8 billion to spend, both capital and maintenance and operating of the highway projects. Two things have happened.

One, the cost of the projects has gone up which has hurt us. Number two is the second page that ya'll have. This is the new methodology that ALDOT Montgomery has developed for the MPO's future funding scenarios. It has hurt us horribly. What they've done instead of using the methodology that we are a per capita of the federal funds of the state, what they decided to do is that for each pot of money, they take the last 6 year average of how has been spent.. So look at National Highway System for example. In the past 6 years there has been an average of about \$9 million a year spent. 60 % of that was capital, 40% of that was operating. So average capital for NHS was \$5.5 million, they multiply that by 25, \$138 million for capital projects over the next 25 years. If we had used the normal methodology, we would have about \$1.8 billion worth of projects over the next 25 years. Using the current funding scenario we have about \$800 million. That's not even enough to build a bridge. The problem is, that's capital, we have \$500 million for capital projects over the next 25 years. We can't hardly do anything. That's not enough to really plan for any future projects. The new I10 Bridge is going to cost at least \$600 million. The problem with this is right after the August MPO meeting, ALDOT Montgomery requested that we include about \$2 ½ million for preliminary engineering for the I10 Mobile River Bridge. You can't spend federal dollars on preliminary engineering unless the project is included in the long range plan so now we don't have money to put the bridge in the long range plan which means we can't spend federal dollars on preliminary engineering on the I10 Mobile River Bridge unless we get a commitment from the state and I doubt we are going to get that. That's kind of a blow to our long range plan.

Mr. Murphy asked who made that decision.

Mr. Harrison said I think that the feds and I asked them to be here today and they declined the invitation. I think they just got so upset with Montgomery about the STP being so out of balance for so long. You know we couldn't authorize any projects because the STP was out of balance. I think that they think part of the problem was that we had too many projects approved and they probably thought that our methodology was wrong.

Mr. Murphy so what's going to happen is because we haven't been getting our share of the money, this just continues that process.

Mr. Harrison said that's right. If we got the short end of the stick over the past 6 years, we are going to get the short end of the stick over the next 25 years.

Mr. Murphy said that Memphis to Atlanta Highway, all that money has been going to that and now because of that they are going to get more money in that area.

Mr. Harrison said that's right. I tested that theory and actually added every MPO up in that state and that's actually not necessarily the case. We actually look pretty good for the past 6 years. The whole state didn't add up. The whole methodology is wrong. I have asked them what are we going to do. They have basically killed the bridge until the State of Alabama uses state dollars to fund the preliminary engineering on the bridge which I don't see that happening.

Mr. Murphy said well what's the answer then.

Mr. Harrison said they don't have an answer, we're sorry. That's actually pretty bad news. I don't if everyone understands this.

Mr. Murphy said how do we fix this. Who do we call?

Mr. Harrison said Mr. McInnis.

Mr. Piper said to do the bridge is going to take a congressional appropriation anyway and if we got that, then that money would be in the system and then we could amend the long range transportation plan, but until that happens, I don't know what's going to happen with the PE.

Mr. Murphy said so when we fill out the forms that Washington asks for when we start asking for those appropriations, the first question on the list is in this in your STP. Is it in your STIP and if it's not in your STIP, then you are most likely not going to get that. So it's just a circle.

Mr. Harrison said what I've decided to do and let me just run through this real quick. This first map on page 1 is if we don't build another road between now and the year 2035, this is what our street network is going to look like. Can everyone kind of guess where these streets are? I didn't label the streets. Red is capacity deficiency. If you take a ruler, one inch equals 100,000 vehicles. If you come down here to McDonald Road and I-10, that's .57 of an inch, that red on I-10. That's 57,000 cars over capacity on I-10 right there. This is if we don't build another road between now 2035. The next page is priority one projects for the long range plan. These are projects that are currently in the TIP or have had some funding spent on the project. The construction is in the 5 year schedule with the exception of Schillinger, Cottage Hill to Three Notch, federal funds are not going to be used on that, but it's a major project that has to be included in the local range plan. Local dollars are going to be used for that. That is why it is in a different color. These are the eight projects that are priority one. These are totaling with right of way and construction \$50,793,965.

Mr. Murphy said the local project that you are showing Schillinger, Cottage Hill to Three Notch, it goes all the way to Old Pascagoula.

Mr. Harrison said it goes all the way to Old Pascagoula.

Mr. Murphy said yes.

Mr. Harrison said okay. Apply to those projects to the travel demand forecast model and the capacity issue gets a little better, not a whole lot. If you flip back and forth, you can obviously see Schillinger Road getting a little better. Priority Two, these projects have some phase already into the system. As a matter of fact if you turn to the very last page of this document, you will see that they have already been given, CPMS numbers. Each project it shows you the current laneage, the future laneage and the estimated cost. These are priority two projects. The bigger ones, the ones that are in bold are priority two, the smaller ones are the priority one projects. These projects total \$256,000,000 for priority two. Apply those projects to the travel demand forecast model; we still have major capacity issues on I-10, I-65 and the Bayway. Priority three projects is basically the arterial. An arterial outer loop. Now every long range plan that we've

had since 1968 has had the I-10, Mobile River Bridge and some form of Outer Loop around Mobile. We cannot afford to do that this time, but what we can afford to do and as a request to the County is to have Snow Road widened and to have some form or arterial loop outside of Mobile. That's the only project that's not in the current CPMS. Those projects combined have a total cost of \$500,000,000 and that's all we have based on this budget. Its slim pickings. As far as doing transportation planning and travel demand forecast model when you have no money, it's hard to figure out future projects. What we have decided to do and if you take the Snow Road arterial outer loop and apply it, you can see some drastic changes on Airport and Schillinger out in West Mobile. What we decided to do is have visionary projects. This is what some of the other MPOs are doing. It's basically a wish list. Page 8, Visionary Project A is the I-10 Mobile River Bridge. The estimated cost is \$600 million. That does not include the Bayway. This goes strictly to the Mobile County line. This is just the bridge, \$600 million. I don't know if that's a good estimate or not, but this is visionary. Apply that and you can drastically see on page 9 the big red swath is about .65 inches which is 65,000 over capacity is gone because of the bridge. The day the bridge opens there will be about 75,000 cars on it. These visionary projects are all Priority 3 projects with just the initial project added to it. So "B" is visionary project I-10 widening. I-10 is a huge problem. As a matter of fact, the state, ALDOT Montgomery, has projected 3 1/2% per year increases on I-10 which means the state line in the year 2035 about 120,000 cars. I've estimated that to be about \$100 million and we still have if you turn to page 11, the capacity deficiency plot, just west of 65 and I-10, we're still seeing about 30,000 cars over capacity and that's with a 10 lane interstate right there. Visionary C Project is US 45 widening. All of these deficiency plots, 45, show major deficiency so from 45, Lott Road all the way to the boundary, I've estimated to be about \$48 million and you can see that still's not enough. At 158 and Spice Pond Road, there's still some capacity issues there. Visionary D is about \$50 million, that's 65, 165 and 43. That may not be enough, but again the next page you can see the capacity issues there. The last page, or page 16 rather, all of the visionary projects plus the priority projects that comes to be about \$1.3 billion and if we had developed the revenues the way that we have always done it, then this would be our long range plan and we would be able to use federal dollars for the preliminary engineering for any of these projects including the bridge. Page 17 shows the capacity plot and you can flip back between page 1 and page 17 and look at the network. As far as vehicle miles traveled and network statistics, the priority and visionary projects network looks the best. We have to have a transportation long range plan adopted by February 2010 so we need to produce a recommended list of projects to the MPO or really for the public to look at. We need to do further environmental justice analysis on a recommended set of projects so I'd really like to have some form of discussion with ya'll. How does this look or is there any projects that we need to include on here? Years ago we even looked at a freeway down Airport Boulevard and some crazy stuff, but we just don't have the money to do that now.

Mr. Murphy said Kevin one project that we want to throw on the table today I see is not in either priority one or priority two and that's the increase traffic on Zeigler that's happening out towards Schillinger Road now with Faith Academy. The growth of Faith Academy has had in the last year or two, Zeigler from Schillinger on out to Snow, if you have the occasion to drive that way in the morning, it's backed up tremendously. We need to be looking at the extension of the multi-lane facility on out beyond Schillinger out to Snow Road. I don't see that in any of the

three priorities, but I don't know how we work that in or if we can work it in. That would be the one that we would like.

Mr. Harrison said I'm not sure how we would that in. I mean on page 6, that's \$503 million for capital when we've been told we get \$497. I'm banking on that number to go up because we've got two extra years. \$503 million is really all that we are going to have to spend. We can take some of the other projects and apply it somewhere else, but that would be ya'lls decision and I hate to do that. If you look at page 18, all of these projects, this is what is in the CPMS. So that's our long range plan. Our short range plan has now become our long range plan.

Mr. Hoffman said one of the issues that the MPO really can't adjust or address and it wouldn't be politically feasible is if all the cities and the county had effective land use control. Then you could work to redistribute jobs, population growth, things like that to where you have the capacity now and that might help reduce over capacity issues in the future, but there isn't a political will I don't think locally to do that type of thing.

Mr. Harrison said no and how would you model something like that?

Mr. Hoffman said that's a good question. I don't know.

Mr. Harrison said the current long range plan that we have has the Outer Loop, a freeway, and the bridge on there. Both of those projects were estimated to be about \$250 million a piece and now the bridge has gone up to \$600 million. I can't even guess as to how much a freeway type facility, Outer Loop, would be. Probably about the same. Now, we've got the West Alabama Freeway under Lieutenant Governor Jim Folsom, whatever he plans to do with that. And that's a public-private partnership. Unless it's a visionary project.

Mr. Murphy said would that be the only hope for that corridor.

Mr. Harrison said that would be the only hope for that and Snow Road and Airport Boulevard on opening day the model shows about 25,000 cars on this new 5 lane section of Snow Road. To have a parallel interstate facility, that's a competition for traffic to justify that Outer Loop. I can tell you that 65 from I-10 to pretty much 165 is going to be in 25 years a parking lot. There's got to be some type of relief especially when Choctaw Point is in full swing and 800,000 TEU's going out a year and most of them are going out by truck and they are going north, straight up 65.

Mr. Murphy said you are not asking us to approve this list today. We can have a little time and meet again before you do this?

Mr. Harrison said I would like to review it to the MPO at the MPO meeting in December. Once we have a recommended set of projects then I have to do some additional analysis on it. We can go ahead and start, but it's basically environmental justice analysis for a recommended plan. Then the public has to review it. We have to have a public hearing on it. So, no, I'm not asking you today to present this as the recommended projects. Take it home and think about it, but I do want to present it and it will probably go out toe the public for the MPO meeting.

Mr. Murphy said we would like to look at it and there's some projects that we might want to swap or move back so we could bring something else up further.

Mr. Harrison said some of the projects that fell out, Florida Street was a project that has actually been in the CPMS for years. I don't if the city still wants that project, the Florida Street extension.

Mr. Bell said it's not something we talked about. We would rather have Government widened from the Loop to Pine Hill. That's not on here, but Florida Street is just not something that has been on our agenda.

Mr. Harrison said I don't need a motion today, but I do want ya'll to do your homework and go home and look at this before the MPO meeting because this will go out to the public for public review before the MPO meeting.

Mr. Miller said is there any questions on that. The next item on the agenda is old business. Kevin do you have any good news.

Mr. Harrison said I put on here review the status of MPO ARRA projects. If you recall at the MPO meeting in August, the city had two Springhill projects that we had to take \$46,000 from one project and add it to another project. Now the same type of situation has come up with the county. I don't think I need MPO approval to do that. I think it can be an administrative change. The way it was explained to me is that if it is 10% or more of the project then it requires MPO approval. I think with the little bit of under on Irvington Bayou La Batre Highway applied to McCrary will be less than 10% or will it be?

Mr. Powell said my estimate right now on Irvington Bayou La Batre you are at like \$87,000 under.

Mr. Harrison said that is a new estimate from the estimate that we talked about.

Mr. Powell said yeah our estimate that we've got running is just over 1.5.

Mr. Harrison said if it's over 10% I need to get approval from the MPO, but when I asked the feds about it, they said just do it that would be an administrative change. I'm kind of getting two different answers.

Mr. Powell said well like you and I talked yesterday, can't we just put something in front of the MPO that is real general that basically says Mobile County has the right to move funds from any of their three ARRA projects to any of the others.

Mr. Harrison said I would like to think that.

Mr. Powell said I can't see why they wouldn't approve it. I mean it's Mobile County's money and then if we have to move it at some point down the road then we don't have to have an emergency MPO meeting to get it done. Jim Doolin's taken care of, we've got an agreement.

Mr. Murphy said the problem is if the one that is going to come in under was the first project then we could go back to the MPO and get it moved, but the one's that coming in under is the last project that the state has set for construction and then we've had already had to award the other one an over amount.

Mr. Amberger said until they are let, you don't know what the numbers going to be and that money needs to be interchangeable amongst your projects.

MR. Murphy said I talked to Mark Bartlett in Montgomery on Monday and he said they are going to try to be real flexible because they want to get it spent, you know, FHWA, wants to get it spent here as much as we want to get it spent.

Mr. Amberger said one thing the city would hope with like our resurfacing jobs that are already let and completed and we fill like they have come in under the total allotment for the two, if there's a balance left on those once ALDOT's done all their back checks, we would like that amount to be applied to our Michigan Avenue Bridge project which we feel like is going to be over. I think that is what the county is saying, if you three projects that have different projects, let us just apply them to our jobs however the chips end up, they just end up.

Mr. Murphy said and fortunately we are getting some pretty good bids right now and it's the only reason we are talking about it quite frankly.

Mr. Harrison said yes, that's something that we can present.

Mr. Murphy said just have them adopt a resolution that as long as the agency or whatever it is has the authority to shuffle the money in projects that's under their jurisdiction.

Mr. Harrison said I've been told two different things that Springhill Avenue which is the same project, there are two phases, it's \$46,000. One was a \$300,000 project and the other was \$140,000 so one was over \$46,000 and took that money and applied it to the other project. I was told that it needed MPO approval to do that. Now, the Federal Highway Administration said just do it so I would like to think that we could do a blanket statement like that.

Mr. Powell said I don't want to say anything that's..., but Montgomery with these stimulus projects, they are back and forth. I get different answers every week as to what we have to do, how we do it, whatever. I'm just saying I can't see why the MPO wouldn't approve it and if there's a chance that someone in Montgomery is going to say well we need MPO approval, why not go ahead do it.

Mr. Murphy said we have some approval that allows us to do that.

Ms. Jackson said Kevin, with this approval, since the Federal supersedes the state as far as with the guidelines, can we get something from the Federal to back that up.

Mr. Harrison said I would think so and I asked them to be here today to go over this very subject.

Ms. Jackson said just in general in dealing with grant funds, the federal supersedes the state so if you get that, then the MPO votes on it, it will all be in compliance.

Mr. Harrison said they should be at the MPO meeting.

Mr. Murphy said Mr. Bartlett also seemed to imply that they were going to, every MPO is having the same problem as we are having, ultimately, all the money that came to this MPO when we get through will all of our projects, we will have some money left over and not have a project that has already been specified. He was sort of encouraging to go ahead and maybe have some additional projects identified so that if there was any money left over that it could roll to. Not knowing how much that is going to be, how do you do that?

Mr. Powell said right now, I went in and I listed everything and based on our current estimates and what's been let, we are still short \$375,000 because of where the bridge is. Now the bridge has two different alternates depending on bid prices that we are going to look at, but I took the lesser of the two evils with the asphalt, not the concrete and we are still like \$375,000 short so if it all works out and we do two things. We let Mobile County move around whatever they need to and then I was going to say what you and I talked about and do the same thing for Michigan Avenue. Once each specific municipal project is done, if they have extra funds, then that money just kicks to Michigan Avenue as well. You get your project built how you want it built and you have \$500 or \$500,000 have the MPO do another resolution that says all the extra money goes to Michigan Avenue.

Mr. Murphy said when we do all three of them, we still think we are going to have a little money left over and we have no problem with that money being contributed to help the city get the Michigan Avenue Bridge done. If that would help us have that resolution passed, I'm all for that.

Mr. Harrison said we might want to vote on that because the Saraland project might be slightly under, Prichard might go slightly over, we might want to take a vote on that before we present that to the MPO in my opinion.

Mr. Powell said well isn't that two different things. If it goes over, it is that municipality's responsibility to cover it.

Mr. Harrison said right, that's what we are saying. All the underrages from the municipalities should go to the Michigan Avenue Bridge.

Mr. Powell said as I think we discussed that the City of Mobile did not get their proportionate share.

Mr. Harrison said I don't disagree with you.

Mr. Powell said and that's what I'm saying. I think that yes, some of these may go over and we are having discussions in the division with our construction folks and some of these jobs that we are doing the CE&I, and I think in the pre time we are going to tell the contractor we are going to go at this in a process. If it's mainly resurfacing, we are going to resurface everything and see where we are money wise. Then if we have some drainage work to do, then we'll do some drainage work. We are going to try and get right at the dollar amount we have to spend and try not to go over. We know a lot of these municipalities don't have money to fund entire projects or fund all the overruns.

Mr. Harrison said how over is the Michigan Avenue Bridge.

Mr. Amberger said it's the subject of what the bids come in, but it could be \$600,000 over. \$4 million is the estimate.

Mr. Powell said right now, they are getting \$3,300,000. Right now, we've got \$3,900,000 on the one alternate and \$4.2 on the other so we are at like 600 and like 950.

Mr. Harrison said I would like a vote from the TCC that we don't introduce any new projects and all underrages be applied to Michigan Avenue Bridge.

Motion was made.

Mr. Bell seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, motion passed.

Mr. Miller said and this will be on the MPO agenda for discussion.

Mr. Harrison said well no what we just did is that we agreed as a TCC to not introduce any other projects to be funded with stimulus dollars. Any underrages from the municipalities will be applied to the Michigan Avenue Bridge because we know that's going to be over.

Mr. Amberger said, Kevin, I think we need to have a discussion about moving that money around for the county. They need to be able to do that, not having to take that back to the MPO every time for them to vote on it. That was a pot of money that was allocated for them, just like with our two projects, we had a situation where we took our best estimate and one came over and came under so had we not been able to swap that money over and I think everybody was on board with it, we would have had to write a check to cover this one job and this other money would have just gone back into the pot. I think just administratively you need to be able to change that around.

Mr. Harrison said I've had that discussion with Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Miller said is the MPO authorization required or are you saying the TCC are going to be sufficient.

Mr. Harrison said I think Tywanda nailed it on the head. The fed said that we can do it, but the state said that anything over 10% requires the MPO. What I'm going to do is get the feds to say that yes, you've got the administrative authority to change that around even after the project is let.

Mr. Murphy said but I think what Nick is saying is let's go ahead and get something in front of the MPO giving you that authority.

Mr. Amberger said that way the county lets its first job and say its \$100,000 short, they can pick up the phone and talk to Don or Kevin. We need to move \$100,000 from this job over there, it's fully funded. They let there second one and do the same thing. If that's way under, you may have a problem there, but you have a couple of them let and you have somewhere to gage where you actually are.

Mr. Harrison said let me ask Don real quick. How many projects are already authorized with the stimulus?

Mr. Powell said how many are authorized. Well we've got the two Springhill's that are let of course. The Saraland striping is authorized and I just receive notice that McCrary and Howell's Ferry are both authorized.

Mr. Amberger said one thing for everybody to be aware of; you don't exactly how much those jobs cost until way after they've been completed. Probably six months in a perfect scenario.

Mr. Murphy said just because they've been bid doesn't mean you are not going to run into something.

Mr. Amberger said until they are complete and ALDOT does all their back checking which can be 6 months to a year after the fact, you don't know what that final number is so you don't know how much you might have to transfer back to fund Michigan or whatever else.

Mr. Murphy said if we have approval from the MPO by letter or something when we take the bids on Howells Ferry, it's going to be over the amount, we could use this money to do that and then have whatever's left from Irvington Bayou La Batre when it's bid in January or February.

Mr. Powell said in my honest opinion, your one questionable project which is Howells Ferry is letting in December; I think that's really going to help bids. Everything else we've got is jammed back into February and because these two are early, I think they are going to come in low and I also think that Howells Ferry is going to come in low because it runs right in front of Weaver's property. I really think Jimmy Lofton wants to pave that road. I know I would if I was him.

Mr. Harrison said MARC vans are also authorized. We are in the processing of purchasing the vans now. Reporting requirements on those I guess, how we do the reporting on two vans.

Mr. Powell said I don't know. That's a good question. I guess it's just the purchase of it.

Mr. Harrison said it's not creating any jobs. They are on the state bid list. The vans are sitting up there. Lindsey, how many jobs are these vans going to create?

Ms. Hutchission said two, but they have longevity.

Mr. Powell said I don't know how the reporting is going to have to go.

Mr. Piper said now typically with transit, you report to TEAM, but now with Highway you don't so I don't if these are going to be reported on TEAM or just like we've been reporting with them.

Mr. Powell said I think it's going to be like we've been reporting everything else. It's going to be on your one little form and it's going to be a one time deal. I'll have Edwin send Paul an email and see how we want to handle that.

Mr. Murphy said do we have any projects that are questionable as to if they are going to make the March deadline.

Mr. Powell said no and that's what I wanted to say. Kevin may not have had any good news, but at this point, we have really been pushing the past month or two and those of you in here, you know we've been badgering people almost weekly to get plans in and what not. At this point, we are either at quality control and we can go straight to OE or we are at the construction review on time. Our next deadline for construction is early December. Everything has met the deadline for November so we're pushing forward and I think we are going to make it.

Mr. Amberger said this is the point of the discussion that I have to say if there happens to be another round of stimulus projects, I think everybody's learned some pretty valuable lessons. You've got to make sure they are simple projects to do. The Springhill resurfacing, easy. We were able to get that out and obviously it's done today. Michigan Avenue Bridge, if you have to acquire right of way, deal with utility relocations, if you're going to take on one of those jobs, you've got to be very aggressive in trying to get it done because you need to stick to stuff that's very simple.

Mr. Murphy said they need to change the stimulus name to just resurfacing.

Mr. Miller said is there any other items under new business.

Mr. Harrison said I'll let you know when the MPO meeting is. I'm awaiting ALDOT Montgomery approval to finish compiling our TIP. Now that we've got the attributable section done. The second that happens, it's got to be advertised at 43 different places around the county for a couple of weeks. Then we will have the MPO meeting hopefully soon.

Mr. Amberger said when you get that revised will you send it out to everyone electronically again. That's just easier to find it.

Meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

---

---

Chairman, TCC