

**Mobile Area Transportation Study
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Technical Coordinating/Citizens Advisory Committee (TCC/CAC) Meeting
January 22nd, 2020 10:00 am
SARPC Boardroom**

MPO Members Present

Mayor David Baker
Mr. Bryan Kegley
Councilmember John Williams
Mayor Tom Williams
Councilmember Lorenzo Martin
Mayor Howard Rubenstein
Mr. Matt Ericksen
Councilmember Fred Richardson
Mr. Damon Dash
Commissioner Jerry Carl
Mr. John F. Rhodes
Mayor Sandy Stimpson
Ms. Essie Johnson rep Mayor Jimmy Gardner
Mr. Dennis Sullivan rep. Mayor Byron Pittman
Mayor Terry Downey
Ms. Lian Li rep. Mr. Mark Bartlett
Mr. Rob Middleton

TCC/CAC Members Present

Mr. John Murphy
Mr. Gerald Alfred
Mr. Nick Amberger
Mr. Jim DeLapp
Ms. Kim Sanderson
Ms. Essie Montgomery Johnson
Mr. Dennis Sullivan
Mr. Jeff Zoghby
Mr. Richard Spraggins
Mr. James Jacobs
Mr. Vince Beebe for Edwin Perry
Mr. Ricky Mitchell
Ms. Shilo Miller
Ms. Jennifer White

MPO Members Absent

Mayor William Criswell
Mr. Ed Phillips

TCC/CAC Members Absent

Ms. Mary Beth Bergin
Ms. Margie Wilcox
Ms. Nancy Hewston
Mr. Fernando Billups
Mr. Brian Harold
Ms. Jennifer Denson
Ms. Casi Callaway
Mr. Bob Harris
Mr. Tom Briand
Mr. Donald Watson
Mr. Jason Wilson
Mr. Merrill Thomas
Ms. Mary Beth Bergin
Mr. Ricky Mitchell
Mr. Logan Anderson
Ms. Shayla Beaco
Mr. John Blanton
Dr. Ted Flotte
Ms. Christienne Gibson
Mr. Donald Watson
Mr. Frank Williams
Mr. Jason Franklin

Guests:

Stephen Welford
Stephen Alley
Kevin Spriggs
Cathy Odom
Terri Pringle
Brooks Miller
Mike Dominguez
Cheryl Wilson

Staff:

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

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Stimpson.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2019 MPO Meeting. Motion was made by Mr. Dennis Sullivan with a second by Mayor David Baker. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the minutes of the January 8th, 2020 TCC/CAC meeting. Motion was made by Mr. Jeff Zoghby with a second by Mr. Bryan Kegley with correction to add Mr. Ricky Mitchell as being in attendance. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to consider approval of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) with ATRIPii Funds, Resolution 20-001.

Mr. Harrison said this is the first resolution of fiscal year 2020. The MPO's role, one of our roles, is anytime there is a federal transportation dollar, it has to be approved by this Board. We had an advisory committee meeting, we had a joint Technical Coordinating Citizens Advisory Committee, we met January 8th and reviewed this agenda. A lot of these resolutions are federal transportation funds. This first one is ATRIP. This was actually a competitive award that was awarded throughout the state. The first one was awarded in Bayou la Batre and it is for the engineering, right of way and construction. The engineering is in 2020, the right of way is in 2020 with construction of roundabout at 188 and Bayou la Batre, in 2021. This project has multiple funds. It has county funds, state funds. It has multiple funding sources for it and is a warranted project. The second one is ATIPii Award by the state to the City of Saraland. This is construction in 2021 for the widening from two lanes to four lanes on State Route 158 from mile marker 7.75 to Spartan Drive. The Mayor of Saraland is here if anyone has any questions. I believe that project is under design now.

Motion was made to approve Resolution 20-001 was by Commissioner Carl with a second by Mayor Downey.

Mayor Downey said I would like to say that on that work to be done on 188, we had another accident there yesterday. It's a spot that has seen a lot of accidents.

Motion to approved Resolution 20-001 passed.

The next item on the agenda was to consider approval of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program with Bridge Funds, Resolution 20-002.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder is Resolution 20-002. This is for bridge funds. Bridge funds are spent at the state's discretion. One requirement that MPOs in the State of Alabama has is that any time there is a cost increase of over \$5 million it is required to come back to you. We've seen this resolution and the next, prior. These are existing projects, but they have had cost estimate increases. The bridge over Tensaw River on the Causeway actually had two cost increases. It was from \$24 million to \$30 million. Now it is up to \$35 million. That project has

had a cost increase. ALDOT is here if anybody has any questions as to why that project had a cost increase, but it does require y'all's approval any time there is a cost increase of over \$5 million.

Motion to approve Resolution 20-002 was made by Mr. Rob Middleton with a second by Mr. Bryan Kegley.

Mr. Erickson said this is the replacement of the West bound bridge. This will be on that new alignment so we don't affect the existing traffic on the Causeway. The new bridge is just south. This increase is mainly due to the construction of the new seawall.

Mayor Stimpson said that is westbound and that is going to be to the south?

Mr. Erickson said yes.

Mr. Richardson said this is not pertaining to the project, but there is a bridge out on 163, Dauphin Island Parkway. I believe it went out in Frederick in 1979. What it has caused is for all that traffic to go around and go all the way to Tillman's corner. What it has done, it has choked the businesses on DIP to death because the bridge is out. Is there any reason why that bridge is still out?

Mayor Stimpson said if we can vote on this, then we'll open the floor back up for that discussion.

Motion to approve Resolution 20-002 passed.

Mayor Stimpson said Councilmen Richardson's question has to do with a bridge on 163. Is there anything in our plan?

Mr. Harrison said are you talking about over Industrial Canal? The bridge that has been out forever.

Commissioner Carl said that went out during in Frederick and all that has been developed since then. All the businesses.

Mr. Harrison said and as I understand, there's an old navy port there and there's a height restriction on the bridge if there were to be a bridge there. In that regard, later in the agenda, on our Long Range Plan Visionary Projects, if you recall, there used to be a Rangeline Road widening project that would kind of ease some of that traffic so you don't have to make the zig-zag to Dauphin Island. That project has been there for 20 years, but it is a visionary project. There's nothing in the MPO or any of our plans to put a bridge back over the Industrial Canal at the Homeport.

A citizen said you used to be able to go to Dauphin Island straight down Dauphin Island Parkway and back, 20 minutes. Now, you have to zig-zag all the way around and now it takes me over 40 minutes because of all the zig zags.

Mr. Harrison said I don't think that's a state route. It would be county.

Commissioner Carl said that's a state route.

Mr. Harrison asked over the Industrial Canal?

Mr. Kegley said yes, that's a state route.

Someone said so you are looking at a couple hundred million dollar bridge, bare minimum. I don't know if it is feasible. I don't how we would come up with that.

Councilmember Richardson said there is no such thing as that. If that bridge is east of I-65. If that bridge had been west of I-65 it would be done. What happened is that people living east of I-65, (inaudible) there is 100,000 people east of I-65 and 100,000 west of I-65. The people east of I-65, (inaudible) But those businesses are dying, they shop down that corridor. Now folks have to go way around. We're talking about a major bridge that is \$2 billion dollars.

Commissioner Carl said we are talking about a high rise span bridge so you're talking several 100 million, not a couple million because we have ships that come in and out of that slip. We're talking about another bridge project that we're trying to fund now, it's not the same length, but it would be several \$100 million. You're talking about a Cochrane Bridge.

Mayor Stimpson said we're going to move on with the agenda because we are not going to solve that situation right now.

Councilmember Richardson said let me close by saying, if you don't plant any seeds, you're not going to get any harvest. I'm just putting this in the ground. I'm planting the seed and I'm looking for a harvest.

The next item on the agenda was Resolution 20-003, amending the FY 2020-2023 TIP with National Highway Funds for SR-158 Extension Lott Road Overpass and Jug Handle Construction, increase from \$20,000,000 to \$25,161,677.

Mr. Harrison said this resolution pertains to National Highway Funds. These are funds that are also spent at the state's discretion. Just like the previous resolution, anytime there is a cost estimate increase of over \$5 million, it requires action from y'all. The previous estimate was \$20 million. This is \$5,161,000 increase. This has to do with the 158 Extension to the state line. This is the jug handle, that terminology, we've seen probably 10 different times at this point alone. I appreciate ALDOT, they're shuffling funds around to get this project done. This probably pertains to that.

Motion to approve the resolution was made by Mayor Rubenstein with a second by Mayor Williams.

Mayor Williams asked a question about the timing of when the projects would be done.

Mr. Erickson said the Lott Road Interchange is getting ready to be let in February. This increase, we had to go back and add to Schillinger Road. The turn lanes and bridge got extended a little.

Mayor Rubenstein asked when can we plan to drive 158 directly to Mississippi?

Mr. Erickson said we've got the overpass project at Glenwood Road and we have Wilmer-Georgetown Interchange and then we have the base and pave. We have three projects that we don't have funding for yet that totals about \$40 million. We have those three projects after the Lott Road Interchange before we'll be able to drive it.

Mayor Williams asked there will be an interchange at Lott Road?

Mr. Erickson said yes.

Motion passed.

The next item on the agenda was to approve the TCC/CAC requested modification to the 2020-2023 TIP with STP Attributable Funds.

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder is Resolution 20-004. This is for STP Attributable Funds. Any time something moves in and out of the four year schedule, it requires approval from y'all. I want you to pay attention to the 11 by 17 printout. This is the STP Attributable Funds. Zeigler Boulevard, Project 1, Forest Hill to Athey, has recently had a sizable cost increase. It is now \$20,800,000. That just got pushed back, I think until an April letting. It was February. That projects getting closer and closer. It is long overdue of getting done. Because that project cost increased, we had to shuffle some projects around in order to get a positive balance. At the bottom of FY 2023 column, that is \$4,463. We are at a positive balance. We are required to have a positive schedule. This is like a checkbook of all of our federal projects. If you add up all of our federal projects, we have a \$105 million worth of projects that we're doing with this four year schedule and we've got a \$4,000 balance. I think we're doing pretty good. We're spending every bit of the money we can. Now, is it going to stay \$4,000 in the next four years. It will probably change next month. That's the first part. That pertains to the utilities and construction for Three Notch Road

from Schillinger to McDonald. We discussed at the Technical/Citizens Advisory Committee on January 8th. Those two projects are now moved out to 2024. That requires action from this board to move a project out of the four schedules from 2023 to 2024. Utilities and Construction for project four, are now out of the schedule and we have a positive balance. The next item on this resolution is the projects of the Congestion Management Process from 2020 to 2023. These pertain to the projects further down on the schedule. Later on when we talk about the Long Range Plan, our Congestion Management Process identifies corridors that are congested and how we can figure out how to improve the capacity without buying right of way which is signals, adaptive signal technology, access management, stuff like that. That's kind of the premise of the Congestion Management Process. Government Street corridor which is under design now, requires more funding. Later on when we talk about the Long Range Plan, we are going to allow Congestion Management Projects to have more than one annual allocation. That first project is Government Street downtown. I think everybody realized that Friday during the summer, it's backed up past Broad Street. It's one of our top priority projects. Other projects to be included in the schedule is Airport Boulevard, Hillcrest to Cody in 2021; University, Old Shell Corridor at University of South Alabama, 2022; and Moffett Road Corridor in 2023. Those projects in the Congestion Management and we will talk about later when we go over it, actually came from the Long Range Plan that has the Congestion Management process and how they are determined. All of the corridors in the urban area are screened. They're first screened for volume to capacity which we have the annual average daily traffic counts compared to the capacity of the road. We have travel time. We have NPRMDS data. It's a huge database of travel times from cell phones, from on-board blue tooth devices. We have the free time compared to the peak travel time. Basically, that's a technical term for congested travel time. Then, we flag it for high rates of rear end collisions. We determine that to be a congestion factor as well. With those three combined, we put a score to it and these are the roads that have the highest scores for the congestion management process. Moffett Road is on there as well. We've allocated \$500,000 to Moffat Road in 2023. This is the Congestion Management Process which is part of our Long Range Plan which is later on the agenda. These projects will be added to the Transportation Improvement Program., four year program.

Motion was made by Mr. Middleton with a second by Councilmember Richardson.

Commissioner Carl asked these congestion times that you have here and amounts, is that a certain time of the day? Is that 8 to 5? How is that figured?

Mr. Harrison said for every road, we have five minute increments, the travel, the average travel time for five minute increments. The peak period travel time is actually calculated based on the entire month of travel times for that particular road. It's a huge job to do this, but the peak period travel time is determined for every road and then the free flow period is determined for every road which is typically, midnight, two in the morning travel times. That ratio of free-flow to peak period, if it's over 75%, then it is flagged as a congested travel time, if that makes sense. If 45 miles an hour on Airport Boulevard is free flow, if 75% of that is 33 miles an hour, if a peak period is 33 miles an hour, then it's flagged as a congested corridor. That data that we get is from cell phone data, blue tooth data, it's from hundreds, thousands of data points that we have access to.

Commissioner Carl said these main feeders are West Mobile traffic coming in and out.

Mr. Harrison said that's right and it's surprising Schillinger's Road is not on there.

Someone said because we've had it under construction for four years.

Commissioner Carl said well that's over now.

A citizen said this is a snapshot in a time of day. Obviously, these projects were looking forward, probably years before we get it done, has any studies been done on growth and how that's going to impact by the time we complete these projects, where we're going to have congestion points as we grow?

Mr. Harrison said absolutely and that's what we have next on the agenda. We have a 25 year long range plan that does that exact thing.

The citizen asked are these two tied together?

Mr. Harrison said these projects are part of the long range plan, yes. These particular projects, these are corridors, not to get into the weeds, but the level detail of our travel demand forecast model, the signals, and the adaptive signals and stuff like that are not necessarily in the model, but when we add capacity, it changes the volume to capacity ratio on some of these projects so yes, it is accounted for.

The citizen said one other thing, and I think everyone in here would probably agree, we have the worst traffic light system in Mobile and that is contributing to a lot of what we see. If we could sync that, I think we alleviate a lot of burden in the traffic.

Mr. Harrison said right and those are expensive and that's why this Board several years ago, carved out \$500,000 a year of federal to be matched with 20% local, either city or county, to take care of some of those projects. It's expensive to replace a whole new signal system.

Another citizen asked why do they have to be replaced? Why can't they just sync them?

Mr. Harrison said the technology today has really increased the ability of some of the signals, adaptive signals, radar, stuff like that and some of the old signals can't.

Mayor Stimpson said the signals on Water Street have been synchronized. It's kind of state of the art along with Airport Boulevard from Sage to McGregor. The study is going on from McGregor to past Hillcrest and the next one will be from wherever that ends to out past the airport. It's in the process, but it's expensive to do that.

Motion for Resolution 20-004 was approved.

The next item on the agenda was to approve Resolution 20-005, 2016-2020 Highway Safety Improvement Program Targets (PM1).

Mr. Harrison said the next resolution in your folder is Resolution 20-005. This pertains to our safety performance measures. We have to do this every year. We have adopted the state's performance measures. The State maintains the five year average and these are the targets that the State has to try to obtain. If you recall, actually our last August meeting, we were late in adopting these and we adopted this same resolution in August, but we had different targets. The number of fatalities and this is for the state average from 2016 to 2020, the projected is 964 that actually last year was 932 so we're not doing as good there. In terms of rate of fatality per 100, we went from 1.33 to 1.35. In terms of number of serious injuries, 8,143 as compared to 8,469 so we are doing better in terms of number of serious injuries. Rate of serious injuries per 100, was 12.08 and now it is 11.025. Doing better there and the number of nonmotorized fatalities and serious injuries is now at 384 as compared to 394 last time. These are performance measures that we have to adopt every year. If the State of Alabama does not hit these performance measures, the caveat is that they will have to use all of their safety money on safety projects. Right now, as I understand it, they are flexing about 40% of the safety money to other projects and if they don't meet these performance measures, they will have to use all of the safety money for safety projects. Right now, I think we are meeting all of the performance measures.

Motion was made by Commissioner Carl with a second by Mr. Kegley to adopt Resolution 20-005. Motion was approved.

The next item on the agenda is to approve the updates to the TCC/CAC Bylaws.

Mr. Harrison said as y'all know, we have a subcommittee. A lot of MPO's do things differently. We have a Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee. They met on January 15th. We have a joint Technical/Citizens committee.

A lot of the MPO's, the Eastern Shore example, they'll have the bicycle committee, a citizens committee, and a technical committee before the work session of the MPO committee. Those are a lot of different meetings. What we have always done in Mobile and it seems to work, we have a joint Technical and Citizens committee. It's about a 35 member committee. The bylaws, we've needed to do some cleanup for some time. This was last updated in November of 2013. If you'll turn to page 2 of the bylaw updates. Every time the City of Mobile has had a change of the organizational structure, we've had to go back and change the bylaws. It is my recommendation and we talked about it at the subcommittee meeting that we just make it more generic and have five City of Mobile employees appointed by the mayor; likewise, with Mobile County appointed by the County Engineer; likewise, with the City of Prichard, Economic Development/Community Development, I don't know that those positions are there. What we will just have is two City of Prichard employees appointed by the mayor. We need to update it to Southwest Region. The freight provider and the private transit provider, we're moving those to at-large. Under section 3.4 in the bylaws, at-large positions are appointed by the Executive Director. We had nobody to appoint a general transit provider or general freight provider before. Moving those under at-large, that gives the appointment of that position to the committee to the SARPC Executive Director. Likewise with the Citizens Advisory Committee, we've had some changes. The Chamber of Commerce is kind of redundant to have two spots and they were in attendance at our subcommittee meeting and they agreed that having two spots on the Citizens Committee is redundant. We are replacing that one Chamber or Commerce position with a Representative of the Alabama State Legislature which I think it's about time this committee have a State Legislature Representative on that committee. We had the existing position before at-large. The Representative of the Alabama State Legislature is at-large under 3.4 to be appointed by the SARPC Executive Director. One final note is we are taking out voted on by the MPO. Every time there is a change to this subcommittee, it is required to come back to the MPO and vote. It is my fault, we haven't actually been doing that because it happens so often. When Matthew Lambert left Saraland, Logan Anderson took his place and every time there is a change in the County, that actually had to come back to y'all and it required a vote. If those positions are being appointed by a MPO member, it is in my opinion kind of redundant to have the MPO vote on that position. In that regard to be voted on by the MPO is being stricken from the TCC/CAC bylaws. Those of you on the subcommittee, we met January 8th and recommended these changes for approval.

Motion was made by Mayor Rubenstein with a second by Commissioner Carl to recommend the approval of updates to the TCC/CAC bylaws.

Councilmember Williams said it all makes sense, but when there is people involved who should know, but I think when we take something away from a vote, I think we take away some of the visibility to the general public, to this membership. It's simply administrative, but I believe it is beneficial when we know the changes that are going on as a body. It's just part of the process. I would offer an amendment to eliminate the change which took out voted on by the MPO on paragraph 3-4 and 3-6.

Mayor Stimpson said there's a motion. Do we have a second to that motion.

Motion to amend by Councilmember Williams was seconded by Councilmember Martin.

Mayor Rubenstein said I respectfully disagree. If the City of Saraland wants to appoint somebody to this board, I don't think anyone outside the City of Saraland should be deciding if our appointee is worthy of being on this board. That's why we have a representative form here. I would be very upset if this board was to tell me that my Saraland resident who the City of Saraland has appointed to this board for whatever reason is not worthy or not able or not qualified to serve on this board. I strongly request that we vote no on the amendment.

Councilmember Martin said we do it with our money. We do it with projects. We're sitting over here voting for projects that are not in the City of Prichard. What's the difference in that? I think as American citizens we should all have knowledge in what's going on in each city. I'm interested in who is sitting at the table because how can we then ignore some of the things that are being neglected. I can't understand that so at least I'll know that these are the people

that are coming onto the board because apparently the people who are currently on the board, is not considering the whole region in my opinion.

Councilmember Williams said no matter what the issue is before this board, the whole board does vote and it's just simply, Saraland had two appointments. If we just want to keep everybody's name off of this and as long as we have the right number of people show up, that's fine, then I could see the argument. This is about transparency. As Kevin pointed out, it's changed over and over again without knowledge which was against the bylaws. I just don't see the real need in taking out voting.

Mayor Rubenstein said again, I respectfully disagree. We are being transparent by notifying the membership and as a point of information letting everybody know who the members are and who appointed them. I still think if this is going to be a global organization made up of all of our respective communities, not just the City of Mobile who right now has the lion share of representation on this board that our Saraland appointee should be a Saraland appointee and should not be subject to being screened by this board to their worthiness of serving.

Mr. Kegley said each of these members has proxies and to my knowledge, proxies are not vetted and approved by anybody other than Kevin and Mr. Rhodes. Is that going to have to come before the MPO also to get approved?

Mr. Harrison said the proxy process is that I have something on file, in writing for one individual proxy per one individual person and that does not get vetted to the MPO. It doesn't even get vetted to the TCC. I just need something in writing that somebody is there on that member's behalf. That's a good point.

Councilmember Williams said sounds like the Mayor has a real problem with the membership changes as opposed to the actual members, but I'll leave my motion and we can vote on that.

The vote to approve the amendment to leave in the phrase 'voted on by the MPO' was not approved.

Motion to approve the updates to the TCC/CAC bylaws as recommended was approved.

The next item on the agenda was the FHWA Certification review findings by Ms. Lian Li.

Mr. Harrison said we would like to welcome Ms. Liane Li. She is a planner with the Federal Highway Administration. As most of you know, close to a year ago, we had our certification review. Every four years, our program, the Mobile MPO is required to go under federal scrutiny to make sure we are doing everything that we should be doing. It is a couple of days event where Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, our subcommittee members. They are here today to present their findings.

Ms. Li said I am Lian Li, a community planner with the Federal Highway Administration, Alabama Division. Today, I'm going to present to you the findings of the 2019 Mobile TMA Certification Review. We completed the certification in 2019. Again, Kevin already told you about what this review is about. Every four years, Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations are required to do a review of the federal transportation planning process for each TMA. To review the planning process to make sure all the requirements are met. The topics we reviewed during this certification review include the following: MPO structure and agreement; transit planning; self-certification including Title VI, non-discrimination, environmental justice, and ADA; bicycle and pedestrian planning activities; public outreach; and status of projects within the Metropolitan Planning Area. Basically, the certification process takes about nine months from beginning to finish. It consists of four primary components. The first component is a desk review. We review the MPO's documents at our desks. The second component is the site visit. During which we meet with the MPO in person. We did that in March of 2019. We came to the MPO and met with the MPO staff as well as representatives from ALDOT and Wave Transit. We also met with a few members of the MPO Policy Board and the public. The third component is a report that summarizes the findings of the certifications. The final component is the closeout presentation which I am doing today. From the findings of the certification review, we made several findings including one corrective action, a couple of noteworthy practices and several

recommendations. Noteworthy practices, the MPO staff. The MPO staff is a group of hardworking, dedicated professionals who are passionate about their work. They are always doing their best to improve the process for the MPO. Some of the members from the MPO policy board as well as the public commended the MPO staff for the work they are doing. The second noteworthy practice that the MPO has lead and assisting the member governments in completing the ADA transition plans. We issued one corrective actions. The action is about the MPO annual listing of obligated projects. Every year, the MPO is required to develop a POP and publish a list of projects that were obligated in the preceding year. On that list, there is some required information and the Mobile MPO's annual listing of obligated projects, the list is missing three pieces of required information. This information includes the amount of federal funds requested in the Transportation Improvement Program, the federal funding that was obligated in the preceding year and the federal funding remaining and available for subsequent years for each authorized projects. It's not just the Mobile MPO that has this compliance issue. It's a statewide issue so we recommend the MPO to work with ALDOT to obtain that information when developing this list. We also made recommendations for each topic we reviewed. I'm just going to briefly go over some of the recommendations we made. For the MPO agreements and bylaws, some of the information in the MPO bylaws was updated, we recommend the MPO to update all the bylaws with the current information and also include in the MPO's agreement with ALDOT, the provisions for development for the Long Range Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program and the annual listing of obligated projects. For transit planning, we recommend the Wave Transit work with the MPO to have a documented process on how the FTA 5307 funds is dispersed and also how the transit projects are selected. We also recommend the Wave Transit use the actual apportionment when programming transit projects for the current year. For public participation, again some of the information in the public participation plan was outdated and we recommend the plan being updated with current information and also recommend the MPO to coordinate the MPO's public involvement process with ALDOT's statewide public involvement process. There were some broken links on the website. We recommend the MPO to periodically to update the website so the information is up to date for the public to view. For self-certification we recommend the MPO to evaluate the self-certification clauses to better define the involvement of the MPO as well as ALDOT. We also recommended the MPO to re-evaluate how the MPO spends the MPO Attributable funds and also incorporating other factors when developing and performing environmental justice analysis. For bicycle and pedestrian planning activities, we recommend the MPO to coordinate and work with local agencies and organizations to perform a gap analysis to include transit stops, school zones and other bicycle/pedestrian facilities so the nonmotorized network for Mobile planning area will be more complete and more connected. For the status of the projects within the MPA, we recommend that the MPO be more aware of the policy directive that was issued by ALDOT about projects end dates. The policy letter was issued in 2015. Basically, it requires every project that was authorized, the PE project, the right of way project or construction project to have a project end date. The project sponsor will be responsible for the expenditure incurred after the project end date. There will not be federal expenditure after the project end date. We also for that topic, we recommend the MPO to develop a process to enable the staff to track the status of all projects within the Metropolitan Planning area when the projects are authorized. This is the last recommendations directly related to the annual listing of obligated projects. These are our recommendations. On July 18th, 2019, FHWA and FTA issued the certification to certify Mobile's Transportation Planning Process, basically it says the planning process for the Mobile Transportation Management Area, meets federal requirements subject to the MPO making progress on the recommended actions and addressing the corrective action. This certification is good until 2023. This concludes my presentation and will take any questions that you may have.

Mr. Harrison said most of those recommendations that we received, we've already made some corrective actions. The bylaws, the annual listing, the last bullet that you had is kind of a tough nut to crack, the amount spent on the STP Attributable projects. Schillinger Road for example is a MPO project and every Tuesday ALDOT has a meeting on the project. I get the agenda and it shows how much the project was authorized for, how much is spent and what is projected to be spent so I know there was a potential \$12 million for that project and it is estimated to spend about 10. I know that project is underestimated. I guess it is slightly under budget, but that's the only project with a process for MPO staff to know how much has been spent. On some of these federal projects, we don't have a process. It is a

state audit problem. It's a tough nut to crack. I spoke with Vince Beebe about it, Bryan on the county projects, Nick with the city. I don't know the best way for when a federal project gets authorized, how are we going to know on a monthly basis or even a quarterly basis, how much has been spent.

Ms. Li said it will take a lot of communication with ALDOT because all those transactions are made at ALDOT. They do have all the information. It's just how that is going to be forwarded on. I think on the Local Transportation Bureau, the Metropolitan Planning Section at ALDOT, they're working with the Office of the Engineer at ALDOT trying to get the CPMS to show those numbers. They are still working on that. It's a statewide issue and it's also a finding from the Federal Highway for the Statewide Planning Process in 2019. It's a finding for every MPO.

The next item on the agenda was the Envision 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan presentation.

Mr. Harrison said this is an informative presentation by your MPO staff. We have a public meeting on January 29th, next week, on the long range plan. There are different chapters in the plan addressing different modes. I'm going to briefly hit them all today. We're still building the document. It's a large document. There's a performance measures section, an environmental justice section which pertains to the highway element. It pertains to disparaging travel times. There's a bike section, a transit section, highway section, Congestion Management Process section, freight and climate change. Climate change hasn't changed in the past five years so we will regurgitate that section. It's still a valid element to the Long Range Plan. Briefly, I'm going to go over the highway part. Everyone look at this 11 by 17 schedule. We have \$345 million for the next 25 years. That includes our \$47 million carryover and the current TIP. The rest of it, \$297 million, we can program about \$10 million per year. It's scheduled with a slight compound increase over the years so it is \$297 million, plus the \$47 million. That's a budget of \$345 million. The MPO projects in the left column here, these are all projects that are pertaining to the Long Range Plan and are determined by the Travel Demand Forecast model that we vetted with the TCC/CAC. The state projects, those are mainly the 158 Extension to the Stateline and I-10, several widening projects on I-10 including under scenario 4, two lanes from State 188 to McDonald Road. I think that is in year 2045. These projects go from 2020 to 2045. The \$345 million sounds like a money, but it's not. Actually, \$685 million is a lot of money, but it's not. Those are the state projects and then of course the local projects that pertains to this pay-as-you-go now. The map, I want you to look at the Scenario Map. These scenarios are based on how the funding table is laid out which is basically a time line. If you notice all of Zeigler Boulevard is blue. Dauphin Street and McGregor is under the TIP. Some new projects introduced, Michigan Avenue. We recognize Michigan Avenue and the entrance to Brookley needs a total rehaul, kind of like Broad Street has right now so we've allocated money to that. Government Street, from Pine Hill to Broad as a joint project with ALDOT, that's how we had it in the last long range plan. We have other projects, Cody Road from Airport Boulevard to Old Shell Road because of the new stadium. We have a county project connecting McFarland Road to Three Notch, a new alignment and then Snow Road eventually all the way up to the new 158 extension. There are some projects in Scenario 5. Scenario 5 is pay-as-you-go. You've got Nevius Extension from Hillcrest to Schillinger. Those are county roads. Anytime there is a road project of regional significance, it should be put in the plan. That's why it's included in the plan. If you'll notice, the Causeway, that's an access management project. That is not the I-10 Mobile River Bridge. Currently, this long range plan as proposed is fiscally constrained. The funding identified for these projects is identified. There is no I-10 Mobile River Bridge in this plan. Under visionary, which is this other map, we do have the bridge included. It's not fiscally constrained. It's a wish list. We're allowed to do that. We're allowed to create a visionary element to the long range plan. These are projects that we are thinking about that don't currently have funding for it. Are there any questions about that because I'm about to get into other modes?

Councilmember Richardson said if you come into Mobile on I-10, Highway 90, DIP, Michigan Avenue and Broad Street downtown, every exit you are exiting on a four lane road. If you get on I-65, you exit at Government, it's four lane. Airport Boulevard four lanes, Dauphin Street four lanes. Springhill Avenue, four lanes. When we were at the conference last weekend, we had Director Cooper there and he said when you exit off an interstate, it should be a four lane road. When you get to Highway 45, you get two lane. Highway 45 starts at Springhill Avenue. You can take Highway 45 from Springhill all the way to the interstate and you won't intersect with a four lane. We are

widening every road we can get our hands on. As we widen these streets, you are also directing the traffic that way too, but when we don't widen the streets, then you are sending the traffic another way. You have to recognize the traffic is out there too. If people have a chance to get on a four lane road or two lane road, they are going to get on a four lane road. The reason we don't have this traffic is because we have directed the traffic our own way so we need new criteria's to address these interest in the inner-city. We have all the traffic going that way and we're still widening Zeigler Boulevard, we're just going on and on. I'm not talking about a city street. I am talking about a US Highway without sidewalks, without curbs, without gutters. (Inaudible) I am saying as we start 2020, you're going to here from Fred Richardson because we have a need on US Highway 45.

Councilmember Martin said Councilmember Richardson is right on with what I texted to myself. Get a score for Highway 45. I also used the word and Kevin used it, is a wish list. If we can wish to have something better. I also use the term that Councilmember Richardson said we need to plant a seed. For 8 years we've been planting a seed of lighting and have not produced anything. We planted a seed of drainage, it hasn't gone anywhere. We planted a seed of expanding sidewalks, curb and gutters on Highway 45 and that plant and seed have died off. I don't know what else we need to do. I heard the term of Title VI, discrimination, environmental justice, I think all those things merit, if it continue on any further than today, it merits something because there is no way we can continually prepare without no plan of expanding Highway 45 in a long term or short term plan. I understand we initially have to be a part of the short term plan.

Mr. Harrison said that's correct and that was the **impotence** for SARPC and the Mobile MPO funded last year, the US 45 Feasibility Study and looked at the entire section of US 45. We hired Volkert to do it. They looked at every inch of 45 and gave recommendations on how to improve 45, not just in terms of traffic flow and capacity but economic development as well. The problem is, it's a US 45 route and typically those are funded at the state's discretion. If you look at the map, there's only two projects that the state is funding, 158 and I-10. There is no other project that the State of Alabama is funding in the Mobile urbanized area. That's ultimately the problem and I wish that this board could have more money to fund projects on 45. If it wasn't, we wouldn't have determined that was a worthy cause to spend it on 45, the feasibility study.

Councilmember Martin said Schillinger Road is a project of the MPO.

Mr. Harrison said Schillinger Road is a project that is determined by our travel demand forecast model that is in dire need of capacity. The volume is way over the capacity of the road and that justifies spending those federal funds for that project.

Councilmember Martin said we're saying the same thing. If there's any interest, even a little bit, put toward 45 as there is to 158, as it is to Schillinger, those projects I've seen come to fruition in my tenure.

Mr. Harrison said what metrics do you recommend? We're using metrics that are used all over the country in terms of travel demand forecast modeling, volume to capacity, average annual daily traffic counts, the absolute number of volume applied to the road and travel time. What other metrics would you propose to introduce?

Councilmember Martin said the metrics you had prior to now was that it merits a five lane and the traffic count merits that. The MPO approved an expansion on Shelton Beach and Highway 45. That expansion on 45 is documented and was a one phase project which was intended for the project to continue on the south and the north side of Highway 45. We presented that information to the MPO so if it wasn't conducive 10 years ago, the traffic has expanded and the economic development has grown since then. If ten years ago, we identified that it should be five lanes, sidewalks with curbs and gutters then what would be the difference now in 2020?

Mr. Harrison said there's a lot of projects on this wish list, Councilmen. Rangeline Road, for example, that project's been on there for 30 years. Those are state routes that are typically funded with state funding. It's an unfortunate situation not just for you but for Rangeline Road, US 43, a lot of these other routes. There's just not enough federal money that the state gets to improve these projects.

Councilmember Martin said I'm going to ask a questions. We had the ATRIPii funding come available with a soft grant which means they were only asking for potential projects, not the actual funding of the project. Just a consideration of some thought around the state of projects that met the ATRIPii which was presented to us from ALDOT. We were even turned down from the consideration of considering the project let alone the point of funding. At some point the MPO is going to have to be able to step up in between of what the problem is other than introducing us to projects that have been on the books for 25 to 30 years. That doesn't mean anything in our regard to US 45.

Mr. Harrison said yes I understand that. That was why we did the US 45 study, to support projects on US 45. Other than that, I don't know what more that we can do.

Councilmember Martin said apparently the federal is not reading your study and ALDOT is not in support of it. Because if they were...

Mr. Harrison said ALDOT is in support of it. They just don't have the funding for it.

Councilmember Martin said the same ALDOT gave us a study in which it was requested for it to be a five lane. The other thing that was in consideration (inaudible) so it wasn't that we are requesting it, it's (inaudible). The one thing that is taking place is they are refusing to do the complete study that shows that it is required to come up to state statute of a highway those things would have to be improved. I can't see for the life of me when you sit at this table and be okay with Schillinger Road expansion or 158 expansion or 65 expansion and not consider Highway 45.

Councilmember Richardson said Kevin let me close out by saying. Nobody sitting in this room had anything to do with the situation that we are facing on Highway 45. It was done long before we got here. We have a chance to change it. (Inaudible) When you get to US 45 it gets down to a little lane all the way through Prichard. It's because of who is down there. That's the same reason that Highway 45 is left. It's because of who lives on Highway 45. We have an opportunity to correct the situation. The people living in my district has as much a right as anybody else. It's all four lane so people can get to the Interstate and be gone. You need a four lane if you got an exit. We can have a turn lane, we can sidewalks, curbs and gutters. Doing nothing is not an option on 45. If I have to go all the way and camp out at the Capitol to get my point over. I will not stop.

Mr. Harrison said other modes of transportation. We have a transit item and remember we have a public meeting January 29th in this room to go over all of these projects in the Long Range Plan. The Wave Transit has presented us, you don't have this in your file, but it will be available January 29th, the short term goals to continue cooperative efforts between the Wave, First Transit, City of Mobile and the MPO; planning efforts in the TDP; continued improvements of passenger amenities. Freight, there is a freight element to the long range plan. Right now, we have additional freight that will be provided to us, phase 3, the \$50 million, 20+ acre yard expansion with the two additional outboard gates that were completed in 2019. There's a 400 foot dock extension to be completed in February of 2020 and the two post Panamax cranes and the two super post Panama cranes. Internationally, there's a 12 million cubic feet pallet position facility capable of 30 blast loads which quadruples the blast freeze capacity that they have now. They are also planning on improving the USDA import/export inspection. We have metrics for existing freight. We have metrics for projected freight to hit our network. Those will all be presented on January 29th. We also have a bicycle/pedestrian element of the Long Range Plan.

Mr. Piper said this double sided map you have in here. It shows the existing, the proposed and the in design projects. The red are the proposed projects. The green are what's existing now. There's different levels. Some are bike lanes, some are an external trail and some are just signage depending on what the conditions warrant. The yellow is what's in design now and includes Three Mile Creek, Beauregard/Broad Street; Canal Street; the Cochrane Bayway, Zeigler Boulevard, McGregor and some other projects. This also when we were doing this, we went out and met with the city's. We looked at comprehensive plans. We looked at other plans like Map for Mobile, things like that. We did the gap analysis to make sure we don't have any weird gaps in connectivity. We'll go over all of this in detail at the meeting coming up.

Mr. Harrison said this was presented at our January 15th BPAC meeting as well.

Mr. Piper said and the TCC/CAC as well.

Mr. Harrison said I just wanted to introduce these projects to y'all. Several months ago, we had an online survey. We had close to 150 comments about what should go into this plan. We heard a lot of Wallace Tunnel, I-10 Mobile River Bridge, Airport Boulevard, transit, bicycle, pedestrian. We'll have those comments at the public meeting. A lot of that went into the building of this long range plan along with our travel demand forecast model which is interesting in itself of how that all works. We'll go over that at the public meeting. Tentatively, the plan will be adopted on March 25th. You will get all the comments from that meeting prior to the adoption. The long range plan does not have the Mobile River I-10 Bridge has a funded project. It is listed in the Visionary Projects. Right now, the current published long range plan that was adopted in March of 2015 has the bridge in it, but we are updating it. The new plan is in draft. For the next two months the bridge is in the long range plan, but it's meaningless because there's not a project in the TIP. It was tabled at the last MPO meeting.

Someone said so is it coming out of the plan is the question or is it going to stay in the plan?

Mr. Harrison said the plan as we are presenting it, does not have a bridge in it and that is subject to change. It's in our visionary element. We recognize there's a need for a bridge, but we can't put it in a fiscally constrained plan unless ALDOT tells us how it's going to be funded.

Mayor Stimpson said at this time Kevin Spriggs would like to make a presentation. Kevin, because we are already 20 minutes past time on our scheduled time, I would ask that you try to do it in 10 minutes.

Mr. Spriggs said I'm Kevin Spriggs. I'm a business man in Daphne and I work with Dr. Lou Campomenosi with the Common Sense Campaign. It's a political organization. We were approached by State Senator Albritton about if the Mobile River Bridge planning could be revived in a lower cost form. There are two things in your packet. One is this presentation, but another very important part of that is a scope of work which the Eastern Shore MPO has looked at today while this meeting was going and I was texted a message that they have passed a motion to actually endorse it. All that does is say that they agree with the scope of work. It doesn't mean the project is real, but part of the deal is to develop a consensus plan that Mobile and the Eastern Shore can all agree and then send back to the governor and ask to her to put the plan back on the State TIP so we can get the ball rolling. The information in this has been provided by, it was online and was presented originally by the Mobile River Bridge Project plus we've also talked with some ALDOT officials and we talked to some engineers. There's no official project. That's all volunteer time that has been put into this at this point. A key part of the Coastal Alabama Consensus Plan, I'm going to compare it to the original bridge plan, the original bridge plan was \$2 billion. The consensus plan has been estimated at being \$1.2 billion. That's a savings of \$800 million that comes out of what was originally proposed. However, because of the extensive amount of engineering work, time, research, there's even a federal record of decision that was received in August, the consensus plan works and builds upon all that work that has already been done. The key point, cable stay bridge in the original plan, that's in the consensus plan. The difference here is what happens with the Bayway. Instead of tearing down the entire Bayway and rebuilding it, the existing Bayway stays in a place. A four lane expressway is build in the gap between the two existing bridges. If a toll was necessary to make this project happen, it is only on the expressway. The scope of work that the Eastern Shore MPO has adopted and the scope of work that is in your document says no tolls on existing routes, the Wallace Tunnel, the Bankhead Tunnel and the existing lanes, no tolls. A plan that would have tolls on those structures, no longer meets consensus. That's just the way it is looked at. To give a physical idea of what it would look like. The top is the Mobile River Bridge concept, the original plan. The bottom is our concept. This shows you that you will have the four lanes built within the existing lanes of the existing Bayway. Now, I'll go through what happens. At Exit 35, the gap narrows so now there is no longer room to build four lanes in between the bridges. What that means is that the Bayway, that part of the Bayway would have to have some kind of extensive demolition work done in order to make it look like what the original plan was. At Exit 35, there's not enough room under the Highway 90/98 bridges to fit all four lanes so these bridges which are actually

older the Bayway itself, it would be reconstructed according to the original plan. This was in the original Mobile River plan. That comes out of the information that is on the site. That work is done as far as the engineering analysis of it is concerned. At the Causeway, instead of demolishing the mid-Bay Bridge interchange, there would be access ramps for exit only to transition somebody from the Expressway back to the old bridge. That's an important safety feature because in the Expressway, you got a much longer route with no opportunities to ingress and egress, but it also gives the opportunity for a traveling tourist that wants to visit the Battleship. If he is on the Expressway, he can drop down to the old bridge and still have access to the businesses that are on the Causeway. This is Virginia Street, the divergent diamond interchange, that's in the consensus plan just as it was in the original plan. Terminating at Broad Street, is the same as the existing plan. Just to show you another project in another area of the country, the Ultimate I-4 project was a P3 project for \$2.3 billion. The State of Florida put a billion dollars in upfront committed with an availability payment of \$75 million a year. It does have an expressway with six general use lanes. The tolls on the express lanes goes to the State of Florida, not the P3. This puts the original cap for construction on the Mobile River Bridge Project, a key figure right here, the Bayway was \$900 million of that project. I was often asked the question how did the project increase so much? Tearing down the existing Bayway and completing rebuilding with all those interchanges, that's why the cost went up. In our project, this is kind of an estimate that was provided by the engineers that are very familiar and have worked on the Mobile River Bridge Project, they did a cost estimate and that is the source of our number for the \$1.2 billion. Here's the funding piece which this is what in order to get back on the TIP, it has to be funded. This is what we're purposing is \$480 million funded by the State. That's not in one year, that's over the six-year construction period. We have the INFRA grant for \$125 million. TIFIA Loan and this is where the tolls come in. TIFIA loans is part of a federal government program, but in order to participate in the TIFIA Loan program, you have to have a dedicated funding sourcing and in highway projects, that is usually a toll. Because we think that an expressway only toll will not generate very much revenue, we capped it at \$200 million. TIFIA loans can be up to a third of the project, but there's no way that an expressway only toll could pay for a TIFIA loan that size. We just used a more conservative number here, but to drill down to how this funded, it has to get back to where the state is working on it and talking to state finance working with the legislative delegations to figure out how much could be allocated this project. This will give you an idea right here, if the state took this on with a \$480 million investment upfront, there still going to be obligated for 30 years of \$34 million a year to pay for this. That is a key factor. Is the state willing to do that? We have to send this project to them and ask them to look at that and are they willing to do it. If we have consensus that we can live with this plan, we need to turn it back to the state to let them have a look. I put this in here. This was in a presentation to the location delegation. The original project relied heavily on private equity from the P3. It showed a quarter that we had to estimate, it was about \$500 million, public activity bonds that we understand are going to be limited to about \$400 million and then the federal loan is the TIFIA loan. This part of the funding is the big driver of the tolls in the original project. You had to pay debt service on the TIFIA loan and the private equity money. A problem with this is the private equity money is expensive. That's a 10 to 12% more type loan. The TIFIA loan and the reason you like to participate in the TIFIA program with a federal guarantee, it can come in around 3% or 2.9%. There's actually a published index on TIFIA bonds that shows you how those will be financed. We are accepting the Governor's challenge to come up with a plan to send back to them. It's a concept plan. It's not a detailed estimate that engineers would do, but it does reduce the cost, it still adds capacity to the routes. In terms of Exit 35, it finishes what you would have to do to Exit 35 when the end of the life cycle of the Bayway comes to pass and you want to replace the existing lane. It keeps access to all of the key points that the original plan had access to. Again, coming back, the ask is to read the scope of work that the Eastern Shore MPO has now blessed, but if you can agree with that scope, a formal resolution from this body endorses that scope of work is what we need to send this all to the state and let them see if they want to start working on it again.

Someone asked what assurance do we have that when you tie into the current bridge structure that they're not going to try and toll all of it because now you've touched some of it? ALDOT has zero credibility. They've changed their mind over and over. They tell us one thing and then they come back again and tell us something different and then they come back again and tell us something different on what we're going to have to pay. Taxes and tolls are the same thing. We are over taxed all ready. There's money out there. They just built a bridge in Birmingham for \$600

million with no toll. Where's the money for Mobile? We shouldn't pay a toll and until that is truthfully on the table from ALDOT especially when you tie into the old bridge, we're not going to buy into this until we have an assurance from ALDOT in writing and the politicians that they are going to protect the taxpayer from having to fund this bridge.

Mr. Spriggs said let me answer that with saying that since this is a call for this project, it's been closer to being able to do what you're saying as far as having the state to fund it all without having to use the TIFIA bonds and the TIFIA bonds, when you're talking about that low of an interest rate over that length of time, you're talking about 10s of millions of dollars of interest. That could be paid by the state or the taxpayers, but there is a desire among the local delegation to eliminate that part of it altogether. The question is if you need to eliminate, you're still going to have to obligate the state for this \$34 million. This plan does present the plan to the state, saying this is what we think it costs. Maybe you have better plans, but we're not going to accept a toll on any existing structure and that's what is in that scope of work. Existing structures can't be tolled. Existing routes have to be maintained. Otherwise, it's not a consensus anymore because the Eastern Shore MPO agrees with you 100% that existing routes should never be tolled.

Commissioner Hudson said I'm speaking for Senator Albritton who I think initiated work on this project. His comments were that the Causeway, the exit onto the Causeway from the Expressway would add additional cost to the project and because there are exits off the Bayway and Causeway already, that was unnecessary cost and was not sure ALDOT would go along with that. How much more does that add to the cost to add that exit?

Mr. Spriggs said the Causeway, the difference in Albritton's plan was Expressway only crossing all the way without the Causeway exit and without even access from Exit 35 as well. I can tell you that although that is about \$120 million difference in the plan, but Albritton's plan is not going to be accepted by the Eastern Shore MPO so it is not a consensus plans. I can tell you the reasons. Daphne, Spanish Fort and Fairhope are heavily dependent on access to all the traffic that moves on Interstate 10, not just the local, but the traffic going straight through. We do get a slice of that.

Mayor Stimpson said this is an idea presented by Coastal Alabama group of Kevin Spriggs and some other individuals. Just as Senator Albritton had a complete Expressway plan, but until there is an indication from ALDOT on what they would embrace, I don't see that we need to take any action on it other than to say we appreciate you trying to solve this problem. I will remind the crowd, other than that this is not at this point and time sanctioned by ALDOT, in the last MPO meeting that we had on the 21st of August, we approved not to put the plan into (1:34:30) the TIP, it was the following day that the Eastern Shore MPO decided that they did not want to move forward. That belief was because there would be a \$6 toll and there was a lot of information that came out at the SARPC Annual Meeting. What Mr. Cooper said because we did not allow the process to work, we never did get the answer to what the true toll would have been. I don't know that we need to take any action, but if there is feedback later that we should get back together, with a two notice, we can have a called meeting. I would remind you that this may not be a good analogy but I will use it. The funding source out of Montgomery is kind of like a parent. I'm a parent and a grandparent. Probably all of you as parents, had an opportunity to give your children an allowance and if they did something, you could not give them that allowance. I'm serious. I'm not trying to be funny when I say this. ALDOT, until they approve the plan, we can suggest all these things, but they're controlling the money. They're controlling the project. Efforts, which we have been working diligently since the 28th of August to try to come up with a plan. Mobile agreed right off the bat that if we had to do away with the West Tunnel Interchange, we would do it. That creates a problem for Mobile. The Battleship Parkway said that they did not need, they could do without the slip ramps. They could depend on signage. The owner of two largest restaurants said they didn't have to have the slip ramps. At what point, if we're trying to get this thing as low of cost as it can be, what point are we going to tell ALDOT, tell us what you can do instead of us trying to tell them what to do. That's a personal observation I have form having been involved in it, but we are way passed time, but I will entertain any other comments for Old Business before we quickly move to New Business.

Mayor Downey said I'm opposed to voting for something and I told Senator Albritton I was for the project, but any unknown like if or ALDOT, I've lost confidence in ALDOT. They're wanting us to embrace something without the

known answer at the end. I guess I'm just opposed to saying we're for that and they've left open doors. I told Senator Albritton I was for the project. I know we need the bridge, but I like to vote on things that I know about, not after they come back and say it's going to be this and that.

Mayor Stimpson said under new business, I would like to welcome Rob Middleton as the new MPO member. Rob is the owner of Middleton Construction and we are delighted to have him here and the expertise he brings to the table having to do with road building projects. There's one other item.

Mr. Harrison said those member governments, the TAP funds, we should have a double award in TAP funds. Look for a May deadline for those TAP applications. In the Mobile MPO, we allow more than one application. The state has a application as well. Also with new business, the bylaws updated today. We have Bayou La Batre, Frank Williams on the Citizens Advisory Committee, Shilo Miller for Saraland Citizen Advisory Committee and Representative Margie Wilcox as the SARPC appointed representative to the Citizens Advisory Committee.

With no other business the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

Chairman, TCC

Chairman, MPO

Date

Date