# EASTERN SHORE MPO 

Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse
1100 Fairhope Avenue
FAIRHOPE, ALABAMA 36532
TELEPHONE: (251) 990-4640 251-990-4643
FAX: 251-580-2590
WWW.EASTERNSHOREMPO.ORG

## COMBINED MEETING AGENDA

Policy Board Work Session:<br>Wednesday, January 9, 2019; 10:00 AM<br>Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)<br>1100 Fairhope Ave.<br>Fairhope, AL 36532<br>Bike/Pedestrian Advisory Committee:<br>Citizens Advisory Committee:<br>Technical Advisory Committee:<br>Policy Board:<br>Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 9:00 AM<br>Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)<br>1100 Fairhope Ave.<br>Fairhope, AL 36532<br>Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 1:00 PM<br>Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)<br>1100 Fairhope Ave.<br>Fairhope, AL 36532<br>Wednesday, January 16, 2019; 10:00 AM<br>Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)<br>1100 Fairhope Ave.<br>Fairhope, AL 36532<br>Wednesday, January 23, 2019; 10:00 AM Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope) 1100 Fairhope Ave.<br>Fairhope, AL 36532

## CALL TO ORDER/INVOCATION/PLEDGE

ROLL CALL

BRATS PRESENTATION (POLICY BOARD WORK SESSSION)

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

## NEW BUSINESS

1. Action - Amending the Long Range Transportation Plan for the Mobile River Bridge Bayway Widening Project (All)
2. Action - State Requested Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) (All)

- State initiated projects within the Planning Area - Require no ESMPO funds.

3. Action - MPO Amendment to the Transportation Improvement Plan (All)

- Design of Roundabout at CR 64/Rigsby Rd and Widening of CR 64 from SR 181 to CR 54 East (additional funding)

4. Action - Resolution Adopting the Public Transit Plan (All)
5. Informational - MPO Coordinator's Report

- Project Update
- Adaptive Signal
- SR 181 Widening
- US 31
- SR 181 and I-10, Diverging Diamond
- 2019 ATPA Conference - Sponsorship Interest
- Planning and Development Update (K. Taylor)


## NEXT MPO MEETINGS (All)

- Policy Board Work Session: Wednesday, April 10, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- BPAC Meeting: Tuesday, April 16, 2019; 9:00 AM; Spanish Fort City Hall, Meeting Classroom
- CAC Meeting: Tuesday, April 16, 2019; 1:00 PM; Spanish Fort City Hall, Meeting Classroom
- TAC Meeting: Wednesday, April 17, 2019; 10:00 AM; Spanish Fort City Hall, Council Chambers
- Policy Board Meeting: Wednesday, April 24, 2019; 10:00 AM; Spanish Fort City Hall, Council Chambers
$\bullet$
PUBLIC FORUM (All)
- Members of the Public:
- Members of the Press:
- Board/Committee Members:


## ADJOURNMENT (All)

| Eastern Shore MPO <br> Agenda Action Form |
| :---: |
| Policy Board Work Session - January 9, 2019 <br> Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019 <br> Citizens Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019 <br> Technical Advisory Committee - January 16, 2019 <br> Policy Board - January 23, 2019 |
| Summary |
| Approval of Meeting Minutes: <br> - Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) <br> - Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) <br> - Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) <br> - Policy Board |
| ATTACHMENT(S) |
| 1.) October BPAC Meeting Minutes <br> 2.) October CAC Meeting Minutes <br> 3.) October TAC Meeting Minutes <br> 4.) October Policy Board Meeting Minutes |

# EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION <br> BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC) <br> DAPHNE, ALABAMA <br> OCTOBER 16, 2018 <br> 9:00 AM 

## CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE/INVOCATION.

$>$ Chairperson Jeff Hudson called the meeting to order at 9:09 A.M.
$>$ Invocation was led by Mr. Jeff Sheldon.
$>$ Pledge was led by Ms. Gail Yongue.

## ROLL CALL

Mrs. Sarah Hart Sislak, MPO Coordinator, did not call the roll due to lack of attendees.
$>$ Members present: Mr. Jeff Hudson, City of Fairhope; Mrs. Katie Bolton, City of Fairhope; Mr. Payton Rogers, City of Daphne; Mr. Jeff Sheldon, City of Spanish Fort; Ms. Molly Peterson, City of Fairhope (phoned in at 9:23 AM); Mr. David Wells, City of Fairhope; Ms. Kathie LaRose, City of Spanish Fort; Ms. Gayle Yongue, Baldwin County.
> Members absent: Mr. Mark Wetzel, City of Daphne; Mr. David Ringler, City of Daphne; Phil Wilbourn, City of Daphne; Mrs. Karen Dees, Baldwin County; Mr. Dewane Hayes, Baldwin County; Mr. Mike Henriksen, Baldwin County: Mr. Raymond Lovell, Town of Loxley.
> Others present: Mrs. Sarah Hart Sislak, ESMPO Coordinator; Mrs. Katrina Taylor, Baldwin County Highway Department
$>$ There were not enough members present for a quorum. It was decided to go over the informational items, in hopes that another member would attend to facilitate a quorum. Ms. Molly Peterson then phone conferenced in to establish a quorum at 9:23 A.M.

## 1. Informational - MPO's Coordinator's Report

- Project Update
- Adaptive Signal - The adaptive signal system on US 98 has been collecting data that the contractor is using to calibrate the intersections. At last month's progress meeting, they were $30 \%$ complete with the calibration. \They will be completely done by the end of November and the system will be fully operational by December.
- Public Transit Projects - Fairhope put out an RFQ for the design of the Downtown Transit Shelter/Parking Deck project. Spanish Fort is working with Cypress to acquire the property at Spanish Fort Town Center. However, in 2016 the property owners backed out, therefore FTA wants the MPO to finish the Fairhope project
before we move onto the next transit project. Daphne is working on agreements to designate specific transit stops.
- SR 181 Widening - The contractor is working on utility relocation.
- US 31 - The contractor is almost done with the utility relocations, and is laying the piping for drainage.
- SR 181 and I-10 Diverging Diamond - The project has been let and has gone out for bid, but has not been awarded. Construction is expected to begin in November.
- TAP Grants FY 19: No TAP grants were awarded in the MPO area.
- 2019 ATPA Conference - Mrs. Sislak stated she is chairing the 2019 Alabama Transportation Planners Conference this year and is looking for sponsors and speakers. She asked if anyone knew of any companies willing to be a sponsor or any speakers.
- HSIP Projects - Mrs. Sislak stated that the Highway Safety Improvement Program is a funding sources through the state that is a 90/10 match. A roundabout at CR 13 and CR 44 was recently awarded funding. Fairhope's HSIP Project for a roundabout at SR 104 at Veterans Road application was misplaced at the state level and has been resubmitted.
- Traffic Incident Management Initiative - FHWA and ALDOT have created ways to improve traffic flow following accidents to improve first responder's response time. Mrs. Sislak will be sending out resources to the Policy Board regarding traffic incident management.
- Mobile River Bridge - The MPO's Long-Range Plan and Transportation Improvement Program will be approved in January including a new cost estimate, the tolling and how it will affect our local roads. The Policy Board will be approving this in January and the Federal Highway will approve the project in February of 2019.
- Planning and Development - Mrs. Katrina Taylor gave an update on the developments and building permits per government in the planning area. This included the third quarter (calendar year) along with the year to date of preliminary plats, final plats and building permits for single-family residential homes in the Metropolitan Planning Area.


## 2. Informational - Public Transit Plan (All)

Mrs. Sislak presented a draft version of the Public Transit Plan that Mrs. Jennifer Fidler has been working on. The draft version will be sent out electronically to all members for feedback before the January meetings to allow board members time to review and input feedback before the final version is presented in January. Mrs. Fidler will be retiring on October 31, 2018.

Mrs. Sislak explain the informational items were complete and now it was on to the action items. Mr. Hudson requested a non-present board member to be phone conferenced in so a quorum would be established. Ms. Yongue had a concern regarding a traffic installation on CR 64 by Rigsby Road. She stated that during the Baldwin County Planning and Zoning approval of a subdivision, the installation of a traffic light was included in the cost. The project is finished and a traffic signal was not installed. Ms. Yongue asked if those funds could be added to the Roundabout Project at CR 64 and Rigsby Road. She would go back through the minutes to inform Mrs. Sislak along with the name of the development.

Ms. Peterson was phone conferenced in to establish a quorum at 9:23 A.M.

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mrs. Sislak explained first is the election of Chairman for FY2019.
MOTION: By Mr. Payton Rogers to nominate Mr. Jeff Hudson to serve as Chairman. The motion was seconded by all members.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: By Mr. Payton Rogers to approve the January 2018 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Katie Bolton.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 3. Action - Adding Projects to the Visionary List (All)

Mrs. Sislak stated that three (3) projects had been submitted by Baldwin County to be added to the Visionary List of the Long Range Transportation Plan. She reminder members that by adding a project to the Visionary List does not commit funding through the MPO or any other source. Mrs. Sislak explained that the widening of CR 64 was previously approved but it was from SR 181 to Austin/Rigsby Road. This is now adding the widening of CR 64 from Austin/Rigsby to CR 54 East. She described the projects to be added to the Visionary List as follows:

- Widening - CR 64 between Rigsby/Austin Road and CR 54 East

Engineers Estimated Cost: \$5,175,000

- Various ADA Compliance Projects

Engineers Estimated Cost: $\$ 450,000$

- CR 32 Bridge Replacement

Engineers Estimated Cost: $\$ 15,000,000$
MOTION: By Mrs. Bolton to add the projects to the Visionary List. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeff Sheldon.

- Discussion: The BPAC board members requested that a 3-foot shoulder be included on the CR 64 widening and the shoulder of CR 32 be widened.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

4. Action - State Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (All) Mrs. Sislak explained that the State had requested projects to be included in the TIP. She reminded the committee that no MPO dollars are involved in the following projects:

- Project: 100062414 (RW) I-10/SR-181 I-10 BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT - DELETION
- Project: 100062416 (CN) Federal aid number: DPI I010 I-10. BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT. Old Engineers Estimate: \$266,320,798.00; New Engineers Estimate: \$806,000,000.00
- Project: 100068892 Federal aid number: ST-002-042-026 SIGNAL INSTALLATION ON SR-42 (US-98) AT SOUTH DRIVE (CN). Target Start Date: 8/15/2018. Engineers Estimate: \$170,000.00
- Project: 100068893 Federal aid number: ST-002-059-027 (CN). SIGNAL INSTALLATION ON SR-59 AT THE EASTBOUND I-10 OFF RAMP. Target Start Date: 9/15/2018. Engineers Estimate: \$150,000.00
- Project: 100066184 (FM) Federal aid number: NH 0042 (534) RESURFACING SR-42 (US98) FROM D'OLIVE CREEK TO JUST NORTH OF SR-104. Old Target start date: May 31, 2019. New Target start date: November 08, 2019. Engineers Estimate: $\$ 2,564,760$.
Mrs. Sislak explained that Project: 100062416 (CN) Federal aid number: DPI I010 I-10. BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT had a cost increase from $\$ 266,320,798.00$ to $\$ 806,000,000.00$. This is due to the old estimate being configured off the current Bayway structure where the new estimate is based on a new elevated structure.

MOTION: By Mr. Rogers to add the state requested amendments to the TIP. The motion was seconded by Mr. David Wells.

- Discussion: Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

5. Action - Revised Resolution Regarding CR34/US98 Signal Installation (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that. the Policy Board approved the funding of a signal installation at CR34 and US 98 at a previous meeting. She explained that the installation was initially planned to be included in the on-going Adaptive Signal Installation project, however Baldwin County and the City of Fairhope are requesting to separate this from the Adaptive Signal Installation to receive lower bids. The resolution presented would update the cost of the project, and change the project sponsor to the City of Fairhope.

| Total Cost: | $\$ 350,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| MPO: | $\$ 280,000$ |

City of Fairhope: $\$ 70,000$
MOTION: By Mr. Rogers to approve the updated resolution of MPO funding of CR34/US 98 Traffic Signal Installation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sheldon.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

6. Action - Amendment of FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (All) Mrs. Sislak explained the MPO amendment to the TIP includes the cost of designing a roundabout at CR 64/Rigsby Rd and designing the widening of CR 64 from SR 181 to CR 54 East. The county requested that the design be funded with MPO funds while HSIP or other possible funds are pursued for the construction. The Baldwin County Commission will be providing the $20 \%$ local match required for the design.

| Total cost: | $\$ 260,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| MPO: | $\$ 208,000$ |
| County: | $\$ 52,000$ |

MOTION: By Mrs. Bolton to approve the use of MPO Surface Funds for the design of a roundabout at CR 64 and Rigsby Road and to design the widening of CR 64 from SR 181 to CR 54 East. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wells.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 7. Action - Performance Measures PM2 (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that this is the last of the Statewide Performance Measures and Targets for pavement and bridges. This is required by the FAST Act to receive transportation funds. Mrs. Sislak reviewed the performance measures and targets and stated that MPO staff suggests the MPO support the statewide targets.
MOTION: By Ms. LaRose to adopt the Statewide Bridge and Pavement Performance Measurement Targets. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Bolton.

- Discussion:
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

8. Action - Resolutions of Appreciation (All)

Mrs. Sislak stated that MPO staff has prepared two resolutions recognizing and thanking Commissioner Chris Elliott and Commissioner Tucker Dorsey for their contribution and participation on the Eastern Shore MPO Policy Board
MOTION: By Ms. LaRose to adopt the resolutions of appreciation for Commissioner Elliott and Commissioner Dorsey. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Bolton.

- Discussion: The BCAP members appreciate the contribution from Commissioner Elliott and Commissioner Dorsey.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

9. Action - Authorization of ESMPO Coordinator's Pay Increase (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that her current salary is well below the national and state averages for MPO Coordinators. A 10\% pay increase was requested by her supervisor and approved by the Baldwin County Commission in its FY 2019 budget.
MOTION: By Mrs. Bolton to approve the authorization of the ESMPO Coordinator's Pay Increase. The motion was seconded by Ms. LaRose.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## OTHER DISCUSSION:

Mrs. Sislak is interested in offering video or phone conferences to all board members that cannot physically attend the quarterly meetings. This was brought to her attention from a quorum not being formed since January's meeting due to lack of attendees.

## NEXT MPO MEETINGS (All)

- Policy Board Work Session: Wednesday, January 9, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- BPAC Meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 9:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- CAC Meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 1:00 PM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- TAC Meeting: Wednesday, January 16, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- Policy Board Meeting: Wednesday, January 23, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)


## PUBLIC FORUM (All)

- Members of the Public: There were no other members of the public present.
- Members of the Press: There were no members of the press present.
- Board/Committee Members:


## ADJOURNMENT (All)

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Hudson. Meeting adjourned at 11:14 A.M.

# EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION <br> CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE <br> DAPHNE, ALABAMA <br> OCTOBER 16, 2018 <br> 1:00 PM 

## CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE/INVOCATION

$>$ Chairperson Mr. Andrew James called the meeting to order at 1:07 P.M.
> Invocation was said by Mr. Greg Walker.
$>$ Pledge was led by Ms. Sherry Sullivan.

## ROLL CALL

Mrs. Sarah Hart Sislak, MPO Coordinator, called the roll.
> Members present: Mr. Donald Ouellette, City of Daphne; Mr. David Stejskal, City of Fairhope; Mr. Tom Granger, City of Fairhope; Ms. Sherry Sullivan, City of Fairhope; Mr. Tedson Meyers, City of Fairhope; Mr. Greg Walker, Baldwin County; Mr. Andrew James, Baldwin County; Mr. Kevin Morgan, City of Spanish Fort.
$>$ Members absent: Mr. Stephen Pierce, City of Daphne; Mr. Rick Davis, City of Daphne; Mr. Richard Jaehne, City of Daphne; Mr. Johnny Chaney, Baldwin County; Mr. Lawrence Wilson, Baldwin County; Mr. Richard Ullo, City of Spanish Fort; Ms. Diane Burnett, Town of Loxley; Ms. Bethany Johnston, Town of Loxley.
> Others present: Mrs. Sarah Hart Sislak, ESMPO; Mrs. Katrina Taylor, Baldwin County
Highway Department

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mrs. Sislak explained first is the election of Chairman for FY2019.
MOTION: By Mr. Tedson Meyers to nominate Mr. Andrew James to serve as Chairman. The motion was seconded by Mr. Greg Walker.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

Mrs. Sislak explained second nomination is the election of Vice Chairman for FY2019.
MOTION: By Mr. Donald Ouellette to nominate Mr. Tedson Meyers to serve as Vice Chairman. The motion was seconded by Mr. Walker.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: By Mr. Meyers to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ouellette.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## NEW BUSINESS

1. Action - Adding Projects to the Visionary List (All)

Mrs. Sislak stated that three (3) projects had been submitted by Baldwin County to be added to the Visionary List of the Long Range Transportation Plan. She reminder members that by adding a project to the Visionary List does not commit funding through the MPO or any other source. Mrs. Sislak explained that the widening of CR 64 was previously approved but it was from SR 181 to Austin/Rigsby Road. This is now adding the widening of CR 64 from Austin/Rigsby to CR 54 East. She described the projects to be added to the Visionary List as follows:

- Widening - CR 64 between Rigsby/Austin Road and CR 54 East Engineers Estimated Cost: \$5,175,000
- Various ADA Compliance Projects Engineers Estimated Cost: \$450,000
- CR 32 Bridge Replacement

Engineers Estimated Cost: $\$ 15,000,000$
MOTION: By Mr. Ouellette to add the projects to the Visionary List. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyers.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

2. Action -State Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that the State had requested projects to be included in the TIP. She reminded the committee that no MPO dollars are involved in the following projects:

- Project: 100062414 (RW) I-10/SR-181 I-10 BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT - DELETION
- Project: 100062416 (CN) Federal aid number: DPI I010 I-10. BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT. Old Engineers Estimate: $\$ 266,320,798.00$; New Engineers Estimate: $\$ 806,000,000.00$
- Project: 100068892 Federal aid number: ST-002-042-026 SIGNAL INSTALLATION ON SR-42 (US-98) AT SOUTH DRIVE (CN). Target Start Date: 8/15/2018. Engineers Estimate: \$170,000.00
- Project: 100068893 Federal aid number: ST-002-059-027 (CN). SIGNAL INSTALLATION ON SR-59 AT THE EASTBOUND I-10 OFF RAMP. Target Start Date: 9/15/2018. Engineers Estimate: \$150,000.00
- Project: 100066184 (FM) Federal aid number: NH 0042 (534) RESURFACING SR-42 (US98) FROM D'OLIVE CREEK TO JUST NORTH OF SR-104. Old Target start date: May 31, 2019. New Target start date: November 08, 2019. Engineers Estimate: $\$ 2,564,760$. Mrs. Sislak explained that Project: 100062416 (CN) Federal aid number: DPI I010 I-10. BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT had a cost increase from $\$ 266,320,798.00$ to $\$ 806,000,000.00$. This is due to the old estimate being configured off the current Bayway structure where the new estimate is based on a new elevated structure.

MOTION: By Mr. Walker to add the state requested amendments to the TIP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ouellette.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

3. Action - Revised Resolution Regarding CR34/US98 Signal Installation (All)

Revised Resolution Regarding CR34/US98 Signal Installation (All)
Mrs. Sislak explained that. the Policy Board approved the funding of a signal installation at CR34 and US 98 at a previous meeting. She explained that the installation was initially planned to be included in the on-going Adaptive Signal Installation project, however Baldwin County and the City of Fairhope are requesting to separate this from the Adaptive Signal Installation to receive lower bids. The resolution presented would update the cost of the project, and change the project sponsor to the City of Fairhope.

```
Total Cost: $350,000
MPO: $280,000
City of Fairhope: $70,000
```

MOTION: No motion

- Discussion: Members did not feel that there are enough traffic counts to confirm the need of a traffic signal. Mrs. Sislak informed them that the residents in nearby neighborhoods initiated the warrant study, and it was then performed by ALDOT. The Citizen's Advisory Board Members took no motion until they receive and review the traffic warrant study.
- Abstain: N/A
- In favor: N/A
- Opposed: N/A
- Result: No Motion

4. Action -Amendment of FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained the MPO amendment to the TIP includes the cost of designing a roundabout at CR 64/Rigsby Rd and designing the widening of CR 64 from SR 181 to CR 54 East. The county requested that the design be funded with MPO funds while HSIP or other possible funds are pursued for the construction. The Baldwin County Commission will be providing the $20 \%$ local match required for the design.

| Total cost: | $\$ 260,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| MPO: | $\$ 208,000$ |
| County: | $\$ 52,000$ |

MOTION: By Mr. Ouellette to add the state requested amendments to the TIP. The motion was seconded by Ms. Sullivan.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 5. Action - Performance Measures PM2 (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that this is the last of the Statewide Performance Measures and Targets for pavement and bridges. This is required by the FAST Act to receive transportation funds. Mrs. Sislak reviewed the performance measures and targets and stated that MPO staff suggests the
MPO support the statewide targets.
MOTION: By Mr. Walker to adopt the Statewide Bridge and Pavement Performance
Measurement Targets. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ouellette.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 6. Action - Resolutions of Appreciation (All)

Mrs. Sislak stated that MPO staff has prepared two resolutions recognizing and thanking
Commissioner Chris Elliott and Commissioner Tucker Dorsey for their contribution and participation on the Eastern Shore MPO Policy Board
MOTION: By Mr. Meyers to adopt the resolutions of appreciation for Commissioner Elliott and Commissioner Dorsey. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ouellette.

- Discussion: Mr. Ouellette stated," to let the record show that motion came from a Democrat".
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

7. Action - Authorization of ESMPO Coordinator's Pay Increase (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that her current salary is well below the national and state averages for MPO Coordinators. A 10\% pay increase was requested by her supervisor and approved by the Baldwin County Commission in its FY 2019 budget.
MOTION: By Mr. Ouellette to approve the authorization of the ESMPO Coordinator's Pay Increase. The motion was seconded by Ms. Sullivan.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 8. Informational - Public Transit Plan (All)

Mrs. Sislak presented a draft version of the Public Transit Plan that Mrs. Jennifer Fidler has been working on. The draft version will be sent out electronically to all members for feedback before the January meetings to allow board members time to review and input feedback before the final version is presented in January. Mrs. Fidler will be retiring on October 31, 2018.

## 9. Informational - MPO Coordinator's Report

## Project Update

- Adaptive Signal - The adaptive signal system on US 98 has been collecting data that the contractor is using to calibrate the intersections. At last month's progress meeting, they were $30 \%$ complete with the calibration. \They will be completely done by the end of November and the system will be fully operational by December.
- Public Transit Projects - Fairhope put out an RFQ for the design of the Downtown Transit Shelter/Parking Deck project. Spanish Fort is working with Cypress to acquire the property at Spanish Fort Town Center. However, in 2016 the property owners backed out, therefore FTA wants the MPO to finish the Fairhope project before we move onto the next transit project. Daphne is working on agreements to designate specific transit stops.
- SR 181 Widening - The contractor is working on utility relocation.
- US 31 - The contractor is almost done with the utility relocations, and is laying the piping for drainage.
- SR 181 and I-10 Diverging Diamond - The project has been let and has gone out for bid, but has not been awarded. Construction is expected to begin in November.
- TAP Grants FY 19: No TAP grants were awarded in the MPO area.
- 2019 ATPA Conference - Mrs. Sislak stated she is chairing the 2019 Alabama Transportation Planners Conference this year and is looking for sponsors and speakers. She asked if anyone knew of any companies willing to be a sponsor or any speakers.
- HSIP Projects - Mrs. Sislak stated that the Highway Safety Improvement Program is a funding sources through the state that is a 90/10 match. A roundabout at CR 13 and CR 44 was recently awarded funding. Fairhope's HSIP Project for a roundabout at SR 104 at Veterans Road application was misplaced at the state level and has been resubmitted.
- Traffic Incident Management Initiative - FHWA and ALDOT have created ways to improve traffic flow following accidents to improve first responder's response time. Mrs. Sislak will be sending out resources to the Policy Board regarding traffic incident management.
- Mobile River Bridge - The MPO's Long-Range Plan and Transportation Improvement Program will be approved in January including a new cost estimate, the tolling and how it will affect our local roads. The Policy Board will be approving this in January and the Federal Highway will approve the project in February of 2019.
- Planning and Development - Mrs. Katrina Taylor gave an update on the developments and building permits per government in the planning area. This included the third quarter (calendar year) along with the year to date of preliminary plats, final plats and building permits for single-family residential homes in the Metropolitan Planning Area.

OTHER DISCUSSION: Members had concerns of the Daphne Transit Hub being considered behind the Home Depot. Mrs. Sislak informed them she let the Policy Board know their concerns from the July meetings. They suggested the Jubilee Center parking lot as a good location for a transit hub.

## NEXT MPO MEETINGS (All)

- Policy Board Work Session: Wednesday, January 9, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- BPAC Meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 9:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- CAC Meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 1:00 PM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- TAC Meeting: Wednesday, January 16, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- Policy Board Meeting: Wednesday, January 23, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)


## PUBLIC FORUM (All)

- Members of the Public: There were no other members of the public present.
- Members of the Press: There were no members of the press present.
- Board/Committee Members:


## ADJOURNMENT (All)

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. James. Meeting adjourned at 1:58 P.M.

# EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING (TAC) <br> DAPHNE, ALABAMA <br> OCTOBER 17, 2018 <br> 10:00 AM 

## CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE/INVOCATION

$>$ Chairperson Mr. Richard Johnson called the meeting to order at 10:10 A.M.
$>$ Invocation was said by Mrs. Adrienne Jones.
> Pledge was led by Mr. Wayne Dyess.

## ROLL CALL

Mrs. Sarah Hart Sislak, MPO Coordinator, called the roll.
> Members present: Mr. Jeremy Sasser, City of Daphne; Mrs. Adrienne Jones, City of Daphne; Mr. Richard Johnson, City of Fairhope; Mr. Wayne Dyess, City of Fairhope; Mr. Taylor Rider, Baldwin Regional Area Transit System; Mr. Frank Lundy, Baldwin County Highway; Mr. Bill Harbour, Baldwin County Board of Education; Lian Li, Federal Highway Administration (for Clint Andrews).
> Members absent: Mr. Robert Cummings, City of Spanish Fort; Mrs. Casey Gay Williams, Eastern Shore Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Robert Davis, Town of Loxley; Mr. Vince Bebee, ALDOT; Mrs. Pam Caudill, Fairhope Airport Authority; Mr. Patrick Northcutt, Central Baldwin Chamber of Commerce; Greg Smith, City of Robertsdale.
> Others present: Mrs. Sarah Hart Sislak, ESMPO; Mrs. Katrina Taylor, Baldwin County Highway Department.

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mrs. Sislak explained first is the election of Chairman for FY2019.
MOTION: By Mr. Wayne Dyess to nominate Mr. Richard Johnson to serve as Chairman. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Adrienne Jones.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

Mrs. Sislak explained second nomination is the election of Vice Chairman for FY2019.
MOTION: By Mr. Dyess to nominate Mrs. Jones to serve as Vice Chairman. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jeremy Sasser.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None


## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: By Mr. Dyess to approve the April minutes. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Jones.

- Discussion: Mrs. Jones gave the MPO staff some typos that needed to be corrected in the minutes for approval.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: By Mr. Bill Harbour to approve the July minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sasser.

- Discussion: Mrs. Jones found grammatical errors in the minutes that needed to be corrected.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## NEW BUSINESS

1. Action - Adding Projects to the Visionary List (All)

Mrs. Sislak stated that three (3) projects had been submitted by Baldwin County to be added to the Visionary List of the Long Range Transportation Plan. She reminder members that by adding a project to the Visionary List does not commit funding through the MPO or any other source. Mrs. Sislak explained that the widening of CR 64 was previously approved but it was from SR 181 to Austin/Rigsby Road. This is now adding the widening of CR 64 from Austin/Rigsby to CR 54 East. She described the projects to be added to the Visionary List as follows:

- Widening - CR 64 between Rigsby/Austin Road and CR 54 East

Engineers Estimated Cost: \$5,175,000

- Various ADA Compliance Projects

Engineers Estimated Cost: $\$ 450,000$

- CR 32 Bridge Replacement

Engineers Estimated Cost: $\$ 15,000,000$
MOTION: By Mr. Dyess to add the projects to the Visionary List. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Jones.

- Discussion: Mr. Lundy informed the board members that the design of CR 32 bridge and the widening of CR 64 is not complete, to give specifics on the projects. The members suggested sidewalks along CR 64 to reduce the traffic congestion from school pick-up/drop off. The walking school bus program was recommended if sidewalks are installed within walking distance to Baldwin County schools.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

2. Action -State Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (All) Mrs. Sislak explained that the State had requested projects to be included in the TIP. She reminded the committee that no MPO dollars are involved in the following projects:

- Project: 100062414 (RW) I-10/SR-181 I-10 BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT - DELETION
- Project: 100062416 (CN) Federal aid number: DPI I010 I-10. BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT. Old Engineers Estimate: $\$ 266,320,798.00 ;$ New Engineers Estimate: $\$ 806,000,000.00$
- Project: 100068892 Federal aid number: ST-002-042-026 SIGNAL INSTALLATION ON SR-42 (US-98) AT SOUTH DRIVE (CN). Target Start Date: 8/15/2018. Engineers Estimate: \$170,000.00
- Project: 100068893 Federal aid number: ST-002-059-027 (CN). SIGNAL INSTALLATION ON SR-59 AT THE EASTBOUND I-10 OFF RAMP. Target Start Date: 9/15/2018. Engineers Estimate: \$150,000.00
- Project: 100066184 (FM) Federal aid number: NH 0042 (534) RESURFACING SR-42 (US98) FROM D'OLIVE CREEK TO JUST NORTH OF SR-104. Old Target start date: May 31, 2019. New Target start date: November 08, 2019. Engineers Estimate: \$2,564,760.
Mrs. Sislak explained that Project: 100062416 (CN) Federal aid number: DPI I010 I-10. BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT had a cost increase from $\$ 266,320,798.00$ to $\$ 806,000,000.00$. This is due to the old estimate being configured off the current Bayway structure where the new estimate is based on a new elevated structure.

MOTION: By Mr. Dyess to add the state requested amendments to the TIP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sasser.

- Discussion: It was commented that ALDOT resurfaces roads around every ten years.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

3. Action - Revised Resolution Regarding CR34/US98 Signal Installation (All)

Revised Resolution Regarding CR34/US98 Signal Installation (All)
Mrs. Sislak explained that. the Policy Board approved the funding of a signal installation at CR34 and US 98 at a previous meeting. She explained that the installation was initially planned to be included in the on-going Adaptive Signal Installation project, however Baldwin County and the City of Fairhope are requesting to separate this from the Adaptive Signal Installation to receive lower bids. The resolution presented would update the cost of the project, and change the project sponsor to the City of Fairhope.

```
Total Cost: $350,000
MPO: $280,000
City of Fairhope: $70,000
```

MOTION: By Mr. Sasser to add the state requested amendments to the TIP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Taylor Rider.

- Discussion: Fairhope Council meets Monday to approve the $20 \%$ match.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

4. Action - Action - Amendment of FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained the MPO amendment to the TIP includes the cost of designing a roundabout at CR 64/Rigsby Rd and designing the widening of CR 64 from SR 181 to CR 54 East. The county requested that the design be funded with MPO funds while HSIP or other possible funds are pursued for the construction. The Baldwin County Commission will be providing the $20 \%$ local match required for the design.

| Total cost: | $\$ 260,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| MPO: | $\$ 208,000$ |
| County: | $\$ 52,000$ |

MOTION: By Mrs. Jones to add the state requested amendments to the TIP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harbour.

- Discussion: The proposed design finish date is unknown at this time. The roundabout capacity will be known after the design is complete. The design is being planned to capacitate future growth.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 5. Action - Performance Measures PM2 (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that this is the last of the Statewide Performance Measures and Targets for pavement and bridges. This is required by the FAST Act to receive transportation funds. Mrs. Sislak reviewed the performance measures and targets and stated that MPO staff suggests the MPO support the statewide targets.
MOTION: By Mr. Dyess to adopt the Statewide Bridge and Pavement Performance Measurement Targets with the reservation to revisit this action within the next two years to revise different standards. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Jones.

- Discussion: Board members were concerned with the decrease in performance measures from Baldwin County's current pavement and bridge standards. These measures were based off ALDOT's Planning Department on the state wide's pavement and bridge measurements, that is a state wide average, not reflecting Baldwin County's pavement and bridge performance measures. MPO has the option to adopt these measures or create their own. Performance Measures should show improvement and therefore the board members would like to develop new standards. Due to the cost and time of evaluate our current pavement and bridge performance standards, this will be revisited within the next two years.
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 6. Action - Resolutions of Appreciation (All)

Mrs. Sislak stated that MPO staff has prepared two resolutions recognizing and thanking Commissioner Chris Elliott and Commissioner Tucker Dorsey for their contribution and participation on the Eastern Shore MPO Policy Board
MOTION: By Mr. Sasser to adopt the resolutions of appreciation for Commissioner Elliott and Commissioner Dorsey. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harbour.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: None
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed

7. Action - Authorization of ESMPO Coordinator's Pay Increase (All)

Mrs. Sislak explained that her current salary is well below the national and state averages for MPO Coordinators. A 10\% pay increase was requested by her supervisor and approved by the Baldwin County Commission in its FY 2019 budget.
MOTION: By Mr. Taylor to approve the authorization of the ESMPO Coordinator's Pay Increase. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dyess.

- Discussion: None
- Abstain: Mr. James
- In favor: All
- Opposed: None
- Result: Passed


## 8. Informational - Public Transit Plan (All)

Mrs. Sislak presented a draft version of the Public Transit Plan that Mrs. Jennifer Fidler has been working on. The draft version will be sent out electronically to all members for feedback before the January meetings to allow board members time to review and input feedback before the final version is presented in January. Mrs. Fidler will be retiring on October 31, 2018.

## 9. Informational - MPO Coordinator's Report

## Project Update

- Adaptive Signal - The adaptive signal system on US 98 has been collecting data that the contractor is using to calibrate the intersections. At last month's progress meeting, they were $30 \%$ complete with the calibration. \They will be completely done by the end of November and the system will be fully operational by December.
- Public Transit Projects - Fairhope put out an RFQ for the design of the Downtown Transit Shelter/Parking Deck project. Spanish Fort is working with Cypress to acquire the property at Spanish Fort Town Center. However, in 2016 the property owners backed out, therefore FTA wants the MPO to finish the Fairhope project before we move onto the next transit project. Daphne is working on agreements to designate specific transit stops.
- SR 181 Widening - The contractor is working on utility relocation.
- US 31 - The contractor is almost done with the utility relocations, and is laying the piping for drainage.
- SR 181 and I-10 Diverging Diamond - The project has been let and has gone out for bid, but has not been awarded. Construction is expected to begin in November.
- TAP Grants FY 19: No TAP grants were awarded in the MPO area.
- 2019 ATPA Conference - Mrs. Sislak stated she is chairing the 2019 Alabama Transportation Planners Conference this year and is looking for sponsors and speakers. She asked if anyone knew of any companies willing to be a sponsor or any speakers.
- HSIP Projects - Mrs. Sislak stated that the Highway Safety Improvement Program is a funding sources through the state that is a $90 / 10$ match. A roundabout at CR 13 and CR 44 was recently awarded funding. Fairhope's HSIP Project for a roundabout at SR 104 at Veterans Road application was misplaced at the state level and has been resubmitted.
- Traffic Incident Management Initiative - FHWA and ALDOT have created ways to improve traffic flow following accidents to improve first responder's response time. Mrs. Sislak will be sending out resources to the Policy Board regarding traffic incident management.
- Mobile River Bridge - The MPO's Long-Range Plan and Transportation Improvement Program will be approved in January including a new cost estimate, the tolling and how it will affect our local roads. The Policy Board will be approving this in January and the Federal Highway will approve the project in February of 2019.
- Planning and Development - Mrs. Katrina Taylor gave an update on the developments and building permits per government in the planning area. This included the third quarter (calendar year) along with the year to date
of preliminary plats, final plats and building permits for single-family residential homes in the Metropolitan Planning Area.

OTHER DISCUSSION: Members wanted to also add a Resolution of Appreciation for Mrs. Jennifer Fidler upon her retirement.

## NEXT MPO MEETINGS (All)

- Policy Board Work Session: Wednesday, January 9, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- BPAC Meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 9:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- CAC Meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2019; 1:00 PM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- TAC Meeting: Wednesday, January 16, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)
- Policy Board Meeting: Wednesday, January 23, 2019; 10:00 AM; Baldwin County Satellite Courthouse (Fairhope)

PUBLIC FORUM (All)

- Members of the Public: There were no other members of the public present.
- Members of the Press: There were no members of the press present.
- Board/Committee Members:

ADJOURNMENT (All)
Motion to adjourn was made by Mrs. Jones. Meeting adjourned at 11:31 A.M.
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MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Proxy Joe Davis, proxy
for Councilman Ron Scott.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: Here.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Mayor Dane Haygood.
MAYOR DANE HAYGOOD: Present.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Chester Patterson as
proxy for Mayor McMillan
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY CHESTER PATTERSON :
Here.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Councilman Richard
Teal.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER RICHARD TEAL: Here.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Commissioner Chris
Elliott.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Here.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Commissioner Tucker
Dorsey.
COMIMISSLUNER TUCKER DORSEY: Here.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: And Mr. Brain Aaron as
proxy for Mr. Vince Calametti.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER BRIAN AARON: Here.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: You have a full board
today, Mr. Chairman.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Very good. Thank
you.
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```
PROCEEDINGS
```


## CALL TO ORDER/INVOCATION/PLEDGE

```
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Good morning,
everybody. Welcome to this meeting of the Eastern Shore
Metropolitan Planning Organization. I have asked
Commissioner Dorsey to lead us in invocation this morning and Mayor Haygood to lead us in the Pledge.
(Commissioner Tucker Dorsey led in prayer.)
(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Thank you,
gentlemen.
```


## ROLL CALL

```
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Sarah, if you'll do roll call, please
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Mr. Richard Johnson as proxy of Mayor Karin Wilson.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY RICHARD JOHNSON:
Here.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Councilman Jack
Burrell.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Here.
```
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```
EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION 10/24/2018
second that.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: A motion and a
second for Mayor Haygood. Are there any other
nominations?
                                    (No response.)
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay. Then we're
going to close nominations and we're going to vote on
that.
All in favor of Mayor Haygood, say aye.
(Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye"
in unison.)
Ayes: 5 POLICY BOARD MEMBERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey
                    Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack
                    Burrell
4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron
                                    Chester Patterson, Joe Davis
No: 0 Board Members: (None)
MOTION CARRIED
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Congratulations,
Dane.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Thank you
very much, Commissioner.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay. We'll do
    nominations for Vice-Chair. It's a very important role.
And I'll go ahead and open the floor for nominations.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: I'd like to
```
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## Austin and Rigsby. So this will just carry that down to

54 East. And there will be a new elementary school going on the corner of 54 East.

The engineer's estimate is five million, one hundred seventy-five thousand $(\$ 5,175,000)$. And you can see that project submittal form on Page 52.

The next project is various ADA compliance projects. These are from the Transition Plan that was completed for the County. It's various locations thought the county but within the MPO, four hundred fifty thousand dollars $(\$ 450,000)$.

And then, lastly, a bridge replacement on County Road 32 over Fish River. And that has a cost estimate of fifteen million dollars ( $\$ 15,000,000$ ).

And just as a reminder, by placing items on the Visionary List does not commit funding in any way. It's just visionary, just kind of a wish list.

And this was -- all three committees recommended approval for this. And you have your resolution on Page 59.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: I don't know if I'm bold enough to recommend from the floor, but, Joey, you ought to recommend we ought to add the extension of 48 through to Robertsdale at some point on the Visionary List.

```
    There is no way that }104\mathrm{ is getting four-laned in
our lifetime. 32, you're not going to four-lane it. It
costs too much, too long of a run. The only way to
relieve traffic east and west and increase capacity is
getting 48 through there
And I think we have an estimate. Y'all's estimate
is roughly ninety-nine and a half million dollars
($9,500,000), which is achievable in the next four or
five years. But it's got to be -- it's got to be done,
because east and west through Baldwin County is getting
tougher and tougher.
MR. JOEY NUNNALLY: Okay. Just for clarity, do
you want to add that to the Visionary List today, or do
you want to bring it up at the next meeting?
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: I'm glad to
do it today, but I don't know if all these committees
would have to recommend approval or not.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Sarah, do you need
this to run back through the process in order to do it?
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Technically, no.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: All right.
I'll make a motion that we adopt -- that we add these
projects to the Visionary List for the Long Range
Transportation Plan: Widening }64\mathrm{ between Rigsby and
```
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POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY CHESTER PATTERSON
Okay．
MS．SARAH HART SISLAK：－－we＇d be glad to get
it on the next meeting＇s agenda．
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY CHESTER PATTERSON：
Okay．Sounds good．
MS．SARAH HART SISLAK：Okay．
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS：
Mr．Chairman．
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT：Yes．
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS：The
current Visionary List consists of how many projects？
These are ones we＇re adding．Roughly how many do we
currently have？Ba」1park will be fine in terms of the
Visionary List．
POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD：It＇s on the
attached handout．
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS：Oh，it＇s
on this one．
POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD：Uh－huh．
（Indicates affirmatively．）
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS：Okay．
POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD：You＇ll see
it back on the back．The three new projects we＇re
considering now are in red， $\mathrm{B}-9, \mathrm{~B}-10$ ，and $\mathrm{B}-11$ ．
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```
```

    POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: Very
    ```
```

    POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: Very
    good. That answers my question. Thank you. Should have
good. That answers my question. Thank you. Should have
done my homework.
done my homework.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL:
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL:
Mr. Chairman, I have some questions.
Mr. Chairman, I have some questions.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Yes, sir.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Yes, sir.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I'd like
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I'd like
some clarification. Just more for curiosity, the Highway
some clarification. Just more for curiosity, the Highway
32 bridge, why does it need to be replaced? I mean, I
32 bridge, why does it need to be replaced? I mean, I
guess we're not four-laning it. So what is the --
guess we're not four-laning it. So what is the --
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKE゙R DORSE゙Y: Structure.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKE゙R DORSE゙Y: Structure.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: It's a --
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: It's a --
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Lifespan.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Lifespan.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: It's a lifespan
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: It's a lifespan
issue. And, again, it's one of the things that
issue. And, again, it's one of the things that
certain -- inside the MPO, certain projects have got to
certain -- inside the MPO, certain projects have got to
be on the Visionary List, whether they're funded from MPO
be on the Visionary List, whether they're funded from MPO
or not.
or not.
But, Joey, if you would, grab a mic there and see if
But, Joey, if you would, grab a mic there and see if
you can --
you can --
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL：And before
you answer that, just so I get a quick answer, is it the
you answer that, just so I get a quick answer, is it the
same for 48 extension as well; it needs to be on the
same for 48 extension as well; it needs to be on the
Visionary List? Because I don't know that the extension
Visionary List? Because I don't know that the extension
would necessary fall within the MPO's jurisdiction in our

```
would necessary fall within the MPO's jurisdiction in our
```
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```
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: The 48
```

```
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: The 48
estimate was prepared for me this year. And your
estimate was prepared for me this year. And your
projects, not knowing what you sidewalk stuff is, all
projects, not knowing what you sidewalk stuff is, all
that is important.
that is important.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Please report that
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Please report that
back to Mayor McMillan.
back to Mayor McMillan.
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay.
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: All in favor,
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: All in favor,
    signify by saying aye?
    signify by saying aye?
(Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye"
(Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye"
                                    in unison.)
                                    in unison.)
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Opposed?
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Opposed?
                (No response.)
                (No response.)
Ayes: 5 POLICY bOARD mEMBERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
Ayes: 5 POLICY bOARD mEMBERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
                    Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
                    Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
                    Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack
                    Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack
    4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron
    4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron
    4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron
    4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron
No: 0 Board Members: (None)
No: 0 Board Members: (None)
MOTION CARRIED
MOTION CARRIED
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion carries
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion carries
unanimously. Thank you.
unanimously. Thank you.
    ACTION - STATE REQUESTED AMENDMENTS TO THE TRANSPIRATION_
    ACTION - STATE REQUESTED AMENDMENTS TO THE TRANSPIRATION_
                IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) (ALL)
                IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) (ALL)
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Next item is State
```

```
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Next item is State
```

```
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motion is a second to approve the -- the adding of some

```
motion is a second to approve the -- the adding of some
projects to the Visionary List.
projects to the Visionary List.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I've got one
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I've got one
question --
question --
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Yes, sir.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Yes, sir.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: --
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: --
Mr. Chairman. So are we amending this to add the Spanish
Mr. Chairman. So are we amending this to add the Spanish
Fort items yet or --
Fort items yet or --
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: No.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: No.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: -- make
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: -- make
another motion, or is that --
another motion, or is that --
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: NO, sir. I --
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: NO, sir. I --
would envision -- I would -- envision. I would expect
would envision -- I would -- envision. I would expect
y'all would probably add that at a subsequent meeting.
y'all would probably add that at a subsequent meeting.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Okay.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Okay.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Chester and them,
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Chester and them,
they're going to need some more time to put some
they're going to need some more time to put some
estimates together.
estimates together.
    And I think our estimate on the 48 project is
    And I think our estimate on the 48 project is
pretty -- pretty good to go ahead and do that from the
pretty -- pretty good to go ahead and do that from the
floor. But I think y'all probably would need more
floor. But I think y'all probably would need more
details on numbers for the other projects. Although I'm
details on numbers for the other projects. Although I'm
very supportive of them, and the Policy Board would be as
very supportive of them, and the Policy Board would be as
well. We just need some numbers.
well. We just need some numbers.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Thank you.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Thank you.
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## amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program.

These are handed down by the State and are required to be added to our TIP, which is your four-year plan list.

None of these projects are funded from MPO funds
They're from other funding sources. I'll just run through them quickly.

The deletion of the right-of-way for the Bayway widening. We have construction of the Bayway widening from Mobile County Line to 98 at Spanish Fort.

Old engineer's estimate is two hundred sixty-six million $(\$ 266,000,000)$, to the new engineer's estimate of eight hundred and six million $(\$ 806,000,000)$, and that is due to the fact that initially ALDOT planned to add on to the existing structure; whereas, now it will be a completely new structure.

Signal installation on US 98 at South Drive, a signal installation on 59 at the eastbound I-10 off ramp there at LoxLey, the resurfacing of US 98 from D'Olive Creek just north of 104, resurfacing I-10 from 59 to point-three (.3) miles east of the Wilcox Road. That is construction and PE. And then we have the design of the Bayway widening as well on there.

And we did have some questions about the resurfacing of 98 from D'Olive Creek to just north of 104. I did speak with Brian about that. It was last surfaced in
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2012. And it is showing areas with cracks and areas of wear and tear that they feel needs to be addressed. And it's kind of coming around into their normal cycle of resurfacing.

Would you like to add anything to that, Brian?
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY BRIAN AARON: No. So
other than just adding to there was some question
regarding the adaptive signal work that's happened out there.

And I expressed to Sarah that a lot of those
components that are in the actual roadway can be actually
pulled back up and reused in the new asphalt. So we're
not, you know, having to incur additional cost as a
result of that.
So those -- those units have 10 -year battery lives
on them, so they should be good for quite a while.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Good.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: And all three
committees did recommend approval for these items. And you can see the resolution on Page 51.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I make a
motion that we approve the requested amendments to the 2016/2019 TIP program.

MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion from
Councilman Burrell.
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    POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: Second.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Second from
Councilman Davis. Any further discussion?
                                    (No response.)
                            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: All in favor?
(Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye"
                                    in unison.)
Ayes: 5 POLICY BOARD MEMBERS:-Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
                                    Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack
                                    Burrell
            4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron,
                                    Chester Patterson, Joe Davis
No: 0 Board Members: (None)
MOTION CARRIED
*)
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion carries.
    Thank you.
            ACTION - REVISED RESOLUTION REGARDING CR34/US98 SIGNAL
                                    INSTALLATION (ALL)
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay. The next item is
a resolution. This a revised resolution of a project
that you-all approved a couple months ago. And this is
the signal installation at County Road 34 an US 98.
Initially we had tried to get this project let under
the adaptive signal contract. However, that brought back
some very high estimates from the contractor.
```
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | funding resolution to match the grant. |
| 2 | MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay. Very good. |
| 3 | So a motion is in order for 2019-03. <br> POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I make a |
| 4 |  |
| 5 | motion for signal installation at County Road 34 and |
| 6 | Highway 98. |
| 7 | MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion by |
| 8 | Councilman Burrell. |
| 9 | POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY RICHARD JOHNSON: |
| 0 | Second. |
| 1 | MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: I have a second. |
| 2 | All in favor? |
| 3 | (Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye" |
| 4 | in unison.) |
| 5 6 | Ayes: 5 POLICY bOARD MEMBERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey, Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack Burrell |
| 7 | 4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron, Chester Patterson, Joe Davis |
|  | No: 0 Board Members: (None) |
|  | MOTION CARRIED <br>  |
| 0 |  |
| 1 | MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion carries. |
| 2 | Thank you. |
| 4 | ACTION - AMENDMENT OF FY 2016-2019 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT |
| 5 | PLAN (ALL) |

SUSAN C. ANDREWS, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER NO. 287


MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: The next item is
amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program using MPO dollars.

This is going to be for the design of the
construction of a roundabout at County Road 64 and Rigsby
Road, and the widening of County Road 64 from 181 to County Road 54 East.

This comes in at two hundred and sixty thousand $(\$ 260,000)$. And you have the Federal funds spreadsheet in your packet on Page 70 that just kind of gives you an overview of how -- what we have in our bank account. We have plenty of money to cover this, obviously.

All three committees recommended for approval. And you can see that resolution on Page 72. And this is just for the design.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Can I ask one question? What's the widening -- how many lanes are we talking about adding -- adding there, Joey?

MR. JOEY NUNNALLY: To be completely honest, I mean, the design hasn't began yet. I mean, that's what we want to do. So when we get into the numbers and volumes and stuff, we'll -- we'll look at that.

It's probably going to be exactly what you have on the -- on the west side, which is, I guess, that's a -that's a three-lane section.
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instead of setting our own. You can see those on Page
74.
    I will say the BPAC and the Citizens Committee did
recommend approval. The TAC did recommend approval, but
they would like to revisit this item in two years.
    They felt like the numbers were low and not very
good targets. They felt like we were not really setting
goals, I guess you could say. So that was the
recommendation from the Technical Committee. You can see
that resolution on Page 74.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay, gentlemen.
I understand that this includes Mayor Haygood's request
that we delineate just whose performance standards these
are. So a motion is in order.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I move that
we approve the performance management measures and
targets for the urbanized area as required by the FAST
Act.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay. I have a
motion.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Second.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion and a
second. Very good. Any further discussion?
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY RICHARD JOHNSON:
Mr. Chairman, I -- I will report from the Technical
```
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Advisory Committee. When you see the word "performance," usually that's an indication that you're trying to do better.

And, for example, if you look at the -- the standard right now statewide is non-interstate pavement in good,
we're at sixty-six-point-two-three percent (66.23\%). Our two-year target is not to be less than forty percent (40\%).

Now, and my comment was if our school system
announced that 6 th grade math scores were at
seventy-eight percent (78\%) and our performance target
was not to be below fifty percent (50\%) two years in the
future, I think a lot of folks would have grief with
that. And that's just a concern.
And -- and the other question that maybe Mr. Aaron
can explain, the question was we did not know what the
implication of adopting these performance standards were
like for the local jurisdictions.
As the City of Fairhope, being a member of the MPO, you know, is there a requirement eventually that we're going to have to evaluate our roadways that are non-interstate and rank those as good or poor and --
and -- and -- and -- and meet this?
And this if that's the case, maybe these lower
performance standards in the future are a benefit. But
eastern shore metropolitan planning organization 10/24/2018
They could be whatever standards we decide that they are.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Right. That's correct.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY RICHARD JOHNSON: I
understand. Yes, sir.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: So for the
sake of the meeting requirement, we're just adopting
these for now.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY RICHARD JOHNSON:
Yes, sir.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Every --
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Mayor, if you can
kind of share some of your initial concerns. Because you've had concerns over this from the beginning.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Well, and, really, it dates back to some safety standards we had that really quantified number of deaths. And it was unclear maybe when you read the resolution that we previously adopted for those safety standards, the amount of deaths that we found acceptable.

And it didn't really indicate that that was a
statewide number. And I thought that was sort of
alarming. So I wanted to make sure we incorporated
either by -- by reference or -- or stating at least where those safety standards were derived from.

And I think the same thing here. I think the
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that was a concern that we had and would like to next
time, I think, in two years, if we have to readopt
something of this nature, to have that better vetted out.
And if it is a performance standard, it's our goal to be
better. And that's kind of the concern.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Got you.
    Brian?
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY BRIAN AARON: & am
unprepared to be able to answer those questions. I will
have to do some homework.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: SO, I
understand -- Mr. Chairman, may I speak?
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Yes, sir.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: So that I
understand that, Richard, is there are -- we are -- we're
required to adopt the standards. I mean, the FAST Act
requires us to. So we're going to just go ahead and
adopt the statewide standards now.
    But the Technical Advisory Committee is saying that
we need to stay on top of this and possibly have better
minimum standards. I think that's what you're saying?
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY RICHARD JOHNSON:
I -- I think that would be worth --
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: And that's
okay. We can -- we can -- We have to adopt standards.
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But don't raise the requirements in here and find
ourselves in a spot where we're exempting ourselves from
Federal funding.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Further
discussion?
                    (No response.)
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: I have a motion
    and a second. All in favor?
    (Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye"
        in unison.)
Ayes: 5 POLICY BOARD MEMBERS.
        Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack
        Burrell
            4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron,
                Chester Patterson, Joe Davis
No: 0 Board Members: (None)
MOTION CARRIED
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion carries.
    Thank you very much.
            ACTION - RESOLUTIONS OF APPRECIATION (ALL)
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Let's skip Item 6
for now, Sarah, and get through with business anyway.
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: This is business.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: We'll skip it and
    come back to it.
```
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No: 0 Board Members: (None)
MOTION CARRIED
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Thank you.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Sarah, you have
done a very good job. We really appreciate it. You've
picked up the ball and ran with it.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Thank you.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: And anything that
got through budget this year was a small miracle, from an
increase standpoint.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Thank y'all. I
appreciate it.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Absolutely.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: You do an
outstanding job.
INFORMATIONAL - PUBLIC TRANSIT PLAN (ALL)
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Item 8, if you
would, please.
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay. Item 8 is a
Public Transit Plan presentation. So Jennifer has worked
really hard on putting this Public Transit Plan together.
So she's going to give a short presentation to you-all
about the Transit Plan.
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    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: I figure you want
to get to Item 7.
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Yes, that's fine, too.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay.
        ACTION - AUTHORIZATION OF ESMPO COORDINATOR'S PAY INCREASE_
                                    (ALL)
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay. Item 7, this is
authorization of a pay increase for the ESMPO
Coordinator, me.
            My salary was well -- yeah, was well below the State
and national averages, compared to other coordinators.
So my supervisor, my boss, recommended me for a raise.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: So moved.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Second.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion and a
second. Any discussion?
                                    (No response.)
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: All in favor?
(Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye"
                                    in unison.)
                        ERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
                        Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack
                        Burrell
    4 POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron,
                                    Chester Patterson, Joe Davis
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            MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: So, you know, in the
beginning, we talked about this Public Transit Plan. And
this is one of the requirements -- It's not really a
requirement, but it's something that -- one of the
objectives of the -- the Metropolitan Planning
Organization.
    So in the beginning, we had several goals and
    objectives. And these include to help provide some
relief to traffic congestion, to provide a means of
transportation for disabled or for those that are in
temporary or permanent need of transportation, to help
move people conveniently, efficiently, reliably, and
safely, to develop short- an long-term goals, and to meet
and follow guidelines set forth by the Federal Highway
Administration,
            The objectives were to increase ridership. This is
Section 1.2 on the board. Part of those was to identify
factors and reasons why riders are not using public
transit; to identify ways to encourage ridership; to
identify transportation needs of the ESMPO; to solicit
and provide participation for transportation planning;
and then consider ideas for the public input, to have
their input concerning transportation improvement.
            So the goals and objectives forced us or made us
look into how can we consider input. The first page of
```
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this is the table of contents, which includes the main parts of the plan, is to look at existing the
transportation system, to look at what our needs are, and to look at possible suggestions and possible solutions.

So I'll just go over this real quickly so you can get an overview of the plan. And I'm not going to go into detail.

But the first -- one of the first parts is to look
at the existing routes. So each part of Section 2 is looking at each existing route that we have and putting each route in this section.

It also talks about the funding and budget that's available, the 5307 funds, 5311 funds, funds that we use through private means, fund that we use through the County, Baldwin County.

We talk about our existing route ridership, and for each route what our ridership is. We have a table that goes from FY -- Fiscal Year 11 -- 2011 to 2018.

In this section, we really -- I really wanted to have how much the cost of services were for each route. We do have -- BRATS does have a breakdown for the entire services, how much the cost of service is for the entire countywide, all routes, but we do not have it broken down per route.

So that may be something we might be able to add to
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## budgetary information that BRATS is using.

It includes the Eastern Shore Chamber of Commerce
Public Transportation Plan Outreach Survey done in 2008,
the -- our transit needs survey that we just completed
with a detailed version.
We also included -- What was one of the most
interesting things about the survey was that in the first nine (9) or ten (10) days, we received a hundred and ninety-three (193) surveys electronically. And some of those were vastly different from the end of the survey.

So I did include those, several of the questions just so you can see the difference of the people who electronically submitted in those first ten (10) days versus at the very end of the survey, when we included a lot of BRATS riders. Also, the survey includes the bicycle and pedestrian concept that was done in 2015.

And that's a summary of the plan. It's a hundred and forty-eight (148) pages long. So it's a great reading material for bedtime. And maybe we'll gain a little bit of information for what we might be able to do with BRATS in the future.

MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Thanks, Jennifer.
I know you put a lot of work into that.
I -- I would encourage the Policy Board to really
take the time to look through this thing. The -- the
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the plan through this draft version. But right now it's
not in there.
The survey results came in. We did a transit
survey, trying to solicit the public's input. So we do
have a detailed version of all survey results. And every
time someone said anything, it's in this plan. It's in a
printed version in the plan in Section 3.
    We interviewed -- In Section 3.5, we did an
interview of the BRATS Director and the staff to get
their opinion and what they thought needed to happen.
And we basically asked some of the same survey questions,
just in a little bit more detail.
    The short -- we suggested short-term possibilities.
And then in section 4.2, we also suggested long-term
suggestions.
    We looked at, in Section 5.5, existing
transit-related surveys and studies. We even included a
couple of these in the back. Most notable is the last
one that was made, the last study that was done, a very
comprehensive study that BRATS is using today.
    There is -- 5.1 has a list of resources, additional
resources we used. And then we have a list of
appendixes. This goes over the acronyms and the
abbreviations that we use, the function of the ESMPO,
laws, lots of different things. It also includes
```
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decide what it is Fairhope City, what it is Daphne City, what it is Spanish Fort City and Loxley City has as your need and where you want the transit system to go.

We're spending approximate five and a half million dollars $(\$ 5,500,000)$ a year on this system. The lion's share of that is Federal money, which I know everybody is more inclined to use, but it's still an awful lot of taxpayer money going for something that is -- that I think could be more efficient with -- with some better direction and leadership.

So I just would encourage -- you know, my parting
challenge, I guess, would be to encourage y'all to look
at what it is you want out of this and -- and really grab
hold of it and -- and give the Commission some direction
on how we can better serve the municipalities.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL:
Mr. Chairman, do you -- you don't envision it going away,
though, do you, just maybe changing?
mpo Chairman chris elliott: I don't

## envision --

POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Any threat
of it going away?
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: I don't envision
it going away. And -- and, again, that's largely because
of the significant amount of the -- the Federal funding
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the facts from this past year, the previous year.
            Are there some efficient routes in there, though,
that are --
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: Well, from --
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: -- utilized
maybe as is hoped for? I mean, like, say, the Fairhope
to Mobile, you know, the -- the station that we have
there --
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: You're going to see the
numbers in there that --
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: From
Fairhope Avenue to --
    MS. JENNIEER FIDLER: You're going to see --
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I see a lot
of cars there.
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: You will see the
readership per route.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Okay.
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: And when you look at your
funding and your revenues, which is also in there, the
revenues for contract routes, which there is a
description of all the routes, you know, what they're
classified as, you're going to start -- it's going to
make sense to you.
    Because I would say -- And it's not black and
```

```
that's received for the -- for the service.
    But, Councilman, what strikes me is -- I mean, it --
it is amazing to me just how unbelievably inefficient it
is.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Oh, yeah.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: And -- and -- and
for the -- the purpose that is there, which it's
currently being used for, I think there are much more
efficient options out there.
The -- the question is, in its current iteration, is
there -- is there a way for that to be -- to be better
utilized by the municipalities or with some vision for
it.
    You know, the County's got the service. But I don't
know that the County is the right -- the right visionary
for an urbanized transit system. We don't -- we don't
think in urban, you know -- we just don't think urban.
We are -- we think sixty (60), eighty (80) foot
right-of-way and, you know -- and get traffic moving down
the road. And -- and long-range, our -- our -- our
vision is different than what y'all have in Fairhope and
Daphne and Spanish Fort and Loxley.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: So the --
And -- and forgive me, because I have not read that plan.
And I'm assuming that the information may be in there, or
```
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        white -- that our cost per rider is less in that bus if
        we're on a contract route or a festival route.
            And it's going to be more cost per rider -- And
talking cost for us, Federal Government, the County
Government. It's going to be more on the demand-response
route like Baylinc, Northlinc.
    And it's going to -- you're going to see that when
you read the plan. I mean, you'll -- but I do not have
it broken out in a way -- and that's because I haven't
been able to get that from BRATS, because they don't --
they don't keep those numbers that way.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: They're
going to start.
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: They don't collect --
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: BRATS'
numbers are not exactly accurate, especially under
contract routes. We've got a major, major malfunction
going on out there with personnel and leadership.
    But we've -- BRATS is complicated. It's not just a
bus system running a route. We are a rural -- rural bus
system, but we do have two urban areas that we've got to
satisfy; one being the Eastern Shore, which is more
commuter-based than a more traditional bus system. The
beach is a little bit different with its -- with its
influx of people in the summer.
```
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We, BRATS, have not done a good job of managing the south end very well. We have not taken advantage of some opportunities.

But when you look at the different types of things, festivals -- the festivals that we run, Arts and Crafts, Shrimp Festival, those things, people are getting on, paying two bucks (\$2), going two (2) miles. Those are -that's a great weekend for us, and us being BRATS.

The commuter routes, Baylinc has done well in the past. Ridership across all sectors has fallen off. Baylinc has not been as reliable as people had wanted it to be. So they just decided to drive themselves

That's an operational problem. When I say folks, it's leadership at the BRATS level is a challenge that Joey and that Commission have

The demand-response is a service that is an Uber service that we are required to give. Is it never going to pay for itself. It is part of what the rural transportation requirements are for us to receive Federal money to stand it up.

The private school routes has been grossly
overestimated with ridership. The cost for those routes has not been borne by the -- the schools.

They're in the process of reconfiguring that to make sure that, you know, that the County Government, the
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done a great job getting involved with that. And you guys on the new Commission understands what some of the challenges are there

And it -- everybody is motivated to see it do better
and -- and move forward. There's no -- there's no interest in shutting it down and saying, thanks very much.

Our community is going to continue to grow,
especially on the Eastern Shore, exponentially. We've got to figure out how to make a public transit system work. It will not be same level of Atlanta or New York, but it can help relieve traffic and help commuter routes be more efficient.

And I'm sorry for carrying on about that, but it's important. It's something that we are -- that we've been working on very hard this year.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: I'm going to
go ahead, if I may, Mr. Chairman, and extend the
conversation. I'm sorry for taking everybody's time.
But if you're saying we're going to have to take the lead
in this, I want to ask a couple questions.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Sure.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: So we are
basically an -- an on-call, on-demand service as well.
Is there a minimum requirement for somebody that utilizes

## Federal Government aren't pays -- and the State

 Government aren't paying to send private school kids to school, which we have been. Because it's been -- it has been inaccurately reported, is the -- is the best way to say it.So we're in the process of fixing that. We have the infrastructure. We have the equipment and the people in place to be able to facilitate those routes. But the schools need to completely pay for those routes. I mean, we're coming to figuring out the cost of those.

And then contract work has been okay. We lost our biggest contract this year with the ARC, which is the mentally handicap route. And that's a big influx that caused us to relook at our budget systems.

Because we lose a three hundred thousand dollar $(\$ 300,000)$ contract, but at the same time, they're asking us to supplement another almost twenty percent (20\%) for the operation of the -- of the BRATS system is what set all the alarm bells going off.

So we're not -- we've got to rethink the way this is. And when you talk about vision, currently the leadership is just following the rules and doing what we've always done. I -- I hate it as much as anybody else does in government.

But I think the conversation has started. Joey has
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```
that and -- and because of the Federal funding, can you
implement some kind of minimum requirements, such as a --
I don't know. Kind of thinking of a -- of a -- of a card
that somebody has to obtain before they can get on there.
And they have to have minimum income or age or handicap
or some kind of requirement. Is there anything like
that?
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Federal
funding for transportation is for everybody. And if
you -- and we do have customers that have to go to
dialyses once a week. We pick them up every week and
take them to dialyses. We are their transportation.
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Yes.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: If I want to
get a ride from Fairhope and Orange Beach, can I call
BRATS and have them take me down there
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: They will
work within their schedule. It will not be pick me up at
two and --
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Okay.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: It's not --
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: The short answer
is yes. It may not be, you know, pick me up at 10:15 and
I need to be there by 11. But -- but and there are
certain routes that they run fairly frequently. And I --
```
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```
Joey, if you could, the demand-response side of this, I
mean, it's pretty à la carte, isn't it?
    MR. JOEY NUNNALLY: Yes. It's à la carte. I
mean, now, again, there's designated route that we run,
whether that be Baylinc or Northlinc or, you know, these
different lincs that we run constantly on a daily basis,
educational routes. We serve mental health, Council on
Aging. We serve all these routes daily.
But if you call BRATS and say, hey, I want to go
from Point A to Point B, they'll schedule you in. If you
call ahead of time, enough ahead of time, they can work
with you a lot better on your times. That's what the
dialysis piece --
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: But the
expense is if I'm the only one who calls, they required
to take me, you know, subject to maybe some time
limitations. But I may be the only passenger; whereas,
they're not going to make that route if I don't call.
    MR. JOEY NUNNALLY: That's correct.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: That's correct.
And that's one of the things we've been pushing, is to --
to find a way to meet that goal, but to do so much more
efficiently --
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: That's real
smart.
```
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MR. JOEY NUNNALLY: That is correct. And --
and one of the requirements is that the origination point
has to be in Baldwin County, not necessarily the
destination point, but the origination point has to be in Baldwin County.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: 1 mean, I
can see a whole work session on this topic so we can understand this better. I think this is alarming to some of us.

It's Federal -- it's Federal regulations, you know, coming down. But I don't think it meets the common-sense test. And hopefully there's some things that can be tweaked.

But -- but I will tell you we've had some good
conversations just with trying to establish drop-off locations in the past.

I think there is certainly a desire, longer term, you know, to try to get us to a -- what I'd call a semi-fixed route, you know, move around between the main points of interest where the public is congregating. You know, your parks are great hubs of activity, your shopping centers, your grocery stores and other public areas.

And, certainly, it's got to be throughout the, you
know, the urbanized areas for the Eastern Shore MPO. If
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    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT -- than driving a
30-passenger bus around. You can imagine, you've been
around Commissioner Dorsey and I enough to know that that
just flies all over us.
                            POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Well, as a
taxpayer, that's just absurd.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: It is. It is. So
we've been pushing for some efficiencies there.
I guess my point to the MPO as -- as a whole and --
and to the Municipalities, is there is a -- there is an
organization there that is underutilized, in -- in my
view.
And to the extent to which y'all can -- coop may be
the wrong word -- but can really try to put your brand on
it, what you need from it, and to -- to the use of your
urbanized transit, then please do so.
    We -- we'd like tor it to be better utilized than it
is, and for a purpose that serves this -- this MPO better
than what we've currently got.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Can I ask
one quick followup question on that? So is the -- the
standard that if the point of origination and point of
destination or within the service area of the rural
transportation service, then we're required to -- to
transport even on just a single user making that request?
```
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## you've got somebody who wants to get from, you know,

 Eastern Shore Centre in Spanish Fort and go down and have lunch or, you know, go see the bay in Fairhope, you know, we've got to be able -- And that would be great to enable some ridership to do that and other points along the way.But it's got to be reliable. And if it's not reliable, it won't get utilized. So I hope we can move to that.

You know, that's a -- that's a change and maybe a paradigm to depart from, a paradigm shift that we've got to figure out how to hit enough points where you can hop on and hop off and make sure, though, that the route isn't too long so you can move around the -- the entire Eastern Shore.

I think there's support from everybody to do that. But I think we'll have to learn as we go, because we're not experts in the subject matter. And I think there'll be some -- some gains and some misses along the way.

MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Well, as
Commissioner Dorsey alluded to this earlier, there was -there was a study done in the south end of the county between Gulf Shores and Orange Beach and Foley, which we thought might be a better place to start with the fixed route systems, especially given the tourists that were there and didn't want to move their car out of the
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parking lot, you know, the condo to get to the next place, et cetera.

Ultimately, that didn't bear any fruit. I think
that was a lack of -- a lack of, frankly, leadership on
the County's part and then, you know, some frustration on
the -- on the side of the Municipalities.
But that might be a good place to start, a good template to start with for -- for the Eastern Shore to start looking at it again.

And -- and it may be something that we're just not ready for yet. But I think that y'all have a better vision for the needs of your respective, you know, communities than -- than we do at the County level.

We just -- we're meeting the needs of a rural
transit organization. There is an opportunity to make this something for your municipalities, to serve y'all better. You've just got to grab it by the horns. POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS:

Mr. Chairman, if I could, having sat in on a number of these since January -- The County Commission, existing Commission, has been very helpful in letting up potential new people be involved along the way.

What I think, as a citizen, $I$ currently don't need BRATS, so I'm frequenting BRATS, communicating with the people that do need the service. I'm not real sure we're 2200 US HIGHWAY 98, SUITE 4, PMB 230, DAPHNE, ALABAMA 36526
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```
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Sure.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: It's a good place
to start.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER RICHARD TEAL: Need to ask
a question. I was going to see if we can get somebody to
explain to us what all -- This is my have first --
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Sure.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER RICHARD TEAL: -- dealings
with BRATS. And -- and I really never thought of it.
And the first thing that popped into my mind is they're a
24-hour service for people just to be picked up? I was
like I don't see that very profitable at all. Somebody
just come in and explain it to us.
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Sure. I will be glad
to facilitate that.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: I may come back
for that meeting.
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: And this plan will be
presented electronically for y'all to review. We didn't
want to print all hundred and sixty (160) something
pages. But it will be sent out this afternoon to y'all
to kind of start reviewing.
    But I will get that -- a meeting set up so y'all
can -- Because it is very complex, what you're allowed to
do and what you're not allowed to do and what we offer,
```
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what BRATS offers right now. So --
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: And I encourage
y'all to ask questions and dig a little bit. The more
I -- you know, the more we dug, the more we found. So
I'd encourage you to continue to ask questions. Okay?
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: And that'll be up
for y'all's approval later -- I guess next year, first of
next year.
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Correct. This is still
draft stage. So we will bring it back probably in
January or April for final adoption. But, obviously, we
want feedback and recommendations from y'all.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Could you
possibly send us a link so we can access the draft?
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Yes.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay. Any further
comments on that?
    (No response.)
    INFORMATIONAL - MPO COORDINATOR'S REPORT
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Next up, MPO
Coordinator's report.
```

```
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    And as far as I know, Daphne is still reviewing
environmental documents and requirements, kind of getting
that together for what -- for moving their stops forward.
```


## SR 181 WIDENING

```
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: The 181, the widening,
they're still working on utilities on that. But as far as I know, they're still on schedule.
```


## US 31

```
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: 31, still working on utilities, but they are laying the drainage pipes as utilities are relocated.
```


## SR 181 AND I-10, DIVERGING DIAMOND

```
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: And 181, the diverging diamond, this was let in August. The project has gone out for bid. But as far as I have been told, it has not been awarded.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Yeah, it has.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY BRIAN AARON: We did
get an -- we did get an award letter on that, so --
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY BRIAN AARON: -- that
is moving forward. So we can expect construction to
```
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ROJECT UPDATE
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay. First we have
the project update.
```


## ADAPTIVE SIGNAL

```
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: The adaptive signal system, construction is complete. They have been calibrating the system. The system has been collecting data. And they are now using that data to calibrate the timings and things.
And I actually saw them out there this morning.
They're expected to have that complete by the end of November. So it should be fully operational by December.
```


## PUBLIC TRANSIT PROJECTS - FAIRHOPE, SPANISH FORT, DAPHNE

```
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Public transit
projects, Fairhope has been awarded their grant. We're working on a lease right now. But they have been approval to move forward with selecting a design engineer.
Spanish Fort, after speaking with FTA, they told us they kind of -- they'd like us to get Fairhope going, because of what happened with Spanish Fort last time. So we're going to get Fairhope on their way, and then we will be working with Spanish Fort.
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start probably somewhere after Thanksgiving, start seeing
some signs go up.
    2019 ATPA CONFERENCE_- SPONSORSHIP INTEREST
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Okay. And no one was
awarded FY19 TAP grant award in our member governments.
So we'll try again in 2020.
```


## HSIP PROJECTS

```
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: The highway safety projects, the County was awarded two million dollars \((\$ 2,000,000)\) for highway safety improvement funds for a roundabout at County Road 13 and County Road 44.
The City of Fairhope, we had a meeting on Monday about their application for the roundabout at Veterans Memorial on 104 and 98 right there at the floral clock.
They are going to work on design. As far as we know, that should be moving along with no problem. Their application had gotten lost in the change of safety engineers at the State and Federal level.
But now they're moving that along, as far as I know. And I will followup on that to make sure it doesn't get lost again.
```

```
                                    STATE TSMO PLAN
```

```
                                    STATE TSMO PLAN
```
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MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: The state TSMO Plan, this is the Transportation Management Operation Plan. ALDOT has asked us -- me -- to get with you all and your team members and encourage y'all to get involved in this plan.

There hasn't been much involvement and cooperation. So they just asked that you please give feedback on things that are working in your operations.

It is going to be a technology-based solution, is what they're focusing on. They e-mailed and said, please have staff -- if they get e-mails from Daniel Driskell, to try and participate in any way that they can with that plan.

## TRAFFIC INCIDENT MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE

MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Traffic incident
management, I can show you right now what those are,
placing emphasis on working together with all entities to kind of improvement traffic incident management, getting those incidents cleared quicker, so disabled vehicles, crashes, and things like.

So I will be sending out -- this afternoon, I'll be sending out some resources for you to share with first responders and other entities that are involved in traffic incidents to try to decrease the delay time 2200 US HIGHWAY 98, SUITE 4, PMB 230, DAPHNE, ALABAMA 36526
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on one-fourteen-point-eight (114.8) acres as a
preliminary plat. Riverwood is located off Highway 90.
It's actually in the county, but the City of Daphne
permitted it.
Diamante, Phase I, came in. Sixty-one (61) lots on thirty-seven-point-four-five (37.45) acres came in as a final. Saint Augustine, Phase IV, twenty-five (25) lots on sixteen-point-eight (16.8) acres as a preliminary plat. Saint Augustine is also located in the county, but the City of Daphne permitted it.

Old Field, Phase 3-B, ninety (90) lots on twenty-five-point-seven-seven (25.17) acres. And it came in as a final. So, altogether, Daphne had a hundred and thirty-one (131) preliminary plats and a hundred and fourteen (114) tinal plats.

Fairhope had Twin Beech Estates, Phase II, come in. Seventy-two (72) lots on twenty-two-point-six-eight (22.68) acres as a preliminary. Twin Beech Estates is located off Twin Beech near Highway 181.

They had Old Battles Place, Phase V, come in, which
is ninety-four (94) units on forty-point-eight-nine (40.89) acres as final. That's a big apartment complex on the corner of Battles and Highway 3.

And then Reid Mixed Used Development, twenty-one (21) units came in as a final. This is located in
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## associated with accidents, basically.

The Mobile River bridge update, we did meet with Federal Highway and ALDOT and the Mobile MPO a couple weeks ago. And we do know what we need to do on our end to make sure we get the bridge in our plans.

We have to do some modelling updating. We'll be working on that. We'll be bringing that back in January for approval. And we expecting to sign off on that on February the 24 th.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT UPDATE (J. FIDLER)
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: And then Ms. Jennifer
Fidler is going to give her planning and development update.

MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: While she's -- while she's getting that up, you should all have the spreadsheet in front of you. Okay. So in the third quarter, July, August, and September, we're going to start with the City of Daphne.

Okay. Daphne had Winged Foot, Phase II-A, come in; Winged Foot, Phase II-B, come in. Those are both final plats, twenty-five (25) lots on six-point-eight-five (6.85) acre and twenty-eight (28) lots to
ten-point-three-six (10.36) acres.
They had Riverwood Estate come in, sixteen (16) lots
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## most final plats that came in at a hundred and fifteen

 (115). Daphne had a hundred and fourteen (114), and Fairhope had a hundred and fifteen (115).So this is the spreadsheet. You have this in your hand. It is a comprehensive look at all of them and how they compare with each other.

And then the last -- the last slide is going to be just a different spreadsheet. And you have that in your hand as well.

So there's -- there was two hundred and seventy-four (274) residential permits that came in, building permits that came in for third quarter for everyone. That's down about seventeen percent ( $1 / \frac{\%}{\sigma}$ ) from last quarter.

And then you'lı be able to see the -- the number of preliminary plats online and final plats online and building permits online on that second spreadsheet. We're having a hard time getting it up, but you have that spreadsheet in your hand.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Jennifer, I appreciate the work on that. I think you've done an outstanding job compiling this and figuring out how you get your data. May I make a couple suggestions?

MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: Sure.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: On this
spreadsheet right here, if we could change the word
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with some density questions and concerns. But it was really odd. And I'm glad to see this data. It really helps keep your eye on the county as a whole and what's going on around you.

But, you know, with a couple of their subdivisions
a hundred and three (103) lots on twenty-nine (29) acres, a little over three (3) units an acre, you know, comparing a couple of these that were in the ETJ in Daphne, sixteen (16) units on a hundred and fourteen (114) acres.

It's just interesting to see the different flavors of development, but also to see how -- how things relate in terms of what projects get attention and what's really happening within -- within the whole urbanized area.

So it is great data. And kudos to you really taking the horns on that one and to pull it all together.

I know it's difficult. But it's a -- it's a great tool. If you weren't doing it, we wouldn't have this data. So thank you.

MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: Thank you. I did want to bring your attention to one spot. The last slide, I just pulled the preliminary plats together for the first quarter and the second quarter and the third quarter and how they compared to each other.

So there was one thousand, two hundred and
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```
"density" to "area" and if we were to add a column that
is truly density, which would be the number of units
divided by area.
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: The number of units
divided by area.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: So some of
the subdivisions -- what Baldwin County has generally
experienced over the last twenty (20) something years is
two-point-four (2.4) to two-point-six (2.6) units per
acre.
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: Uh-huh. (Indicates
affirmatively.)
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: And, nOw,
that's to help you keep an eye on whether or not there's
any change in the fluctuation of those densities.
Because that density stuff is really what our biggest
impacts are going to be in all of our communities.
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: Okay.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Thank you.
    MS. JENNIFER FIDLER: Any other comments?
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Any other
questions or comments?
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Just a quick
observation, if I could. Following up with Commissioner
Dorsey, Daphne's had some high-profile projects lately
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to be able to make those tighter. And we've just got to pay attention to those things.

I will say that the building market has seen a significant halt in new home sales. Something's hit -something blipped the radar in the last five or six weeks. So there will be a slowdown.

As this -- as this stuff goes through, you'll see a slowdown on the lots being developed in the next little bit. Because there's -- something has happened.

I don't know if the people finally realized the rates are going up or what, but this is a -- it's not alarming, but it's a noticeable slowdown in home sales.

MS. JENNIEER FIDLER: Thank you. Is there any
other questions I can answer on that?
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Great job. MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: It is. It is very good data for this body to have to try to plan for the future and understand what's coming up and really a good warehouse source for the data for a lot of different areas out there so we can make decisions.

Okay. What's next Sarah?

LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO MRS. JENNIFER FIDLER
MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Lastly, on my
coordinator's report, I have a letter of appreciation for
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | from Commissioner Dorsey real quick? And that will be |
| 2 | very good. |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | (Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies indicate |
| 5 | affirmatively.) |
| 6 | MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Fine. Okay. Go |
| 7 | ahead. |
| 8 |  |
| 9 | ACTION_- RESOLUTIONS OF APPRECIATION_(ALL) (REVISITED) |
| 10 | POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Well, I just |
| 11 | want to maybe come back and bring up Agenda Item 6, as |
| 12 | Vice-Chair. I know we want to say thank you to two |
| 13 | long-serving members, and one of those is you. So I |
| 14 | think that makes it a little maybe uncomfortable to -- to |
| 15 | toot your own horn. |
| 16 | But I wanted the Policy Board to make sure we did |
| 17 | touch on Agenda Item 6 and -- and recognize Commissioner |
| 18 | Elliott for his leadership on this board, as well as |
| 19 | Commissioner Dorsey. |
| 20 | You know, Commissioner Dorsey has been here since |
| 21 | the inception of this. I look around this policy board, |
| 22 | and there's I don't think any other faces, other than |
| 23 | Commission Dorsey, that's really been here since day one. |
| 24 | And, you know, certainly the seats have remained, you |
| 25 | know, the same, but the faces have changed. |
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```
Jennifer. She will be retiring on the 31st of this
month, so this will be the last meeting that she will be
here with us.
    So we just drafted up on the request of the -- of
what the Technical Advisory Committee requested. So that
is that last page of your agenda packet.
    And then we still have Item Number 6.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Hey, Sarah,
will you let me go Dane Haygood on your letter?
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Sure.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: I would
like to add a couple changes. Because of your
outstanding work, after the word "involvement" I would
like to add "and outstanding performance." And rather
than "participation with," I would like to change that to
"contribution to."
    Wordsmith, right, Mayor Haygood?
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Absolutely,
Commissioner.
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Thank you.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: Which,
Mr. Chairman, would you mind if I took a moment of
executive privilege, being Vice-Chair?
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Not -- not at all.
But can we do unanimous consent on the changes we've had
```
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And your efforts on -- especially those early days, |
| 2 | doing all the groundwork to get this to the point it's at |
| 3 | is much appreciated. Your service and insight and your |
| 4 | tenacity towards these issues is -- is much appreciated |
| 5 | as well as the service to our community as a whole. |
| 6 | And then, Commissioner Elliott, for your leadership |
| 7 | as well, services as the Chairman of this body. |
| 8 | Appreciate all the work that y'all have done in the |
| 9 | county as a whole. |
| 10 | And I know you couldn't do it without staff. But -- |
| 11 | but certainly your -- your leadership and your commitment |
| 12 | to this is much appreciated. |
| 13 | And I would love for somebody to consider making a |
| 14 | motion to adopt Resolution 2019-06 in support of -- |
| 15 | POLICY BOARD MEMBER RICHARD TEAL: So moved. |
| 16 | POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: -- |
| 17 | recognition. |
| 18 | POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Second. |
| 19 | POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: Second. |
| 20 | POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: All in |
| 21 | favor? |
| 22 | (Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye" |
| 23 | in unison.) |
| 24 25 | Ayes: 5 POLICY BOARD MEMBERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey, Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack Burrell |
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dark suit and a red tie, apparently, before you get you
picture taken. Tell Norma how to dress you.
    POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: That's
right.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: I didn't realize
they -- that was the uniform.
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: Thank you very much,
Mayor Haygood, for doing that.
    Thank you, Commissioner Elliott and Commissioner
Dorsey, for everything you've done for the MPO. It's
been a pleasure working with you.
    MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Thanks.
    MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: And that is all I have
for you today.
```


## MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

```
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Very good. We don't have any press here.
```


## MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

```
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: We don't have any public here.
```


## BOARD/COMMITTEE MEMBERS

```
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Any comments from
```

```
Ayes: 5 POLICY bOARD MEMBERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey
                                    Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
                                    Burrell
    4 POLICY bOARD MEMBER PROXIES: Richard Johnson, Brian Aaron,
                                    Chester Patterson, Joe Davis
No: 0 Board Members: (None)
Motion CarRied
*********************************************************************
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: All right.
    Motion passes.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Y'all are kind.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Thank you.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Where was that
    taken, Tucker? Was it Paris or London?
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Yes.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay. That's what
    I thought.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: I've got to
    tell you that picture on the right is in the courthouses,
    has been. That was taken at 7 a.m. on November 10, 2010.
    I absolutely hate that picture, and I am so ready for it
    to be gone.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: They will take it
    down quickly. I promise you, they will move it quickly.
            MS. SARAH HART SISLAK: I like the picture in
    the middle. I think it's really good.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Joe, you need a
```
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```
the Policy Board?
```

            POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: I do.
            MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Okay.
            POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Yeah. So I
    am grateful for the resolution. And I appreciate the
kind words, Dane.
When we started this organization, the one thing --
first of all, it was put on us by our population, and
then there's the Federal targets that caused this to
happen.
And one of the biggest concerns that I had was that
we were just going to sit here and divide it up by four
and call it a day. And we wouldn't do anything of any
impact.
This group has made great strides in making sure
that we use the resources available to us and the
influence this policy board has to make an impact
regionally for things that affect all of us. I'm very
proud of that, of this group doing that.
When you look at the project list -- Now, we didn't
fund these things, but we certainly had a purpose in
seeing these through.
And these are regional projects of significance to
the Eastern Shore and metropolitan -- or the area that --
that will last beyond our lifetimes. And I'm proud of
SUSAN C. ANDREWS, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER NO. 287
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that. I'm proud of the work we've all done together. I
thank you for your -- your work for our community.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Thank you, sir.
Any other comments?
POLICY BOARD MEMBER DANE HAYGOOD: If I could,
I'll be short. But I did want to make sure that the policy board was aware that Daphne is going to have some meetings tonight and over the next two days in conjunction with utilizing some of the planning grant funds that have been made available to the City through the -- through the Eastern Shore MPO.

So there is a work session tonight in these council
chambers at 6:30 p.m. related to Olde Town Daphne
transportation and within the main street corridor. And
there's a series of workshops tomorrow and Friday. I
think that we've got six with the consultant that we're
using out of Louisiana. So if anybody's interested in
attending those, we'd certainly encourage you to do so.
And then I also just wanted to say, you know, thank you, Jennifer Fidler, for all your hard work and efforts. I'm sad to see you go.

And then, Sarah, that's a much earned raise. Looks like you might have another mouth to feed here pretty soon. So I'm sure you'll put that hard earned income to -- to good work.
eastern shore metropolitan planning organization 10/24/2018

And I think that we had agreed to work together to do what's best for the region. And I think we've done that. I think we continue to do that. And I hope that legacy lives on. So thank y'all.

MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Thanks, Jack.
Okay. Yeah, Richard.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER RICHARD TEAL: I'm the newest on the board. I'd like to say thank you to Jennifer. She's helped the Town of Loxley tremendously. Sarah, congratulations on your raise.

And like it reach out to Tucker and Chris. Because the Town of Loxley, we work very close with the County. There was -- they have helped us in the past with resources that Loxley couldn't do. And I'd like to say thank y'all for that.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Yes, sir.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Absolutely.
Councilman Davis.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: Yes. I
feel like I'm in a very unique situation.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: You have no idea.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: And I'm going into a unique situation. I understand that.

But in recent travels around this county, I've had the opportunity and have decided and -- and have asked
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```
people, when you did you discover paradise?
```

And there are a lot of people that are born and raised here. But then there are a lot more, like myself, I was born in Mobile and grew up in Thomasville. Came to Gulf Shores at 4:30 in the morning, put baby oil and iodine on and got burned up. You do get to -POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Campaign speech.

POLICY BOARD MEMBER PROXY JOE DAVIS: No, I'm not doing that. But I want to tell you that what we have a chance to do as this body and as our cities -- cities and as our county for the next generation and the little one that you'll be bringing into the world pretty soon, it's phenomenal.

And our county is so unique. Every community has it's uniqueness. And we want to keep that. And we want to get connected. And it's organizations like this that our citizens need to realize and how we work together.

Because we've all seen situations where that hasn't been the case. And nobody prospers. So I am honored and privileged to be on Daphne City Counsel. And I love very much the opportunity to be on this and be sure and do this. Thank y'all.

MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Thanks, Joe.
Well, this -- this organization's funding will
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increase over time. And we'll have more ability to fund some of these projects as opposed to just coordinating them.

But I -- I think, you know, really -- and y'all
touched on this already -- the ability to understand
what's going on in your neighboring municipality, what's going on in the county just outside your municipality really puts us in a good position, a supportive position to plan for the future.

Having the data Jennifer's putting together allows
us and affords us the opportunity to understand how --
how our -- this place, our home, is growing, so that we
can make sure that we accommodate the transportation
needs in the future.

## ADJOURNMENT

MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: So, with that,
I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER TUCKER DORSEY: Got it.
POLICY BOARD MEMBER JACK BURRELL: Second.
MPO CHAIRMAN CHRIS ELLIOTT: Motion and a
second. All in favor?
(Policy Board Members and Policy Board Member Proxies say "aye"
in unison.)
**************************************************************************)
Ayes: 5 POLICY BOARD MEMBERS: Dane Haygood, J. Tucker Dorsey,
Chris Elliott, Richard Teal, Jack
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SUSAN C. ANDREWS, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER NO. 287 2200 US HIGHWAY 98, SUITE 4, PMB 230, DAPHNE, ALABAMA 36526

EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION $10 / 24 / 2018$

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15:10, 15:13, 15:19, | 26:11, 28:13, 28:18 | building [5] - 69:11, <br> 69:16, 72:9, 72:10, | 26:12, 28:19, 31:14 | 23:12, 23:20, $25:$ |
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| 18:11, 18:13, 18:2 | 86:23, 87:3, 87:8 | BURRELL [47]-6:25, | carry [2] - 13:1, 58:6 | 32:22, 34:6, 34:13, |
| 19:2, 19:6, 19:12, | Board/ | 8:25, 11:24, 18:4, | carrying ${ }_{\text {[1] - 51:14 }}$ | 35:11, 37:4, 37:7 |
| 19:16, 20:5, 20:12, | COMMITTEE [1] | 18:7, 18:21, 19 | [2] - 47:15, 7 | 37:17, 37:21, 3 |
| 20:13, 20:16, 20:17, | 79:24 | 19:16, 20:5, 20:12, | carte [2] - 53: 2, 53:3 | :2, 38:5, 38:17, |
| 20:20, 22:3, 22:6, | Board/Committee [1] | 20:16, 22:3, 22:6 | case [2]-33:24, 85:2 | 38:20, 39:5, 39:9, |
| 22:10, 22:15, 22:25, | -5:15 | 22:10, 22:15, 22:25, | caused [2] - 50 :14 | 39:14, 39:19, 43:22, |
| 23:1, 23:14, 23:16, | body [3] - 73:17, 76 | 1, 28:4, 32:1 | 80:9 | 44:14, 45:19, 45:23, |
| 25:6, 25:21, 26:1, | 56.11 | 34:11, 34:14, 34:24, | causeway [1] - 16:1 | 46:6, 51:22, 52:22, |
| 26:8, 26:10, 27:15, | bold [1] - 13:22 | 35:5, 45:16, 45:21, | Causeway [3] - 16: | 3:20, 54:1, 54:7, |
| 27:22, 28:4, 28:9, | bond [1] - 15:16 | 46:5, 46:23, 47:5, | 6:2, 16:22 | 56:19, 59:11, 5 |
| 28:15, 28:17, 29:16, | born [21-85:2, 85:4 | 47:11, 47:14, 47:18, | center [1] - 44:22 | b0:2, 60:7, 60:16, |
| 30:1, 30:15, 30:2 | borne [1]-49:23 | 51:17, 51:23, 52:14, | centers [1] -55:22 | 1:2, 61:7, 61:14, |
| 31:10, 31:12, 32:15, | boss []]-38:14 | 52:20, 53:14, 53:24, | Central [1] - 68:4 | 61:18, 61:23, 63:20, |
| 32:21, 32:24, 3 | BPAC $_{[1]}$ - $32: 3$ | 54:5, 58:25, 59:21, | Centre [1]-56:2 | 70:21, /3:16, 74:24, |
| 34:11, 34:14, 34:22, | brain [1] -7:19 | 59:24, 76:18, 77:17, | certain [3]-18:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 6,77: 10,77: 14, \\ & 78: 9,7: 11,78: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 35:8, 35:14, $36: 13$, | brand [1] - $54: 14$ | 78:10 86:20 | 52:25 | 78:21, 78:25, 79:5, |
| 36:17, 37:11, 37:13, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 42:9, } 42: 20,43: 1 \text {, } \end{array}$ | Burrell [19] - 2:8, b:24, |  | 79:12, 79:17, 79:21, |
| 38:15, 38:16, 38:23, | 43:15, 43:21, 44:2, | 9:13, 10:1, 10:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 17,30: 3,36: 10, \\ & 55: 17 \\ & 55 \cdot 24 \end{aligned}$ | 79:25, 80:3, 81:3, |
| 38:25, 39:15, 44:13, | 48:10, 48:19, 49:1, | 10:18, 12:8, 23:15, | 16:11, $77: 12,80: 21$, | 83:3, 84:5, 84:17, |
| 45:16, 45:21, 46:5, | 49:8, 49:14, 50:18, | 25:25, 26:9, 28:8, | 81:18, 82 | 84:21, 85:24, 86:17, |
| $46: 23,47: 5,47: 11$, $47 \cdot 14,47 \cdot 18.48 \cdot 12$, | 52:16, 53:9, 57:24, | 28:16, 31:11, 37:12, | Certification [1] | 86:21, 87:6 |
| 47:14, 47:18, 48:12, | 59:22, 59:24, 60:9, | 38:24, 76:25, 78:2, | 88:23 | challenge $[2]$ - 45 |
| 52:8, 52:14, 52:1 |  | bus | [3]-1:1 | challenges [11-51:3 |
| 52:20, 52:21, 53:14, |  | 48:20, 48:23, 54 |  | amber [1] - 43 |
| 53:24, 54:5, 54:20, |  | bus |  | ambers [1] - 1 |
| 55:6, 57:18, 58:25, | Brian [18] - 2:9, 9:14, | 11:19, 12:15, | cetera [2]-44:23, 57:2 | hambers [1] - 81:13 |
| 59:21, 59:24, 60:4, | 10:19, 12: 2, 23:16, | 77:22, 37:23 | Chair [7]-8:18, $8: 19$ | rance [3]-19:8, |
| 60:8, 61:15, 63:21, | 24:25, 25:5, 26:10, | BUSINESS ${ }_{\text {[1] - 12:14 }}$ | 9:23, 10:1, 10 | 19:9, 85:11 |
| 63:24, 69:19, $99: 24$, $70: 6,70,13,70: 19$, | 28:17, 31:12, 34:7, | BUSINESS............. | 74:23, 75:12 | change $[6]-44: 18$, 56:9, 64:19, 69:25 |
| 70:23, 72:6, 72:12, | 37:13, 38:25, 77:1, |  | Chairman [20]-2: | $70: 15,74: 15$ |
| 73:15, 74:8, 74:11, |  | 8:7, 8:9 |  | 75:2 |
| 74:18, 74:21, 75:10, | 34:8, 63:21, 63:24 | BY | 20:18, 22:7, | tanges [2] -74:12, |
| 76:19, 76:20, 76:2 | bridge [\|0]-13:12, |  | 3:25, 34:12, 45:17, |  |
| 77:1, 77:5, 77:11, | 18:9, 19:13 | C | 51:18, 57:19, 59:1, |  |
| , 78.1, | 1:24, 66:2, 66:5 |  | 89:14 |  |
| 78:7, 78:10, 78:13, | brief [1]-59:19 |  | CHAIRMAN ${ }_{\text {[12] }}$ | 2:9, 22:16, 23:1 |
| 78:16, 79:3, 80:2, |  | rate [1] - 62:9 |  |  |
| 80:4, 81:5, 83:5, | 16:10, 61:11, 7 | calibrating (1) -62:8 | 11, 8: | 78:3, 87:2 |
| 83:18, 83:19, 84:7, |  | CALL $[3]$ - 4:3, 6:3, |  | CHESTER[]]-7:8, |
| 84:16, 84:19, 84:22, | 85:13 |  | 10:7, 10:11, 10:2 | 15:19, 16:13, 16:18, |
| 20, 86:25, 87: | broken [2]-41:23, |  | 11:1, 11:7, 11:11, | 17:1, 17:5, 77:20 |
| board 1100 - 7:22, | $48: 9$ | campaign [1] - $85: 7$ | 11:16, 12:1, 12:4, | CHRIS |
| 40:17, 59:3, 75:18, | brought [2] - 26:24, | acity $[2]$ | 12:12, 12:14, 14:18, | 3, 6:17, 7:15, |
| 75:21, 80:17, 81:7, | 82:14 bucks $11-49.7$ |  | 14:21, 15:8, 15:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 16, ~ 8: 20,9: 2,9: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2:2, 83:14, 84:8 |  | [1] 56:2 |  | 9:18, 9:22, 10:3, |
| Board 45- - 8:1, 9:10, | [et [3] - 39:10, 12, 50:14 | card [1] - 52:3 | 14, 19:11, | 10:7, 10:11, 10:23, |
| 9:15, 10:15, 10:20, | detary 11 - $43: 1$ | IED ${ }_{\text {[12] - 9:16, }}$ |  | 1:1, 11:7, 11:11, |
| 12:5, 12:10, 22:23, | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { budgetary }[1]-43: 1 \\ \text { budgets }[1]-82: 17 \end{array}$ | 0:21, 12:11, 23:18, | $22: 16,23: 5,23: 8$ | 11:16, 12:1, 12:4, |

SUSAN C. ANDREWS, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER NO. 287

eastern shore metropolitan planning organization 10/24/2018

| 12:12, 12:14, 14:18, | 11-64:16 | commuter | cont [2] - 5:1, 5:3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:21, 15:8, 15:11, | close [3]-9:7, 10:12, | 48:23 | ts [1] -41 | 15, 24:9, 26 |
| 17:10, 18:6, 18:12, | 84:12 |  | continue [5] -36:14, | 1, 28:5, 29:5, |
| 18:14, 19:11, 20:19, | coded [1] - 21:19 | compare | 51:8, 61:5, 83 | :6, 29:7, 30:19, |
| 21:19, 21:22, 21:25, | collect [1] - 48:14 | 24 | 84:3 | 30:20, 36:23, 36:22, 41:15, 44:6, 46:15, |
| 22:5, 22:9, 22:12, | collecting [1] -62 | comparing [1] -71 | continuing [1] - 82:22 | 1:15, 44:6, 46:15, |
| 22:16, 23:5, 23:8, | color [ [1] - 21:19 | competitive [1] - 27:4 | contract [7] - 26:24, | 48:4, 49:25, 55:3, 55:5, 57:13, 57:20, |
| 23:12, 23:20, 25:17, | column [1] -70:1 | compiling [1] - $69: 21$ | 47:21, 48:2, 48:1 | 5:5, 57:13, 57:20, |
| 25:24, 26:2, 26:5, | coming [4]-25:3 | complete [2]-62:7, | 50:11, 50:12, 50 | 64:11, 64:13, 68:1 68:24, 707, 82.2 |
| 26:14, 28:2, 28:7, 28:11, 28:21, $30: 22$. | 50:10, 55:11, 73:18 | 62:12 | contractor[1]-26-2 | 68:24, 70:7, 82:2, 82:5, 84:12 |
| 28:11, 28:21, 30:22, <br> 30:25, 31:3, 31:7, | comment [1] - 33:9 | completed [2]-13:8, 43:4 | contribution [1]- | 82:5, 84:12 <br> COUNTY ${ }_{[1]}-88$ |
| 31:16, 32:11, 32:19, | $\begin{gathered} \text { comments }[9]-15: 20 \\ 21: 22,36: 1,61: 19 \end{gathered}$ | completely []]- | convenient | county [12] -13: |
| 32:22, 34:6, 34:13, | 70:20, 70:22, 79:25, | 24:15, 29:19, 50:9 | 40:12 | 36:4, 56:21, 67 |
| 35:11, 37:4, 37:7, | 81:4, 83:6 | complex [3] -59:16 | conversation | 67:9, 71:3 76:9, |
| 37:17, 37:21, 37:24, | Commerce [1] - 43: | 60:24, 67:22 | 50:25, 51:19 | :11, 84:24 |
| 38:2, 38:5, 38:17, | Commission [9]- | com | , | :15, 86:7 |
| 39:14, 39:19, 43:22, | 27 | 15:1, 16:8, 16:10 16:14 |  | 57:5 |
| 44:14, 45:19, 45:23, |  |  | - | coumy |
| 46:6, 51:22, 52:22, | COMMISSIONER [1] - |  |  | 41:23 |
| 53:20, 54:1, 54:7, |  | compon |  | couple [8] - 26:21, |
| 56:19, 59:11, 59:23, | Commissioner [25] | 25:11 | Coordin | 42:18, 51:21, 66 |
| 61:2, 61:7, 61:14 | 2:4, 2:7.7.6:7 | comprehensive | 2:19, |  |
| 61:18, 61:23, 63: | $\begin{aligned} & 3,7: 16,9: 21, \\ & 9,54: 3,56: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 42:20, 69:5 <br> computer [1] - 88:8 | Coordinator's ${ }^{4}$ 4:18, 4:20, 5:2, |  |
| 70:21, 73:16, 74:24, | 59:12, 70:24, 74:19, | computer-aided [1] | 61:24 | 88:22 |
| 75:6, 77:10, 77:14, | 75:1, 75:17, 75:19, | \%8.8 | oordinator' | 78.17 |
| 78:9, 78:11, 78:14, | 75:20, 76:6, 77:9 | concept ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 73:25 | 78.17 |
| 79:12, 79:17, 79:21, | 79:9, 82:25, 83:1 | concern []]-33:14, | COORDINATOR'S | cover [1]-29:12 <br> CR34/US98 [2] - 4:12 |
| 79:25, 80:3, 81:3, | Commissioners [1] - | concerning [1] - 40:23 | coordinators [1] - | 26:17 |
| 83:3, 84:5, 84:17, <br> 84:21, 85:24, 86: | 83:9 | concerns (4] - 35:12, |  | cracks [1] - 25:1 |
| 84:21, 85: $24,86: 17$ $86: 21,87: 6$ | commit [1] - 13: commitment | $: 13,71: 1,80: 11$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \mid \text { corner }[2] ~-~ 13: ~ \\ 67: 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crafts }_{[1]}-49: 5 \\ & \text { crashes }[1]-65: \end{aligned}$ |
| Chris [15]-2:4, 7:13, 9:12, 10:17, 12:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { commit } \\ 76: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 124 | correct | Creek [3] - 16:4, |
| 23:14, 26:8, 28:15, | committee [1]-27:8 | FERE | 27:23, 35:2, 36:16, $53: 19.53: 20.51 .1$ |  |
| 31:10, 37:11, 38:23, | Committee $[8]$ - $27:$ <br> 27:10, 32:3, 32:9, | 64:4 | 53:19, 53:20, 55:1, <br> 61:10, 88:10, 89:6 | curiosity [1] - 18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76: 24,78: 1,84: 11, \\ & 86: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 33:1, 34:19, 36:1 | congestion []] - 40:9 | Correct[1] - 27:21 | current [2] - 17:12, |
| Church [1]-68:1 | 74:5 | gratuations [5 | (1]-81:14 | $\text { ustomers [1] - } 52 \text { : }$ |
| cities $[2]$ - 85:11 <br> citizen [1]-57:23 | 13:18, 14:16, 25:19, | 83:7, 84:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 19,15: \\ & 5,41: 20 \end{aligned}$ | cycle $[1]-25: 3$ |
| Citizens [2]-27:10, | common [1] - 55:11 | ating [1]- | 48:4, 49:2 | D |
| 85:18 |  | 74.25 | council [1] - 81:12 | D'Olive [2] - 24:1 |
| City 1221 - :13, $2: 6,6$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { communicate } \mid \\ 58: 10,58: 21 \end{gathered}\right.$ | consent [1] - 74:25 |  | 24:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2: 8,2: 11,2: 13, \\ & 8: 6,27: 1,27: 6, \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\text {communicating [1] - }} 57$. | 40:25, 76:13 | councilman [2] -6:23 | $\mathrm{NE}[32]-7: 5,8: 4$, |
| 20, 33:19, 45: | col | ring | Councilman | 20, 9:25, 11:21, |
| 45:2, 64:14, 66:19, | 58:18, $82: 9$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 17: 25 \\ \text { consistent }[2]-72: 13, \end{array}$ | Councilman [11] - 2:8, |  |
| 67:3, 67:10, 68:24, 81:10, 85:21 | communities [2] |  | 25:25, 26:3, 28:8, | 7:23, 20:17, 20:20, |
| clarification [1] - 18:8 | 57:13, 70:17 | consists [1]-17:12 |  | $32: 21,35: 14,38:$ |
| $\text { clarity }[2]-14: 12,21: 7$ | community [6] - 51:8, 76:5, 81:2, 82:14, |  | counsel [1]-88:12 Counsel [1] - $85: 21$ | 44:13, 54:20, 55:6, |
| classified [1] - 47:23 | 76:5, 81:2, 82:14, <br> 82:24, 85:15 | construction [5] - $24: 8,24: 21,29: 5$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Counsel }[1]-85: 21 \\ \text { County } \left.{ }^{444}\right]-2: 5,2: 7, \end{array}$ | 61:15, 70:23, 74:18, <br> 74:21, 75:10, 76:16, |
| $\text { cleared [1] }-65: 20$ |  | 62:7, 63:25 <br> consultant $11-81: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:23, 2:25, 12:21, } \\ & \text { 12:22, 13:9, 13:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 76:20, 77:5, 77:11 |

SUSAN C. ANDREWS, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER NO. 287 2200 US HIGHWAY 98, SUITE 4, PMB 230, DAPHNE, ALABAMA 36526

| 77:22, 78:7, 81:5 <br> Dane [23]-2:6, 7:4, <br> 8:1, 8:24, 9:12, 9:19 <br> $10: 17,12: 7,23: 14$, <br> 26:8, 28:15, 31:10, <br> $37: 11,38: 23,72: 14$, <br> 74:9, 76:24, 78:1, <br> 80:6, 86:25, 89:3, <br> 89:10, 89:14 <br> Daniel [1] - 65:11 <br> DAPHNE [1]-62:15 <br> Daphne [20]-1:13, <br> $1: 14,2: 6,2: 14,8: 6$, <br> 8:24, 45:1, 46:22, <br> 63:1, 66:19, 66:20, <br> 67:3, 67:10, 67:13, <br> 68:24, 69:2, 71:9, <br> 81:7, 81:13, 85:21 <br> Daphne's [1] - 70:25 <br> Daphne... [1] - 4:24 <br> dark [1] - 79:1 <br> data [9]-62:9, 69:22, <br> 71:2, 71:15, 71:19, <br> 73.17, 73:19, 86:10 <br> dates [1] - 35:15 <br> Davis [17]-2:13, 2:24, <br> 7:1, 9:14, 10:19, <br> 12:9, 23:16, 26:3, <br> 26:10, 28:17, 31:12, <br> $37: 13,38: 25,77: 1$, <br> 78:3, 84:18, 87:2 <br> DAVIS $[13]-7: 3,17: 8$, <br> 17:11, 17:18, 17:22, <br> 18:1, 26:1, 57:18, <br> $76: 19,79: 3,84: 19$, <br> 84:22, 85:9 <br> days [4]-43:8, 43:13, <br> 76:1,81:8 <br> deal [1] - 30:12 <br> dealings [1] $-60: 8$ <br> deaths [2] - 35:16, <br> 35:19 <br> December [1] - 62:13 <br> decide [4]-15:16, <br> 35:1, 44:6, 45:1 <br> decided [2]-49:12, <br> 84:25 <br> decision [1] - 82:5 <br> decisions [1] - 73:20 <br> decrease [1] - 65:25 <br> delay [1] - 65:25 <br> deletion [1] - 24:7 <br> delineate [1] - 32:13 <br> demand [5] - 44:19, <br> $48: 5,49: 16,51: 24$, $53: 1$ <br> 53:1 <br> demand-response [4] 53:1 <br> demographic [1] - | 72:24 <br> densities [1] - 70:15 <br> density [4] - 70:1, <br> 70:2, 70:16, 71:1 <br> depart [1]-56:10 <br> Department [1] - 2:25 <br> derived [1] - 35:24 <br> description [1] - 47:22 <br> design [8]-24:21, <br> 29:4, 29:15, 29:20, <br> 30:18, 30:19, 62:19, <br> 64:17 <br> designated ${ }_{[1]}$ - $53: 4$ <br> desire [1]-55:17 <br> despite [1] - 77:6 <br> destination [2] - <br> 54:23, 55:4 <br> detail [2] - 41:7, 42:12 <br> detailed [2] - 42:5, <br> 43:5 <br> details [1] - 22:22 <br> detour [1] - 20:9 <br> develop [1] - 40:13 <br> developed $[1]$ - 73:8 <br> Development [2] - <br> 5:9, 67:24 <br> DEVELOPMENT ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 66:11 <br> development [3] - <br> 66:13, 71:12, 82:12 <br> dialyses [2] - 52:11, <br> 52:12 <br> dialysis [1]-53:13 <br> Diamante ${ }^{[1]}$ - $67: 5$ <br> DIAMOND ${ }_{[1]}-63: 15$ <br> diamond [1] - 63:17 <br> Diamond. <br> ....... $[11]-5: 4$ difference $[1]-43: 12$ <br> different ${ }_{[10]}-42: 25$, <br> 43:10, 46:21, 48:24, <br> 49:4, 53:6, 69:8, <br> 71:11, 72:24, 73:19 difficult [2]-20:23, <br> 71:17 <br> dig $[1]-61: 3$ <br> direction [4] - 44:3, <br> 45:10, 45:14, 83:21 <br> Director [1] - 42:9 <br> disabled [2] - 40:10, <br> 65:20 <br> discover [1] -85:1 <br> discuss [1] - 15:21 <br> discussion [8]-12:2, <br> 15:12, 26:3, 30:23, $31: 5,32: 23,37: 5$, <br> $31: 5,32: 23,37: 5$, $38: 18$ <br>  <br> discussions [2] - <br> 21:9, 27:13 <br> disjointed [1] - 30:2 | Diverging ${ }_{[1]}$ - $5: 4$ DIVERGING ${ }_{[1]}$ 63:15 <br> diverging ${ }_{[1]}-63: 16$ divide [2]-80:12, 83:24 <br> divided [2] - 70:3, 70:5 <br> doctor's [1] - 44:23 documents [1]-63:2 dollar [2] - 19:15, 50:15 <br> dollars [7]-13:10, 13:14, 14:7, 15:6, 29:3, 45:5, 64:11 done [21]-14:9, 18:3, 27:16, 39:6, 42:19, 43:3, 43:16, 49:1, 56:21, 69:20, 76:8, 77:7, 79:10, 81:1, 82:7, 82:9, 82:16, 84:2 <br> Dorsey [29] - 2:7, 6:7, 6:10, 7:17, 9:12, 10:17, 12:7, 15:9, 23:14, 26:8, 28:15, 31:10, 37:11, 38:23, 54:3, 56:20, 59:12, $70: 25,75: 1,75: 19$, $75: 20,75: 23,76: 24$, 78:1, 79:10, 82:25, 83:14, 83:22, 86:25 DORSEY [40] - 7:18, 13:21, 14:15, 14:22, 15:13, 16:16, 18:11, 18:13, 19:2, 19:12, 20:13, 23:1, 30:21, 36:13, 36:17, 38:15, $39: 15,48: 12,48: 15$, $52: 8,52: 17,52: 21$, 69:19, 69:24, 70:6, 70:13, 70:19, 72:6, $72: 12,73: 15,74: 8$, $74: 11,78: 13,78: 16$, 80:2, 80:4, 83:18, 84:16, 85:7, 86:19 doubt $[1]-82: 4$ down [13]-12:24, 13:1, 19:25, 24:2, 41:23, 46:19, 51:6, 52:16, 55:11, 56:2, 69:12, $78: 22,88: 7$ downtown [1] - $68: 1$ draft [3]-42:1, 61:11, 61:16 <br> drafted [1] - 74:4 drainage $[3]-30: 7$, 30:10, 63:12 dress [1] - 79:2 | Driskell ${ }_{[1]}-65: 11$ drive [4]-20:14, 44:20, 49:12, 58:13 Drive [1]-24:16 drivers $[1]$ - 58:12 driving [1] - 54:1 drop ${ }^{[1]}$ - $55: 15$ drop-off $[1]-55: 15$ due [1]-24:13 dug [1] - 61:4 | 43:9, 43:13, 60:19 electronics $[1]$ - 8:6 elementary $[2]-13: 2$, 30:4 <br> Elementary [1] - 16:3 elements [1] - 16:21 eligible [1] - $58: 19$ Elliott [18]-2:4, 7:14, 9:12, 10:17, 12:7, $23: 14,26: 8,28: 15$, $31: 10,37: 11,38: 23$, $31: 10,37: 11,38: 23$, $75: 18,76: 6,76: 24$, 78:1, 79:9, 82:25, 86:25 <br> ELLIOTT ${ }_{[123]}-6: 4$, 6:13, 6:17, 7:15, 1:24, 8:2, 8:11, 8:13, 8:16, 8:20, 9:2, 9:6, 9:18, 9:22, 10:3 10:7, 10:11, 10:23, 11:1, 11:7, 11:11, 11:16, 12:1 12:4, 12:12, 12:14, 14:18, 14:21, 15:8, 15:11, 17:10, 18:6, 18:12, 18:14, 19:11, 20:19, 21:19, 21:22, 21:25, 22:5, 22:9, 22:12, 22:16, 23:5, 23:8, 23:12, 23:20, 25:17, 25:24, 26:2, 26:5, 26:14, 28:2, 28:7, 28:11, 28:21, 30:22, 31:16, 32:11, 32:19, 32:22, 34:6, 34:13, 35:11, 37:4, 37:7, 37:17, 37:21, 37:24, 38:2, 38:5, 38:17, $38: 20,39: 5,39: 9$, 39:14, 39:19, 43:22, $44: 14,45: 19,45: 23$, $46: 6,51: 22,52: 22$, 53:20, 54:1, 54:7, 56:19, 59:11, 59:23, 60:2, 60:7, 60:16, 61:2, 61:7, 61:14, 61:18, 61:23, 63:20, 70:21, 73:16, 74:24, $75: 6,77: 10,77: 14$, $78: 9,78: 11,78: 14$, 78:21, 78:25, 79:5, 79:12, 79:17, 79:21, 79:25, 80:3, 81:3, 83:3, 84:5, 84:17, 84:21, 85:24, 86:17, 86:21, 87:6 emphasis [1]-65:18 enable [1] - 56:4 enabled [1] - 82:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SUSAN C. ANDREWS, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER NO. 287
US HIGHWAY 98, SUITE 4, PMB 230, DAPHNE, ALABAMA 36526

Eastern shore metropolitan planning organization 10/24/2018

|  | expecting [1] -66:8 | 64 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| age | expense [1]-53:15 |  | d[2] - 55:19, 56:23 |  |
| 3:24, 45:11, 45:12, | [1] -70 | , | $\mathrm{gli}_{1 \mathrm{l}} 50$ | 57 |
| 61:2, 61:5, 65:4, | experiences $[1]-58: 8$ | feed [1] - 81:23 | flavors [1]-71: | frequen |
| 81:18 | experts [1] - 56:17 | feedback [2]-61 | flaws [1] -20:7 | 57: |
| 49:2, 56:21, 62:12, 66:4 | explain [3]-33:17 | 65:7 | flies [1]-5 | requently |
|  | 60:6, 60:13 exponentially $[11$ | felt [2] - 32:6, 32:7 festival ${ }^{[1]}$ - $48: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { floor [3] - } 9: 24,13: \\ & 22: 21 \end{aligned}$ | Friday ${ }_{[1]}-81: 15$ front $[11-66: 17$ |
| engineer $[1]$ - $62: 20$ <br> Engineer [1] - 2:23 <br> engineer's [3] - 13:4, | 51:9 | Festival [1] - $49: 6$ | floral [ $[1]$-64:16 | fruit [1]-57:3 |
|  | expressed [ [] - 25 | festivals $[2]$ - 49:5 | fluctuation [1] -70, | frustrating [1] - |
|  |  | few [2] - 15:22, 20 | focusing [1] -65:10 | frus |
| engineer's [3] - 13:4, 24:10, 24:11 engineers [1] - $64: 20$ | extension [4]-13:24, | Fiddler [1]-2:21 | Foley [1] - $56: 22$ | FTA [1] - 62:21 |
|  | 15:4, 18:23, 18:24 | FIDLER [18] - 40: | folks [2]-33:13, 49 | full [1] -7:22 |
| ensures [1] - 36:14 entertain [2]-8:21, 86:18 | extent [1] - 54:13 | 47:1 | follow [1] - 40:1 | fully [2] - 30:11 |
|  | eye [2] - 70:14, 71 | :19, 48 | following [3] - 1:12, | [1] - 42:24 |
| entire [3]-41:21, <br> 41:22, 56:13 <br> entities [2]-65:18, | F |  |  |  |
|  |  | 73:13, 73:23 |  | $\text { funded }[2]-18:$ |
| 65:24 <br> environmental [1]- |  | Fider [2]-66:13 | foot ${ }^{[1]}$ - 46:18 |  |
|  |  | 81:20 | FOR [1]-72: |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \quad 63: 2 \\ & \text { envision [5] - 22:13, } \end{aligned}$ | facilitate $[2]-50: 8$ 60:15 | Fider). | 0:2 | 24:5.28:1.36.15 |
|  | facilitated [1] -82:8 |  | foregoing [3]-88 |  |
| 45:17, 45:20, 45:23 equipment [1] - $50: 7$ esk [1] - 44:15 | g[1]-82:13 |  |  | 52:1, 52:9, 85:25, |
|  | 1-24:13, 36:3 | -67:11 |  | funds [12]-20:25, |
| ESMPO [5] - 4: 18, $38: 7,38 \cdot 10,40 \cdot 20$ | factors [1] - 40:18 | field [1]-21:1 | form [1] - 13:6 | 11:5, 21:14. 24:4 |
|  | $11-47: 1$ | fifteen [7] - 13:14 | forms [1] - 16:2 | 9:9, 30:18, 4 |
| especially [4] - 48:16, 51:9, 56:24, 76:1 | fair [2]-11:16 | 68 | formulating [1] -59 |  |
|  | Fairhope [21] -2:8, | [2] - 13:10, 33:12 | Fort [12]-2:16, 4:2 | future [8] - 33:13, |
| establish [3] - 36:3,$36: 5,55: 15$ | 2:12, 4:24, $27: 1$, 2777 , $3: 19,36: 1$ | figure [4] - 21:6, 38:2, | 45:2, 46:22, 56:2, | 59:17, 73:18 |
|  |  | 51:10, 56:11 |  | 86:14 |
| Estate ${ }_{[1]}$ - $66: 25$ | 45:1, 46:21, 47:6, 47:12, 52:15, 56:3 | ${ }_{\text {figuring }} \mathbf{f}$ | 68:19 | (13]-4:13, 28 |
| Estates [3]-67:16, 67:18, 72:15 | 47:12, 52:15, 56:3, 62:1/, $62: 22,62: 24$, | $69$ | $\text { ORT }_{[1]}-62: 15$ | FY19 [1] - 64 |
|  | 64:14, 67:16, 68:1, | final [15]-61:12 |  |  |
| estimate [9]-13:4, 13:13, 14:6, 15:5, |  |  |  | G |
| 22:19, 23:2, 24:10, 24:11 |  |  | forty-five $11-20.14$ |  |
| estimated ${ }_{[1]}-15: 3$ estimates [3]-15:25 | fall [1] - 18:25 | 69:1, 69:15, 72:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forty-five }[1]-20: 20: \\ & \text { forty-one }[1]-68: \end{aligned}$ | in [1] - 43:19 |
|  | fallen [1]-49:10 | fin | - | ins [1] - $56: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { estimates [3] - 15:25, } \\ & 22: 18,26: 25 \end{aligned}$ | fancy [1] - $8: 1$ <br> far ${ }^{[8]}$ - $36: 19$, | finally [i] -73:1 | $\text { nine }_{[1]}-67: 21$ | $\text { alli1) } 16: 711$ |
| ETJ ${ }_{[1]}$-71:8 evaluate [1]-33:21 | 7. $63: 18,64: 1$ | fine [4] - 17:14, 38 |  | generation [1]-85:12 |
|  | 64:21, 72:2, 72:5 | 75:6, 77:10, | 1:5, 62:19, | gentlemen [3]-6:14 <br> 11:19, 32:11 |
| event [1] - 36:7 <br> eventually ${ }_{[1]}$ - 33:20 | fashion [1]-44:15 FAST [2]-32:17, | first [19] - 8:17, 11 | 63:3, 63:25 | 11:19, $32: 11$ girder $[1]-19: 22$ |
| exactly [3] - 29:23,$48: 16,59: 19$ |  |  | fostered | given [3] - 56:24, 59:1, |
|  | favor ${ }^{\text {che }}$ - $9: 9,9,10: 13$, | 43:7, 43:13, 60:6, | four [15] - 13:10, 14: | 88:10 |
| example $[1]$ - $33: 4$ executive $[1]-74: 23$ | $12: 4,23: 8,26: 5$ <br> 28:12, 31:7, 37:8, | 60:10, 61:8, 62:2, | 14:2, 14:8, 18:10, | glad [4] - 14:15, 17 60:14, 71:2 |
|  | 38:20, 76:21, 77:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 23 \\ & 80: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | goal []] - 34:4, 36: |
| exempting [1] - 37:2 existing $[8]-16: 9$, | 86:22 | Fis | 9, 72:2, 72 | 18, 36:22, 36 |
| $24: 14,41: 2,41: 9 \text {, }$ <br> 41:10, 41:16, 42:16 | February [1] -66:9 | Fish (1) - $13: 13$ |  |  |
|  | Federal [20]-20:25, 29:9, 36:14, 36:19, | five $[16]$ - 13:4, 13 | four-1ane [1] - 14: | $\begin{gathered} \text { goals }[4]-32: 8, \\ 40: 13,40: 24, \end{gathered}$ |
| expect[3] - 22:13, |  | 12, 14,45 |  |  |
| 30:12, 63:25 expected ${ }_{[1]}-62: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:25, 48:4, 49:19, } \\ & 50: 1,52: 1,52: 8 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $67: 6,67: 7,67: 12 \text {, }$ 7:4, 72:9, 72:20, | four-year $[1]$ - $24: 3$ | Government $[5]-$ $48: 4,48: 5,49: 25$ |
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| 50:1, 50:2 | 7, 14 | higher [2] - 36:5, | important [3] -9:23, | input [5] - 40:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| government [1] 50:24 | 16:12, 16:20, 17:3, 17:7, 21:17, 21:21, | $\begin{gathered} 36: 25 \\ \text { highway } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:4, 51:15 } \\ & \text { improve }[1]-82: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $40: 23,40: 25,42$ $59: 6$ |
| governments [1] | 23:7, 23:25, 25:1 | 64:12 | IMPROVEMENT [2] - | inside [1] - 18:16 |
| 64:6 | 2:19, 27:24, 29: | Highway [10] - 2:2 | 23:24 | insight [1] - 76 |
| grab [3] - 18:19, | 31:20, 35:2, 35:10 | 16:2, 18:8, 28:6 | Improvement | Installation [1] -4 |
| 45:13, 57:17 | 36:16, 37:23, 38: | 40:14, 66:3, 67 | 4:10, 4:13, 24: | installation [4] |
| grade [1]-33:10 | 4, 38:9, 39:4, | 67:19, 67:23, 68:18 | 29:2 | 24:16, 24:17, |
| grant [1]-21:1, 28:1, 62:17, 64:6, 81:9 | 8, 39:12, 39:21 <br> :13, 60:1, 60:1 | hit $[2]$ - $56: 11,73$ |  | 28:5 |
| grateful [1] - 80:5 | 18, 61:6, 61:11 | home [] - 73: | inaccurately [1] - 50:4 | 26: |
| gray [1]-8:9 | 61:17, 62:2, 62:6, | 73:12, 86:12 | inception [1] - 75:21 | instead [1] - 32:1 |
| great [14] - 43:18, | 62:16, 63:6, 63:1 | homework [2] - 18:3, | Incident (1]-5:8 | interest $21-51: 6$, |
| 49:8, 51:1, 55:21, | $64: 10,65: 1,65: 1$ | $\begin{gathered} 34: 10 \\ \text { honest }[1]-29: 19 \end{gathered}$ | INCIDENT ${ }_{[1]}$ - 65 |  |
| 71:17, 73:15, 80:15, | 66:12, 73:24, 74:10, | honored [1] - 85:20 | 65:19 | Interest. |
| 82:7, 82:11, 82:15, $83: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 74:20, 78:23, 79:7, } \\ & 79: 13 \end{aligned}$ | hop [2] - 56:11, 56:12 <br> hope [2] - $56: 7,84: 3$ | incidents [2]-65:20 65:25 | ........ [1]- |
| n [1] - 8:10 | hate [2]-50:23, 78:19 |  |  |  |
| grew [1] -85:4 | HAYGOOD [32] - 7:5, | hopefu | inclu | interestin |
| grief $[1]-33: 13$ | 8:4, 9:20, 9:25, | horn [1] -75:15 | 4.11, 5.7 , 58 |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { grocery }[2]-44: 21, \\ 55: 22 \end{gathered}\right.$ | 11:21, 15:10, 17:16, 17:20, 17:23, 20:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { horns [2] - } 57: 17, \\ & 71: 16 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | included [4]-12:25, 42:17, 43:6, 43:14 | interstate [2]-33:5 |
| grossly [1] - 49:21 | 20:20, 29:16, 30:1, | hour [1] - 20:8 | includes [5] - 32:12, | interview [1] - 42:9 |
| groundwork [1] - 76:2 | 30:15, 32:21, 35:14, | house [1] -82:3 | 41:1, 42:25, 43:2, | interviewed [1] -42 |
| group $[2]-80: 15$, | 38:16, 44:13, 54:20 | housing [1]-72:2 | 43:15 | invocatio |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \begin{array}{c} 80: 19 \\ \text { grow }[2]-44: 24, ~ 51: 8 \end{array} \end{array}$ | 74:18, 74:21, 75:1 | $\operatorname{HSIP}_{[2]}-5: 6,64: 9$ hubs [1] - 55:21 | $\left.\right\|_{81: 24} ^{\text {income }[2]-52: 3}$ | involved[1-27: |
| growing [1] - 86:12 | 76:16, 76:20, 77:5, | hundred [25] - 13:4, | incorporated [1] - | 65:24, 72:15, |
| grows [1] - 20:23 |  | 13:10, 19:19, 24:10, | 35:22 | involvement [2] |
| guess [6] - 18:10, $29: 24,32: 8,45: 12$ | Haygood [26] - 2:6, | 24:12, 29:8, 43 | increase [5] - 14 | 65:6, 74: |
| 29:24, $54: 9,61: 8$ | 6:8, 7:4, 8:1, 8:24 | 67:13, 67:14, 68:2, | 38:10 $86: 1$ | iodine [1]-85 issue [3]-15: |
| guidelines [1] - 40:14 | 9:3, 9:9,9:9:12, 10:17, | 68:3, 68:11, 68:13, | INCREASE [1] - $38: 7$ | 18:15, 30 |
| Gulf [2] - 56:22, 85:5 |  | 69.2. 69:3, | Increas | issue |
|  | 1, 38:23, 74:9 | 69:10, 71:6, 71:9, | incumbent | 82:13 |
| 83:11 | 74:17, 76:24, 78:1, | 11:25, 72:99,72:16 | 1-2 | it'll [1] - 31:3 |
| H |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | I | 75:4 | item $[10]$ - $12: 17$ |
| half [ [3] - 14:7, 15:6, |  |  | Indicate 70:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 14,23: 25,2 \\ & 29: 1,31: 20,32 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | heaith [1] -53:7 | I-10 [4] - 5:4, 24:17, |  | 38:9, 39:19, 39:21 |
| Hall [1] - 1:13 | heard [1] - 59:12 | 24:19, $63: 15$ idea $41-21.659 .12$ | indication [1]-33:2 | items []]-13:15, 22:8, |
| halt [1] - 73:4 | hearing $[1]$ - 10:1 <br> HELD [1] - 1:2 | idea [4] - $21: 6,59: 12$, 59:17, 84:21 | inefficient [2] - 44:15, | 25:19 |
|  | held [1] -1.12 | ideas [1] -40:2 | 46:3 | iteration [1]-46:10 |
| handed []] - 24:2 | help [8] - 40:8, 40:11, | identify [] - 4 | influence $[1]-80: 17$ influx $[2]-48: 25$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { itself }[1]-49 \\ & \mathbf{V V}_{[1]}-67: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| handicap [2]-50:13, | $5,51: 12,58: 23,$ | $40: 19,40: 2$ | infux ${ }^{\text {ind }}$ |  |
| - 17: | helped [2]-84:9, | \|| 1 [1] -66:20, 66:2 67:16, 68:7, 68: | information [4]- | J |
| hard [\|]-39:23, |  | II-A (1) -66:20 | INFORMATIONA |  |
| 51:16, 69:17, 81:20, 81:24 | helpful [1] - $57: 21$ helps [1] - 71:3 | II-B [1] - 66:21 <br> imagine [2]-30 | $-39: 18,61: 22$ | JACK [47] - 6:25, 8:25, 11:24, 18:4, 18:7. |
| Hart [1] - 2:19 | hereby [ $31-88: 6$, | 54:2 | Inform | :21, 19:6, 19 |
| HART [ 67 - -6:19, 6:23, | 89:4, 89:10 | impact [2] - 80: |  | 20.5, 20:12, 20:19, |
| 7:1, 7:4, 7:6, 7:10, | high [3] - 21:12, | 80:17 |  | 22:3, 22:6, 22:10, |
|  | high profile | impacts [1] - 70:17 | initial [1] - 35:12 | 25:21, |
| 7:22, 8:12, 8:18, <br> 10:25, 11:4, 11:10, | high-profile [1] - $70: 25$ | implement [1]-52:2 implication [1] - 33:17 | Initiative [1]-5:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:4, 32:15, 34:11, } \\ & \text { 34:14, 34:24, 35:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
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| 45:16, 45:21, 46:5, 46:23, 47:5, 47:11, 47:14, 47:18, 51:17. 51:23, 52:14, 52:20, 53:14, 53:24, 54:5, 58:25, 59:21, 59:24, 76:18, 77:17, 78:10, 83:5, 83:19, 86:20 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { least }[1]-35: 23 \\ & \text { led }[1]-6: 10 \\ & \text { legacy }[11-84: 4 \\ & \text { legal } 11-9: 21 \\ & \text { less }[3]-33: 7,36: 7, \\ & 48: 1 \\ & \text { letter }[3]-63: 22, \\ & 73: 25,74: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { looking }[4]-41: 10, \\ & 57: 9,72: 20 \\ & \text { looks }[1]-81: 22 \\ & \text { loop }[1]-30: 6 \\ & \text { lose }[1]-50: 15 \\ & \text { lost }[3]-50: 11,64: 19 \text {, } \\ & 64: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 48:8, 50:9, 53:2, <br> $53: 4,55: 6,58: 14$, <br> 72:21 <br> means [4]-8:8, 40:9, <br> 41:14, $88: 8$ MEASURES ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 31:19 <br> measures [5]-16:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{38.2}$.2 |  |  |  |
|  | [1] - 66:1 |  |  |  |
|  | sdiction [1] - 18:25 |  |  |  |
|  | jurisdictions |  |  |  |
|  | 33:18 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | K |  | love [2] - 76:13, 85:21 <br> low [1]-32:6 |  |
| Jack [18] - 2:8, 6:23, |  | LETTER ${ }_{[1]}$ - 73:23 Letter [1]-5:11 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:14, 31:21, 31:22, } \\ & 32: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 7, 10:24, 12:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Karin }_{[2]}-2: 11,6: 20 \\ & \text { Katrina }[1]-2: 25 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 23:14, 26:8, 28:15, |  | letting $[1]-57: 21$ level [4]-49:14, 51:11, 57:13, 64:20 | lower [1] - 33:24 Loxley [8] - $2: 17$, 24:18, 45:2, 46:22, | Measures [1] - 4:14 meet [6] - 33:23, 40:13, 53:22, 66:2, 83:16, 83:17 |
| 10, 37:11, 38:23, | keep [6] - 11:12, 30:6, |  |  |  |
| $76: 24,78: 1,84 \cdot 5$, $86 \cdot 25$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 51:11, } 57: 13,64: 20 \\ \text { License }[1]-89: 8 \end{array}$ | 24:18, 45:2, 46:22, 68:13, 84:9, 84:12, 84:14 |  |
| \%:25 | 85:16 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { lifespan } \\ \text { 18:14 } \end{array} \text { - 18:13, }$ <br> lifetime $[11-14 \cdot 2$ |  | Meeting [2] - 1:4, 89:6 meeting [15] - 6:5, 11:10, 12:23, 14:14, |
| January [4] - 11:15, 57:20, 61:12, 66:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { key }_{[1]}-82: 12 \\ & \text { kids }_{[1]}-50: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | lunch [1] 56:3 |  |
| nnifer [9]-2:21, | kin [1] -88:13 | lifetimes [1]-80:25 | M | 22:14, 35:6, 57 |
| 11, 39:22, 43:22, | kind (18] - 13:17, 21:4, | lim |  | 17, 60:23, 64:14, |
| 81:20, 84.9 | 12, 36:8, 52:2, | -53: | Magnolia [1]-68:1 |  |
| JENNIFER [17] - 40: | 52:3, 52:6, 58:8, |  | mailed [1] -65:10 | mee |
| 47:4, 47:9, 47:13 | 19, 60:22, 62:22, | 61:1 | mails S1] -65:11 $^{\text {d }}$ | eetings ${ }_{[1]}-8$ |
| 47:16, 47:19, 48:14, | 3:2, 65:19, 78:9, | lion's [1] - 45:5 | Main [1] -1:14 | eets [1] - 55:11 |
| 66:15, 69:23, | ng [1] | List ${ }_{\text {[16] }}$ - $4: 8,12: 18$, |  | Member [4] -8:1, |
| , |  | 13:16, 13:25, 14:13, |  |  |
| :23 |  |  | malfunction [1] |  |
| nnifer's [1] -86:10 | L |  | 48:17 | 77 |
| [9] - 39:6, |  |  | MANAGEMENT | 86:23 |
| 49:1, 51:1, 58:21, |  | list [8]-13:17, 15:14, | Management [2] | embe |
| 82:16 | lane [3] - 14:2, 29 | 20:23, 21:2, 24.3 | 65:2 | W |
| JOE [13]-7:3, 17:8, |  |  | manag | 6:25, 7:3, 7: 8, 7:12, |
| 1, 17:18, 17:22 | lanes in- $29: 17$ | live | 32:16, 65:17, 65:19 | :21, 8:4, 8:23, 8:25, |
| 18:1, 26:1, 57:18, | lanesi] - 14.17 | lives [2]-25:15, 84, | managing [2] - 49 | 9:14, 9:20 |
| 84:22, 85:9 |  | 58 | mandated [1] - 83:13 | $1: 24$ |
| Joe [16]-2:13, 7:1, | 45:2 | loasl [1]-13: | market [3] - 72:15 | 4:15, 14:22 |
| 9:14, 10:19, 12:9, | 31:21, | located [8] -67:2, | 72:21, 73:3 | 15.13, 15:19, 16.1 |
| 23:16, 26:10, $8: 17$ $31: 12,37: 13,38: 25$, | 42:19, 62:23, |  | Master $[3]-16$ | 16:16, 16: |
| 77:1, 78:3, 78:25, | 69:13, 10:8, 71:2 | 68:4, 68:17, 68:21 | match []] - 27:6 | 17:16, 17:18, 1 |
| 85:24, 87:2 | 25 |  |  | 17:22, 17:23, 18 |
| JOEY [11] - 14:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 25 \\ & \text { lastly }[2]-13: 1 \end{aligned}$ | locations [3] <br> 16:15, 55: | material [ [] - 43 | 18.4, 18.2 , 18.1 |
| 7, 20:9, 2 | lastly ${ }_{\text {l2] }} \mathbf{7}$ | London [1] -7 | math [1] - 33:16 | 18:13, 18:21, 1 |
| 37:2, 53:3, 53:19, | lately [1] - 70:22 | LONG ${ }_{[1]}$ - 12:16 | matter [1] - 56 |  |
| 55:1 | latitude (1] - 36 | long-range $[1]$ - 46 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { layor }[17]-2: 6,2: \\ & 2: 15,6: 8,6: 20,7 \end{aligned}$ | 20:16, 20:17, 20:2 |
| Joey [7] - 2:23, 13:23, | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { laws }[1]-42: 25 \\ \text { laying }[1]-63: 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Hong-se } \\ 75: 11 \end{array}$ | B:24, 9:3, 9:9, 15:11, | 2 |
| 25, 3.1 | lead [ [] -6:7, 6: | -term[2] - 40:13 |  |  |
| JOHNSON $[9]-6: 21$ | 51:20 | 2:14 |  | 26:1, 26:10, 2 |
| 10:5, 27:15, 27:22, | leaders [1] - 83:12 leadership -44.25, | look $[16]-29: 22,3,3: 4$, $40: 25,41: 2,41: 3$, | mayor [2] - 7:4, 35 | 27:22, 28:4, 28:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28: 9,32: 22,34: 22, \\ & 35: 3,35: 8 \end{aligned}$ | leadership [9] - 44:25, 45:10, 48:18, 49:14, | 40:25, 41:2, 41 41:4, 41:8, 43:2 | MAYOR [1] - 7 |  |
| 14] - $2: 1$ | :22, 57:4, 75:18, | 俍47:49,49 |  |  |
| 19, 9:14, 10:19 | 年:6, 76.41 | 23, 75:2 |  |  |
| 12:9, 23:16, 26:10 | learn [1] -56:16 | 80:20, 82:10 |  | 34.22, 34.24 |
| 28:17, 3 | lease [i]-62:18 | looked [2] - 42:16, <br> 82:3 | 34:16, 46:2, | 35:5, 35:8, 35:14, |

SUSAN C. ANDREWS, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER NO. 287
2200 US HIGHWAY 98, SUITE 4, PMB 230, DAPHNE, ALABAMA 36526
eastern shore metropolitan planning organization 10/24/2018

| 36:13, 36:17, 37:13, | 0:24 | 2:3 | 56:19 | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39:15, 44:13, 45:16, | 1:3 | 6, 32:14, 32:22 | :7, 60:16, 61:2 |  |
| 45:21, 46:5, 46:23, | mic [1] - 18:19 | 32:22, 37:7, 37:17, | 61:7, 61:14, 61:1 | national [ [1] - 38:13 |
| 47:5, 47:11, 47:14, | mics [1] - $8: 7$ | 38:17, 76:14, 77:5, | 61:22, 61:23, 63:20 | - |
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| related [2] - 42:17, | 22, 65:23, 80:16, | Rigsby [\|] - $12: 2$ | S | 0:4, 10:6, 10 |
| 81:13 | 84:14 respect | \| 30: |  | 15:11, 22:1, 26:1, |
|  | responders [1]-65:2 | River [2] - 13:13, 66:2 | sad [1] - 81:21 | 5.2, 28.10, 21 |
| reliably [1] - 40:12 | response [15]-9:5 | rwood [3]-66:25, | safely $[1]-40: 13$ | 0:21, 30:23, 32 |
| relief (11-40:9 | 10:10, 12:3, 21:24, 23:13, 26:4, 30.24, | 68:23, $72: 15$ riverwood $11-67.2$ | safety $[7]-35: 15$, 35:18, 35:24, 36:24, | 2:23, 37:8, 38:16, <br> 8:18, 69:16, 71:23, |
| relieve [2]-14:4, $51: 12$ | 23:13, 26:4, 30:24, <br> 31:6, 37:6, 38:19, | riverwood [1] - 67: road [3] - 20:10, |  | 38:18, 69:16, 71:23, 76:18, 76:19, 77:19, |
| cated (1) | :19, 48:5, | 36:24, 46:2 | Saint [3] - 67:7, 67:9, | 77:21, 86:20, 86 |
| ${ }_{\text {relook [1] - 50:14 }}$ | 1,6 |  | sake 11 - $35 \cdot 6$ | section [5] - 29:25, |
| remained ${ }_{[1]}$ - $75: 2$ | result [2] - 25:1 | 12:22, 13:13, 15:1, <br> 15:4, 24:20, 26:22, |  | 42: |
| replaced [1] - 18:9 | results [2] - 42:3, 42:5 | 28:5, 29:5, 29:6 | SALE [1]-72:17 | ction |
| replacement [2] - |  | 29:7, 30:19, 30:20, | ales [2] - 73:4, 73: | $\text { 41:9, 42:7, } 42$ 42:16 |
| 13:12, 15:3 | 24:18, 24:19, 24:23 | 64:13 |  |  |
| REPORT [l] -61:22 | $\begin{gathered} 2! \\ \text { reti } \end{gathered}$ | roads [1] - 36: | 6:10, 7:13, 7 | [34 |
| Report [1] - $5: 2$ <br> report [4]-23:5 | retirement [1] -83:7 | roadways [1]-33:21 | , | 16.5, |
| 32:25, 61:24, 73:25 | retiring (11) - 74:1 | Robert [1]-2:24 | 8, 10:25, 11:4 | 7:23, 18:19, 20 |
| Report... [1]-4:20 | reused [1]-25:12 | ert's [1] -77:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 10,11: 13,12: 17 \\ & 14: 20,16: 12,16: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 27: |
| reported [1]-50:4 |  | ertsdale $[4]$ - | 17:3, 17:7, 2 | 33:1, 43:12, 44: |
| Reporter [3]-1:15, 88:22, 89:8 | review [1] - 60:19 | 72:23 | 21:21, 23:7, 23:25 | 44:3 |
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| 47:14, 47:16, 48:7, 51:4, 55:7, 56:3, 60:5, 60:12, 69:14, 71:2, 71:11, 71:12, 73:7, 81:21 seeing [2] - 64:1, 80:22 <br> seek [1] - 21:12 seeking [1] $-21: 5$ selecting [1] - 62:19 semi [2]-44:8, 55:19 semi-fixed [1]-55:19 semi-urban [1] - 44:8 send [2]-50:2, 61:16 sending [2] - 65:22, 65:23 <br> senior [1]-44:22 <br> sense [2]-47:24, <br> 55:11 <br> sent [1] - 60:21 <br> separate [2]-16:11, 27:3 <br> September [1] - 66:18 <br> series [1]-81:15 <br> serve $[4]-45: 15,53: 7$, <br> 53:8, 57:16 <br> served [2]-83:10 <br> serves [1] - $54: 18$ <br> service [14]-41:22, <br> 44:3, 46:1, 46:14, <br> 49:16, 49:17, 51:24, <br> 54:23, 54:24, 57:25, <br> $58: 18,60: 11,76: 3$, 76:5 <br> services [3] - 41:20, <br> 41:22, 76:7 <br> serving [3]-10:13, <br> 75:13, 82:24 <br> session [3] - 55:7, <br> 59:17, 81:12 <br> set $[4]-36: 18,40: 14$, <br> 50:18, 60:23 <br> sets [1] - 59:3 <br> setting [2] - 32:1, 32:7 <br> seven [5]-67:6, <br> 67:12, 68:8, 68:16 <br> seventeen $[1]$ - 69:13 <br> seventy [5] - 13:5, <br> 33:11, 67:17, 68:14, <br> 69:10 <br> seventy-eight [1] - <br> 33:11 <br> seventy-five ${ }_{[1]}-13: 5$ <br> seventy-four ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 69:10 <br> seventy-two [1] - <br> 67:17 <br> several [3]-16:20, <br> 40:7, 43:11 <br> share $[3]-35: 12$, | 45:6, 65:23 <br> shift ${ }_{[1]}-56: 10$ <br> shoot [1] - 36:9 <br> shooting ${ }_{[1]}$ - 36 :6 <br> Shop [1]-83:16 <br> shopping ${ }_{[1]}-55: 22$ <br> SHORE ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:3 <br> Shore [15]-6:5, 10:2, <br> 43:2, 48:22, 51:9, <br> 55:25, 56:2, 56:14, <br> 57:8, 80:24, 81:11, <br> 82:4, 87:8, 89:3, <br> 89:15 <br> Shores [2]-56:22, <br> 85:5 <br> short [7]-39:24, <br> 40:13, 42:13, 52:22, <br> 81:6, 83:15 <br> short-term [1] - 42:13 <br> show [1]-65:17 <br> showing [1] - 25:1 <br> shows [1] - 72:14 <br> Shrimp [1] - 49:6 <br> shutting [1] - $51: 6$ <br> side $[5]-29: 24,30: 3$, <br> 30:5, 53:1, 57:6 <br> sidewalk $[1]-23: 3$ sidewalks $[1]-16: 9$ <br> sidewalks [1] - 16:9 sign $[2]-66: 8,72: 17$ <br> SIGNAL [2]-26:17, <br> 62:5 <br> signal [10] $-24: 16$, <br> 24:17, 25:8, 26:22, <br> 26:24, 27:11, 27:16, <br> 27:18, 28:5, 62:6 <br> Signal [1] - 4:12 <br> Signal.................. [1] - <br> 4:22 <br> signature [1] - 89:10 <br> significance [1] - <br> 80:23 <br> significant $[2]-45: 25$, 73:4 <br> signify ${ }_{[1]}-23: 9$ <br> signs [1] - 64:2 <br> Silverhill ${ }_{[1]}-68: 20$ <br> sincere [1]-83:11 <br> single [1]-54:25 <br> SISLAK [67] - 6:19, <br> 6:23, 7:1, 7:4, 7:6, <br> 7:10, 7:13, 7:16, <br> 7:19, 7:22, 8:12, <br> 8:18, 10:25, 11:4, <br> 11:10, 11:13, 12:17, 14:20, 16:12, 16:20, <br> $17: 3,17: 7,21: 17$, <br> 21:21, 23:7, 23:25, <br> $25: 18,26: 19,27: 24$, <br> $29: 1,31: 20,35: 2$, $35: 10,36: 16,37: 23$ <br> $35: 10,36: 16,37: 23$, | 38:1, 38:4, 38:9, <br> 39:4, 39:8, 39:12, <br> 39:21, 52:13, 60:1, <br> 60:14, 60:18, 61:6, <br> 61:10, 61:17, 62:2, <br> 62:6, 62:16, 63:6, <br> 63:11, 63:16, 63:23, <br> 64:5, 64:10, 65:1, <br> 65:16, 66:12, 73:24, <br> 74:10, 74:20, 78:23, <br> 79:7, 79:13 <br> Sislak [1]-2:19 <br> sit $[1]-80: 12$ <br> site [1] - 72:25 <br> site-built [1] - 72:25 <br> situation [2] - 84:20, <br> 84:23 <br> situations [1] - 85:19 $\boldsymbol{s i x}[10]-24: 10,24: 12$, 33:6, 66:22, 66:24, 67:17, 68:8, 70:9, <br> 73:5, 81:16 <br> six-point-eight-five [1] - 66:22 <br> sixteen [3]-66:25, <br> 67:8, 71:9 <br> sixteen-point-eight [1]-67:8 <br> sixty $[7]-24: 10,29: 8$, <br> 33:6, 46:18, 60:20, <br> 67:5, 68:14 <br> sixty-one [1] - 67:5 <br> sixty-six [1] - 24:10 <br> sixty-six-point-two- <br> three [1] - 33:6 <br> sixty-three-point- <br> seventy-two [1] - <br> 68:14 <br> skip [2] - 37:21, 37:24 <br> slate [1] - 10:24 <br> slide [2]-69:7, 71:21 <br> slowdown [3] - 73:6, <br> 73:8, 73:12 <br> small [1] - 39:10 <br> smart [1] - 53:25 <br> solicit [2]-40:20, 42:4 <br> solution [1] - 65:9 <br> solutions [1] - 41:4 <br> someone [1] - 42:6 <br> something's $[1]-73: 4$ <br> soon [2]-81:24, <br> 85:13 <br> sorry [3] - 51:14, <br> 51:19, 77:8 <br> sort [1] - 35:21 <br> sounds [1] - 17:6 <br> source [1] - 73:19 <br> south [2] - 49:2, 56:21 | South [1]-24:16 <br> Southwest [1] - 2:9 <br> Spanish [12]-2:16, <br> 4:24, 16:21, 22:7, <br> 24:9, 45:2, 46:22, <br> 56:2, 62:21, 62:23, <br> 62:25, 68:19 <br> SPANISH ${ }_{[1]}-62: 15$ <br> speaking [2] - 8:10, 62:21 <br> speech [1] - $85: 8$ <br> speed [1] - 20:8 <br> spending [1] - 45:4 <br> split [2]-83:23, 83:24 <br> Sponsorship [1]-5:5 SPONSORSHIP [1] - <br> 64:4 <br> spot [2] - 37:2, 71:21 <br> spreadsheet [7] - <br> 29:9, 66:17, 69:4, <br> 69:8, 69:16, 69:18, 69:25 <br> SR $[4]$ - 4:25, 5:4, 63:5, 63:15 <br> staff [3] - 42:9, 65:11, <br> 76:10 <br> stage $[1]$ - 61:11 <br> stand [1] - 49:20 <br> standard [4]-33:4, <br> standards [13] - <br> 32:13, 33:17, 33:25, <br> 34:16, 34:18, 34:21, <br> 34:25, 35:1, 35:15, <br> $35: 18,35: 24,36: 7$, <br> 36:21 <br> standpoint [1] - 39:11 <br> start [14]-11:14, <br> 19:24, 20:3, 47:23, <br> 48:13, 56:23, 57:7, <br> 57:8, 57:9, 60:3, <br> 60:22, 64:1, 66:19 <br> started [2] - 50:25, <br> 80:7 <br> state [1] - 65:1 <br> STATE $[3]-23: 23$, <br> 64:25, 88:3 <br> State [10] - 4:10, 5:7, <br> 20:25, 23:25, 24:2, <br> 36:7, 36:22, 38:12, <br> 50:1, 64:20 <br> statewide [4] - 31:25, <br> 33:5, 34:18, 35:21 <br> stating $[1]-35: 23$ <br> station [1] - 47:7 <br> stay $[1]-34: 20$ <br> steel [2] - 19:22, 19:25 <br> stenotype $[1]-88: 7$ <br> still $_{[7]}-45: 7,61: 10$, <br> 63:1, 63:7, 63:8, | 63:11, 74:7 <br> Stonebridge ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 68:13 <br> stops [1] - 63:3 <br> store [1]-44:21 <br> stores [1] - $55: 22$ <br> Street [2] - 1:14, 68:1 <br> street $[1]-81: 14$ <br> strides ${ }_{[1]}$-80:15 <br> strikes [1] - 46:2 <br> structure [3] - 18:11, <br> 24:14, 24:15 <br> struggled [1] - 44:1 <br> studies ${ }_{[1]}$ - 42:17 <br> study $[6]-27: 11$, <br> 27:16, 27:19, 42:19, <br> 42:20, 56:21 <br> sturt $14-23: 3,29: 22$, <br> 70:16, 73:7 <br> subdivision [1] - <br> 72:23 <br> subdivisions [2] - <br> 70:7, 71:5 <br> subject [2]-53:16, 56:17 <br> submittal $[2]-13: 6$, <br> 16:25 <br> submitted [2]-12:20, <br> 43:13 <br> subsequent $[1]$ - <br> 22:14 <br> succeeding $[1]$ - $19: 9$ <br> sufficiency ${ }^{[1]}$ - 19:17 <br> suggested [2]-42:13, <br> 42:14 <br> suggestion [1]-59:8 <br> suggestions [3]- <br> 41:4, 42:15, 69:22 <br> suit [1] - 79:1 <br> summary [1] - 43:17 <br> summer $[1]$ - $48: 25$ <br> Sunday ${ }^{[1]}$ - $58: 14$ <br> supervisor $[1]$ - $38: 14$ <br> supplement $[1]$ - <br> 50:17 <br> support [4]-12:23, <br> 19:10, 56:15, 76:14 <br> supportive $[2]-22: 23$, <br> 86:8 <br> surface $_{[1]}{ }^{[1]}$ - $30: 17$ <br> surfaced [1] - 24:25 <br> surprised [1] - 30:14 <br> survey [9] - $42: 3,42: 4$, <br> 42:5, 42:11, 43:4, $43: 7,43: 10,43: 14$, <br> 43:7, 43:10, 43:14, <br> 43:15 <br> Survey $[1]$ - 43:3 <br> surveys [2]-42:17, <br> 43:9 <br> SUSAN ${ }_{[1]}-88: 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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## SUMMARY

MPO staff has prepared an Amendment to the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan regarding the Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening Project. The amendment is required for project approval by FHWA.

ALDOT and FHWA have reviewed the prepared amendments.

## RECOMMENDATION

- BPAC recommends:
- CAC recommends:
- TAC recommends:


## Attachment(S)

1.) LRTP Amendment
2.) Resolution
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# EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION 

## RESOLUTION NO. 2019-

## Adopting the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening Amendment

WHEREAS, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the organization designated by the Governor of the State of Alabama as being responsible, together amended by FAST Act, Sections 1201 and 1202, December 2015); 42 USC 2000d-1, 7401; 23 CFR 450 and 500; 40 CFR 51 and 93; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Transportation requires all urbanized areas, as established by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, doing area-wide urban transportation planning that involves more than one Department of Transportation operating administration, to submit a Long Range Transportation Plan as a condition for meeting the provisions of Title 23 USC 134; and,

WHEREAS, consistent with the declaration of these provisions, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, in cooperation with the Alabama Department of Transportation, has prepared the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the declaration of these provisions, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, in cooperation with the Alabama Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration, has prepared an Amendment to the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan regarding the I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to its duties, functions, and responsibilities, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, in session this $\qquad$ th day of $\qquad$ , 2019, did review and evaluate the aforementioned Amendment to the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, summarized on the attached pages; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization that the same does hereby endorse and adopt said Amendment to the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.


## ATTEST:

Date: $\qquad$
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Federal regulations for metropolitan planning organizations require the development of a minimum 20-year long range transportation plan of projects that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. [23 CFR $450.322(\mathrm{~b})$ ]. The long range transportation plan must: 1) identify current transportation needs; 2) forecast future transportation needs and; 3) establish strategies and projects that address the needs. Additionally, a key responsibility of MPOs is the inclusion of Title VI and Environmental Justice communities in the planning process. Title VI, Environmental Justice, and similar rules and regulations are discussed in detail in Appendix A.

This plan - the first Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) produced by the Eastern Shore MPO - utilizes a 25 -year planning horizon and considers future needs out to year 2040. The Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT) established the 2010 census year as the base year for the 2040 LRTP. Socioeconomic and employment/business data, purchased from InfoUSA, were used in the production of this Plan. ESMPO staff reviewed land use patterns and maps of municipalities, and using Citilabs Voyager travel demand simulation software, developed a computerized 2010 base year network model, from which future travel demand projections could be made. Population and land use trends were projected out to 2020 and 2040, and then run through the model. The results highlighted road and street segments that are likely to experience congestion or capacity deficiencies in the future. The MPO utilizes model results to develop lists of needed projects, which will help mitigate, within MPO funding constraints, roadway congestion in 2020 and 2040.

The 2040 LRTP anticipates a continuation of rapid growth experienced in Baldwin County and the Eastern Shore for the past three decades. This rapid growth exacerbates the congestion problems already encumbering certain corridors within the Eastern Shore. The primary congestion areas identified in the 2020 travel model, include US 98, US 31, US 90, and SR 181. Unfortunately, major capacity improvements are difficult or impossible on these statemaintained corridors, either because of the limited funding available to the MPO, or because of design constraints along the corridors. In an effort to maximize the return on investment for federal, State, and local transportation dollars, the LRTP pursues technology-related projects or smaller optimization projects affecting these major corridors. These projects will only be possible with participation from the Alabama Department of Transportation. The financially constrained side of the Plan also advances improvements for local corridors in an effort to encourage motorists using the main corridors, to utilize alternate corridors.

The 2040 travel model outputs indicate that nearly every road in the travel network will be over capacity in 2040. Unfortunately, the MPO's funding is insufficient to address these problems. Local officials will need to coordinate with the Alabama Department of Transportation to identify the funds necessary to address these issues.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1-Background

The Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is the instrument for coordinating the metropolitan long range transportation planning for the urbanized area along the Eastern Shore of Baldwin County. The LRTP identifies transportation improvements that will be needed in the Eastern Shore area over the next 25 years. The LRTP implements the 3-C planning process:

- Comprehensive (including all modes)
- Cooperative (involving a broad array of stakeholders and other interested parties)
- Continuous (being updated at least every five years)

The 3-C planning process is established in Federal statute and is required for areas designated as urbanized (have a population of 50,000 and above). The LRTP is one of the key products of the planning process for the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (ESMPO).

Federal regulations also require MPOs to develop long range transportation plans, with a minimum 20-year horizon, which identify the projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the Plan (23 CFR 450.322). In addition, MPOs have been required to develop transportation plans and programs that are consistent with projections of potential transportation demand (23 CFR § 450.316). This demand is based on the interrelated levels of activity in the areas of economic, demographic, environmental protection, growth management, and land use activities, in accordance with metropolitan and local development goals. Travel demand models have become the primary tools used to identify the existing and future travel demand of person and vehicle travel.

This document serves as an Amendment to the existing Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, specifically as it relates to section 3.6 of the existing plan regarding the Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening project.

## 1.2 - Eastern Shore MPO Area Description

The Eastern Shore MPO includes a substantial portion of the corporate limits of three cities and one town. These municipalities include: The City of Spanish Fort, the City of Daphne, the City of Fairhope, and the Town of Loxley. The ESMPO also encompasses the urbanized areas surrounding these four municipalities.
The land area of the Eastern Shore MPO planning area (sometimes called the study area) is approximately 311 square miles. The land area of the urban area of the ESMPO is approximately 143 square miles. The MPO planning area and the MPO urban area are shown in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1: MPO Metropolitan Planning Area


Source: MPO Staff
Based on 2010 US Census Data

## 1.2 - Performance Measures

The United States Department of Transportation, through the Fixing America's Transportation (FAST) Act, has elected to move towards performance based planning. This process refers to the application of performance management principles to achieve desired outcomes for transportation facilities. The Eastern Shore MPO has elected to adopt the statewide measures and targets in all categories and will support the targets through the Transportation Improvement Program. The categories, measures, and targets adopted by the Eastern Shore MPO can be seen in the table below.

Table 1.1: Performance Measures and Targets
Performance Measures and Targets

| Category | Performance Measure | Performance Target |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety | Number of Fatalities | 1,010 |  |
|  | Rate of Fatalities | 1.49 |  |
|  | Number of Injuries | 8,369 |  |
|  | Rate of Serious Injuries | 12.42 |  |
|  | Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities \& Injuries | 390 |  |
| Transit | \% of Revenue Vehicles that Exceeded ULB* | Reduce by 10\% |  |
|  | \% of Non-Revenue Vehicles that Exceeded ULB* | Reduce by 10\% |  |
|  | \% of Fatalities with Condition Rating < 3.0 | No more that $20 \%$ rated 3.0 |  |
| Assets | \% of Pavement in Good Condition (Interstate) | Greater than 50\% |  |
|  | \% of Pavement in Poor Condition (Interstate) | Less than 5\% |  |
|  | \% of Pavement in Good Condition (Non-Interstate) | Greater than 40\% |  |
|  | \% of Pavement in Poor Condition (Non-Interstate) | Less than 5\% |  |
|  | \% of NHS Bridges in Good Condition | No less than 27\% |  |
|  | \% of NHS Bridges in Poor Condition | No greater than 3\% |  |
|  |  | 2 Year Target | 4 Year Target |
| System <br> Performance | Reliable Person Miles on the Interstate | 96.4\% 96\% |  |
|  | Reliable Person Miles on the Non-Interstate NHS | 93.7\% | 93.6\% |
|  | Truck Travel Time Reliability Index | 1.20 | 1.21 |
|  | Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay | N/A |  |
|  | \% of Non-SOV | N/A |  |
|  | Total Emissions Reduction | N/A |  |

[^0]
### 2.0 Highway Facilities

## 2.1 - I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening Project Scope

The I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening project is a proposal to increase the capacity of I-10 by constructing a new six-lane bridge, with 215 feet of Air Draft Clearance (ADC), across the Mobile River, and replacing the existing I-10 bridges across Mobile Bay, known as the Bayway, from four to eight lanes at an elevation above the 100-year storm surge. The proposed project would be located in Baldwin and Mobile Counties. For the purpose of this Plan, only the Baldwin County section is included. The Baldwin County section includes the I-10 Bayway widening from Mobile County Line to East of SR-16 (US-90) in Spanish Fort. The bridge increases the capacity of I-10 to meet existing and predicted future traffic volumes, and to provide a more direct route for local, regional, and coastal interstate traffic, while minimizing impacts to Mobile's maritime industry.

The Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan includes the part of the bridge from Mobile County Line to Spanish Fort, while the Mobile County part of the bridge is included in the Mobile Area Long Range Transportation Plan Destination 2040. The Eastern Shore Long Range Transportation Plan may present the entire mapped project for information purposes, but funding will be by jurisdiction, with ALDOT allocating the funding as required. Estimated cost with project details for the Bayway widening portion can be seen in Figure 2.1 below.

## 2.2 - Capacity

## $\underline{2.3 \text { - Modeling }}$

Figure 2.1: CPMS Funding Reports

| Project Family ID | Project Reference ID | Fiscal Year | Scope |  | Stip Plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5011 | 100062413 | 2019 | PE-PE |  | 2016 |
| Project Description |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-10 BAYWAY WIDENING FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF SR-16 (US-90) AT SPANISH FORT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work |  | Revision Date | Target Start Date | Authorized Date | Work Accepted Date |
| GRADE, DRAIN, BASE, PAVE AND BRG |  | 10/19/2018 | 3/1/2019 |  |  |
| Actual Compl. Date | Orig. Est. Amount$\$ 0.00$ | Est. Amount$\$ 0.00$ | Urban Area <br> 032 - EASTERN SHORE | Targeted Compl. Date 12/24/2019 | District |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Congressional | Senate | Lead Agency | Function Class. | Aldot Area |  |
| 01 | 22 |  | 01 -INTERSTATE | 5 -MOBILE AREA |  |
| Initiator Name | Route Type | Route | Second route type | Second route |  |
| Richard Stoudenmire | , | 10 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Project Funding |  |  |
| Federal Obligated Amou$\$ 23,905,432.97$ | State Obligated Amount |  | Other Obligated Amount $\$ 0.00$ | Total Obligated Amount |  |
|  | \$5,976,358.24 |  | \$0.00 | \$29,881 |  |


| Project Family ID | Project Reference ID | Fiscal Year | Scope |  | Stip Plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5011 | 100062416 | 2019 | CN-CN |  | 2016 |
| Project Description |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-10 BAYWAY FROM MOBILE COUNTY LINE TO EAST OF EASTERN SHORE INTERCHANGE (EXIT 35) SR-16 (US-90) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work |  | Revision Date | Target Start Date | Authorized Date | Work Accepted Date |
| GRADE, DRAIN, BASE, PAVE AND BRG |  | 10/5/2018 | 7/26/2019 |  |  |
| Actual Compl. Date | Orig. Est. Amount | Est. Amount | Urban Area | Targeted Compl. Date | District |
|  | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 032-EASTERN SHORE | 9/17/2019 |  |
| Congressional | Senate | Lead Agency | Function Class. | Aldot Area |  |
| 01 | 22 |  | 01 -INTERSTATE | 5 -MOBILE AREA |  |
| Initiator Name | Route Type | Route | Second route type | Second route |  |
| Richard Stoudenmire | 1 | 10 |  |  |  |
|  | Project Funding |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Obligated Amou \$644,800,000.00 | State Obligated Amount |  | Other Obligated Amount | Total Obligated Amount |  |
|  | \$161,200,000.00 |  | \$0.00 | \$806,000,000.00 |  |

### 3.0 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

## 3.1 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) prepared for this project committed to providing a bicycle and pedestrian crossing of the Mobile River as part of the proposed project. While a specific route was not identified in the DEIS, options included the Bankhead Tunnel, Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge, and the new Mobile River Bridge, but no detailed studies were performed to determine which one should be utilized. At the Corridor Public Hearings, ALDOT received comments from the public stating that they would like for the new bridge to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Subsequent to the Public Hearings, ALDOT continued the dialogue with stakeholders through meetings with bicycle/pedestrian focus groups and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs) for the Mobile Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Eastern Shore MPO. Input from these meetings was used to refine the proposed alternatives to be considered. As a result, ALDOT studied the following bicycle and pedestrian alternatives:

1) I-165/Bay Bridge Road/Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge/US 90;
2) Bankhead Tunnel;
3) Mobile River Bridge with facilities on the south side of the new bridge;
4) Mobile River Bridge with facilities on the north side of the new bridge; and
5) Mobile River Bridge with facilities on both the north and south sides of the new bridge.

## 3.2 - Public Input on Bicycle and Pedestrian Alternatives

The alternatives listed above were presented to the public at a Bicycle/Pedestrian Public Workshop on October 27, 2016. A total of 523 comments were submitted to ALDOT before the comment period closed on November 11, 2016. In addition to the comment forms, 95 individuals signed a petition supporting the path to be built on the Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge. Of the comments received, 322 people indicated they would prefer the bicycle/pedestrian facility be placed on the new Mobile River Bridge. More than half of these individuals specifically noted that the view from the bridge would be an attraction for residents and tourists. A total of 88 individuals preferred the Bankhead Tunnel option, and a total of 129 individuals preferred the Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge route. A petition with 95 signatures in support of a route using the Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge was received. The petition notes safety and growth and redevelopment of the Africatown/Plateau area as reasons for preferring the CochraneAfricatown USA Bridge route. A total of 41 people stated they were opposed to providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities because of the associated costs.

ALDOT met with the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs) associated with the Mobile Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Eastern Shore MPO to discuss compatibility with existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian plans. In addition to meeting with the BPACs, ALDOT met with the Mobile Baykeeper bicycle/pedestrian focus group. The Mobile BPAC and Mobile focus group preferred bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be located on the new Mobile River Bridge. The Eastern Shore MPO preferred the Bankhead Tunnel route. Although an observation area on the new Mobile River Bridge was not presented as an option at
the October public workshop, the Mobile focus group, Mobile BPAC, and Eastern Shore BPAC all commented on the desire to see an observation area on the new Mobile River Bridge.

## 3.3 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Preferred Route

After reviewing the input from the workshop and further discussions with the bicycle/pedestrian focus groups and BPACs, ALDOT's preferred alternative includes a combination of facilities to meet the interests of a variety of user groups based on feedback from the public workshop, BPACs, and focus groups. The preferred route is shown on Figure 3.1.

The preferred route is the Cochrane-Africatown USA Shared Use Path. The petition received in support of this route notes safety and growth and redevelopment of the Africatown/Plateau area as reasons for preferring the Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge route.
ALDOT will provide a bicycle and pedestrian shared use path from the I-165 southbound onramp at Bay Bridge Road to the Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge. ALDOT will retrofit the Cochrane-Africatown USA Bridge to provide two protected bicycle and pedestrian lanes (one on each side of the bridge). The bicycle and pedestrian path will be a minimum of eight feet wide. ALDOT proposes to provide a shared use path on the south side of Bay Bridge Road and a sidewalk on the north side of Bay Bridge Road with crosswalks at appropriate locations. More detailed studies, design, and coordination with the local community will be required to finalize the details of the bicycle and pedestrian facilities along this route. The length of this proposed corridor is approximately 2.6 miles. This facility will be constructed using Federal and/or state funds and will be completed within the same timeframe as the completion of the Mobile River Bridge and Bayway project.

## Future Extensions of Cochrane-Africatown USA Shared Use Path

ALDOT also commits to work with local municipalities to provide bicycle and pedestrian paths from Beauregard Street in downtown Mobile to the Cochrane-Africatown USA Shared Use Path via surface streets, such as Conception Street or Telegraph Road. ALDOT will work with local municipalities and the local BPAC of the Mobile MPO to determine the appropriate route for these paths, taking into consideration the opportunity for connectivity with the proposed Three Mile Creek Trail improvements, the Africatown Connections Blueway, and other proposed and existing bicycle and pedestrian plans and greenway initiatives.

ALDOT will also work with local municipalities and the Mobile and Eastern Shore BPACs to extend the path to the USS ALABAMA Battleship Memorial Park.

ALDOT will also work with local municipalities from the Eastern Shore to extend the bicycle and pedestrian facilities from the USS ALABAMA Battleship Memorial Park to Spanish Fort/Daphne as proposed in the Spanish Fort Causeway Master Plan. Specifically, ALDOT will include bicycle and pedestrian facilities in future transportation improvement projects along the US-90/US-98 corridor, such as the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations being included in the ongoing Tensaw River Bridge replacement project.

It is anticipated that these extensions will be funded with Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) transportation grants, Federal-aid funds, and/or other available means.

Figure 3.1: Preferred Bicycle and Pedestrian Route


[^1]- Mobile River Bridge Belvedere:

In addition to the above-listed facilities, ALDOT commits to constructing a belvedere (i.e., overlook that provides a space for people to stop, rest, and enjoy the view) on the bridge at the west main tower. This commitment is provided to address the stated desire from the BPACs and the public to have a viewing area from the bridge as an attraction for residents and tourists. Access to the belvedere will be provided via an elevator and stair tower located on the west side of the river. The path from the tower access to the belvedere will be a minimum of 12 feet wide. The belvedere will have a minimum area of 700 square feet. Construction of the belvedere will provide the view from the new Mobile River Bridge that was requested in comments received from the public workshop, the BPACs, and the bicycle/pedestrian focus group.

- Bankhead Tunnel:

ALDOT has previously closed the Bankhead Tunnel to vehicular traffic for a few hours on the weekends to allow bicyclists and pedestrians to use the tunnel to cross the Mobile River. The majority of respondents from the public workshop who favored the Bankhead Tunnel alternative said they would solely use the tunnel on the weekends. The Eastern Shore MPO BPAC also supported this route for the Mobile River crossing. ALDOT will continue this program as long as there is interest from the community and availability to close the tunnel without major disruptions to traffic.

## 3.5 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Options

In response to public input requesting that bicycle and pedestrian facilities be located on the new bridge, ALDOT has included options that may be incorporated into the project should sufficient funding become available. As part of their bids, the teams proposing on the project will include prices for the options listed below. This process encourages the proposing teams to be innovative in how they approach including these options on the project. Ultimately, ALDOT will determine whether either of these options can be added to the project. A decision on these options would not be made until after the FEIS/ROD is approved since the proposing teams will not be able to submit their proposals and bids until after the FEIS/ROD is approved.

- Option 1: Full Shared Use Path on Mobile River Bridge:

Option 1 would provide a minimum 12-foot-wide shared use path along the high level approaches and main span bridge crossing the Mobile River. The path would begin between Virginia Street and Texas Street on the west side of Mobile River and end near US-90/US-98 on the east side of Mobile River. The path would be located on the same side as the Mobile River Bridge Belvedere and would provide a connection to the belvedere from the path.

- Option 2: Elevators/Stairs on Both Sides of Mobile River with Connecting Shared Use Path:

Option 2 would provide an elevator and stair tower on the east side of Mobile River. A 12-foot-wide shared use path from the Mobile River Bridge Belvedere would connect to the elevator and stair tower on the east side of Mobile River. The belvedere could be moved to the center of the main span bridge.

## 3.6 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations

As previously stated, the Mobile River Bridge and a portion of the Bayway project falls outside of the Eastern Shore MPO planning boundary. The following recommendations focus on bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the US90/US98 Causeway within the Baldwin County limits. These recommendations should be considered as alternatives to placing the bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Bayway structure.

The Eastern Shore MPO Policy Board approved the following projects to be added to the Visionary List of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan:

- Trail Segment - Multi-modal Trail from the Eastern Segment of Causeway plan, connecting the existing Eastern Shore Trail at Highway 90 to Meaher State Park, Five Rivers Delta Center and Pineda Island. Includes a multi-modal crossing span over Blakely River on the north side of Causeway, access improvements, pedestrian safe havens through median installation, and a lighted Crossing at Meaher State Park.
- Trail Segment - Multi-modal trail From the Eastern segment to the Central Segment of the Causeway plan. Beginning at Meaher State Park and Five Rivers Delta Center and located on the North side of the Causeway. Includes a multi-modal span over the Apalachee River to the I-10 Interchange, additional lighting, wayfinding signage, pedestrian safe havens through the use of medians, and access for possible fishing pier, boat/ kayak launches and trail head parking area.
- Trail Segment - Multi- modal Trail from the Central Segment stopping point at the I-10 interchange to the Western Segment of the Spanish Fort Causeway Plan. The Trail spans across the Tensaw River, creates pedestrian access through safe havens created by median or a pedestrian and multi-modal span over the Causeway, connecting the north and south sides of Causeway to a possible park on the south side of Causeway.

Figure 3.2: Bicycle and Pedestrian Visionary List
Bike-Ped \& Transit Visionary List - October 2018


### 4.0 Funding

## 4.1 - Public Private Partnership

The I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening will be funded through a Public-Private Partnership (P3). P3's allow public agencies to leverage private sector resources to build critical projects when the public agencies do not have sufficient funds to do so otherwise. This P3 pairs ALDOT with a private partner or partners, to design, build, finance, operate, and maintain the new I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway without additional burden on public tax dollars.

As the public partner, ALDOT will facilitate the selection of the private partner, or concessionaire, through a competitive process. The concessionaire agrees to lease the infrastructure in the designated project area for 55 years, making the concessionaire responsible for designing and constructing the project, as well as maintaining and preserving the roadways and bridges over the life of the lease. During the 55 -year concession period, ALDOT will provide oversight and hold the concessionaire accountable for the goals, deadlines, and budgets detailed in the lease. The concessionaire will also be required to meet all commitments detailed in the approved FEIS/ROD.

In addition to private investment and available state funds, P 3 projects are often tolled to help with upfront project costs. Tolls also support the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facilities, allowing the private partner to recover their investment in the project over the life of the P3.

## 4.2-Tolling

The proposed project would use all-electronic tolling, allowing drivers to travel through the facilities without stopping to physically pay a toll. Electronic toll gantries would span the roadway and initiate the toll collection process via transponder or license plate image. Users would be able to pay for tolls using a credit or debit card or by pre-purchasing a transponder, paying online, or paying over the phone. Users would also be able to pay in person at a local walk-in center. Alabama is in the process of coordinating with neighboring states to develop a cooperative agreement for toll users who may already have accounts in place in other states, such as Florida or Georgia.

Toll rates are still being studied and will not be defined until after the design is complete. Factors influencing toll rates include traffic volumes; existing travel conditions; forecasted travel conditions; and costs for construction, operations and maintenance. On opening day, toll rates are expected to range from $\$ 3$ to $\$ 6$ for passenger vehicles. Frequent user discounts are also being evaluated.

### 6.0Title VI and Environmental Justice

In response to Executive Order 12898, FHWA identifies three fundamental Environmental Justice (EJ) principles for transportation projects:

1) To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations;
2) To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and
3) To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

## 5.1 - Methodology

The methodology used to conduct the Environmental Justice Assessment for the I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Project is based on requirements set forth in Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations; U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.2(a), Final DOT Environmental Justice Order; and FHWA Order 6640.23A, FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.

In order to evaluate the potential effects on EJ populations that could result from the Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Project, the following steps were undertaken:

1) Develop demographic profile for project study area.
2) Identify locations within project study area with high concentrations of low-income and/or minority populations using commonly-accepted thresholds.
3) Determine whether the proposed project would result in adverse and/or beneficial impacts on EJ populations.
4) Determine whether potential impacts on EJ populations would be considered "disproportionately high and adverse."
5) Develop measures to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse impacts on EJ populations.
6) Include all findings and determinations in the NEPA document prepared for the proposed project.

Areas with concentrations of minority and/or low-income populations were identified using U.S. Census Bureau data and poverty guidelines from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

## $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ - Public Involvement

ALDOT conducted community workshops in EJ areas that could be affected by the proposed project on June 18 and 19, 2018, from 5:00-7:00 p.m. These workshops focused on discussing potential impacts of the proposed project, including traffic and tolling, with members of the EJ communities. More than 5,000 postcards were mailed directly to residents and property owners in the community to invite them to the workshops. Postcards were also placed in local community centers and churches. Nine written comments were received from area residents.

## 5.3 - Environmental Justice Conclusions

Based upon the updated EJ assessment, including input from the workshops conducted in June 2018, the impacts resulting from the proposed project are not expected to be "disproportionately high and adverse" on EJ populations. The projected impacts are not expected to be disproportionately borne by low-income and/or minority populations, nor are the predicted impacts expected to be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population.

# EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION 

## RESOLUTION NO. $\underline{\text { 2019- }}$

## Adopting the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening Amendment

WHEREAS, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the organization designated by the Governor of the State of Alabama as being responsible, together amended by FAST Act, Sections 1201 and 1202, December 2015); 42 USC 2000d-1, 7401; 23 CFR 450 and 500; 40 CFR 51 and 93; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Transportation requires all urbanized areas, as established by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, doing area-wide urban transportation planning that involves more than one Department of Transportation operating administration, to submit a Long Range Transportation Plan as a condition for meeting the provisions of Title 23 USC 134; and,

WHEREAS, consistent with the declaration of these provisions, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, in cooperation with the Alabama Department of Transportation, has prepared the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the declaration of these provisions, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, in cooperation with the Alabama Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration, has prepared an Amendment to the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan regarding the I-10 Mobile River Bridge and Bayway Widening project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to its duties, functions, and responsibilities, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, in session this 23rd day of January 2019, did review and evaluate the aforementioned Amendment to the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, summarized on the attached pages; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization that the same does hereby endorse and adopt said Amendment to the Eastern Shore 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.

## Dane Haygood, Chairman

## ATTEST:

> Date:
$\qquad$

# Eastern Shore MPO 

## Agenda Action Form

Policy Board Work Session - January 9, 2019
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019
Citizens Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019
Technical Advisory Committee - January 16, 2019
Policy Board - January 23, 2019

## SUMMARY

The Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT) requests that the following changes be made to the TIP:

Project was deleted due to ALDOT no longer pursuing grant:

- [DELETION] Project 100057419 (CN) Federal aid number: IM MR17. DESIGN OF VARIOUS INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVICES AND FIBER BACKBONE ALONG I-10, I-65, I-165, SR-16 (US-90), SR-42 (US-98), SR-59 WITHIN THE MOBILE AND BALDWIN URBAN AREA


## Design and Construction of Bridge Paintings:

- Project 100069462 (PE) BRP ON VARIOUS BRIDGES ALONG I-10. ON US-98 OVER I-10 (BIN 10002, 10003) ON I-10 OVER FISH RIVER (BIN 10170, 10171) ON I-10 OVER 3-MILE CRK (BIN 10172, 10173) ON I-10 OVER COWPEN CRK (BIN 8527, 8528) ON I-10 OVER STYX RIVER (BIN 8530, 8531)
- Project 100069479 (CN) BRP ON VARIOUS BRIDGES ALONG I-10. ON US-98 OVER I-10 (BIN 10002, 10003) ON I-10 OVER FISH RIVER (BIN 10170, 10171) ON I-10 OVER 3-MILE CRK (BIN 10172, 10173) ON I-10 OVER COWPEN CRK (BIN 8527, 8528) ON I-10 OVER STYX RIVER (BIN 8530, 8531)


## 100067471RECOMMENDATION

- BPAC recommends:
- CAC recommends:
- TAC recommends:


## Attachment(S)

1.) Resolution

# EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION <br> RESOLUTION NO. 2019- <br> State Requested Amendments to the FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 

WHEREAS, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the organization designated by the Governor of the State of Alabama as being responsible, together with the State of Alabama, for implementing the applicable provisions of 23 USC 134 and 135 (amended by the FAST Act, Sections 1201 and 1202, December 2015); 42 USC 2000d-1, 7401; 23 CFR 450 and 500; 40 CFR 51 and 93; and

WHEREAS, Title 23 USC 134 and 23 CFR 450.324 require that transportation projects in urbanized areas, funded by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, be included in a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), amended as often as required, and adopted by the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO); and

WHEREAS, consistent with the declaration of these provisions, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, in cooperation with the Alabama Department of Transportation, adopted Resolution 2015-24 approving the Final FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, the Alabama Department of Transportation has proposed the following changes to the Final FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program:

- [DELETION] Project 100057419 (CN) Federal aid number: IM MR17. DESIGN OF VARIOUS INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVICES AND FIBER BACKBONE ALONG I-10, I-65, I-165, SR-16 (US-90), SR-42 (US-98), SR-59 WITHIN THE MOBILE AND BALDWIN URBAN AREA


## Design and Construction of Bridge Paintings:

- Project 100069462 (PE) BRP ON VARIOUS BRIDGES ALONG I-10. ON US-98 OVER I-10 (BIN 10002, 10003) ON I-10 OVER FISH RIVER (BIN 10170, 10171) ON I-10 OVER 3-MILE CRK (BIN 10172, 10173) ON I-10 OVER COWPEN CRK (BIN 8527, 8528) ON I-10 OVER STYX RIVER (BIN 8530, 8531)
- Project 100069479 (CN) BRP ON VARIOUS BRIDGES ALONG I-10. ON US-98 OVER I-10 (BIN 10002, 10003) ON I-10 OVER FISH RIVER (BIN 10170, 10171) ON I-10 OVER 3-MILE CRK (BIN 10172, 10173) ON I-10 OVER COWPEN CRK (BIN 8527, 8528) ON I-10 OVER STYX RIVER (BIN 8530, 8531)

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, has reviewed the requested amendments to the FY 2016 to 2019 Transportation Improvement Program and does hereby approve the aforementioned changes.

The foregoing resolution was adopted and approved on the $23^{\text {rd }}$ day of January 2019, by the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board.

Dane Haygood, Chairman

## ATTEST:

Date:
Date: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Eastern Shore MPO <br> Agenda Action Form

Policy Board Work Session - January 9, 2019
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019
Citizens Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019
Technical Advisory Committee - January 16, 2019
Policy Board - January 23, 2019

## SUMMARY

## Baldwin County:

- Design of Roundabout at County Road 64 and Rigsby Road and to Design the Widening of County Road 64 from State Route 181 to County Road 54 East.

Total Cost: $\quad \$ 275,000$
MPO: \$220,000
Local: $\quad \$ 55,000$

## RECOMMENDATION

- BPAC recommends:
- CAC recommends:
- TAC recommends:


## Attachment(S)

1. Project Submittal Form
2. Federal Funds Sheet
3. Resolution

## EASTERN SHORE MPO PROJECT SUBMITTAL FORM

For Submitting a Proposed Project for Inclusion in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) or Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Date: ${ }^{7 / 20 / 2018}$ Point of Contact: Joey Nunnally
Address: 22070 SR 59, Robertsdale AL 36567
Phone: 251-972-6879 Email: jnunnally@baldwincountyal.gov
This Project was Recommended by (check one): $\square$ Citizen Working or Living within MPO Area
Advisory Committee Member $\square$ Public Official $\square$ Other
Please provide the following information about the proposed project:
Project Description and Location (include termini description, if road improvement)
-DESIGN OF ROUNDABOUT AT CR 64 AND RIGSBY ROAD AND TO DESIGN THE WIDENING OF CR 64 FROM SR 181 TO CR 54 EAST

Reason for Proposed Project (Purpose and Need):
Capacity Improvement

Project Length (if applicable):
5,200 feet
Bicycle and Pedestrian or ADA Upgrades:
The project will meet or exceed ADA requirements

Roadway Classification (if applicable):
Minor Arterial
Percent (\%) Local Match:
20\%

Environmental Justice Issues or Concerns:
There are no Environmental Justice issues or concerns that have been identified.

## For Internal (MPO or Project Sponsor) Use Only

Scope of Work:
Cost Estimate:
Preliminary Engineering:

Right-of-Way:

Utilities:

Construction:

TOTAL COST:
\$275,000

## Project Map:



## Potential Funding Sources:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. $\qquad$
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Recommendation:

$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the Visionary List of the LRTP
$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the TIP
Recommend the Policy Board postpone taking any action on the proposed project to give time for further review or to change the project scope: $\qquad$
$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the Financially Constrained List of the LRTP
$\square$ Recommend the Policy Board not approve the project
Votes:
Chair or Vice Chair Signature
Date

## Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendation:

Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the Visionary List of the LRTP
$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the TIP
$\square$ Recommend the Policy Board postpone taking any action on the proposed project to give time for further review or to change the project scope: $\qquad$
$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the Financially Constrained List of the LRTP $\square$ Recommend the Policy Board not approve the project

Votes:

Chair or Vice Chair Signature
Date

## Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation:

$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the Visionary List of the LRTP
$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the TIP
$\square$ Recommend the Policy Board postpone taking any action on the proposed project to give time for further review or to change the project scope: $\qquad$
$\square$ Recommend approval of the project as submitted for inclusion in the Financially Constrained List of the LRTP
$\square$ Recommend the Policy Board not approve the project
Votes:
Chair or Vice Chair Signature
Date

## Policy Board Action:

$\square$ Approve the project as submitted for inclusion in the Visionary List of the LRTP
$\square$ Approve the project as submitted for inclusion in the TIP
$\square$ Postpone taking any action on the proposed project to give time for further review or to change the project scope: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$ Approve the project as submitted for inclusion in the Financially Constrained List of the LRTP
$\square$ Choose not to approve the project

## Votes:

Resolution Number:


| SCOPE | FEDERAL FUNDS | Start Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PE | \$256,000 | 12/01/2015 |
| CN | \$2,811,404 | 09/30/2016 |
| CN | \$21,901 | 12/15/2015 |
| PE | \$6,400 | 03/01/2016 |
| PE | \$6,400 | 03/01/2016 |
| CN | \$797,022 | 09/30/2016 |
| PE | \$40,680 | 02/01/2016 |
| PE | \$42,000 | 05/01/2016 |
| CN | \$344,400 | 09/15/2016 |
| PE | \$17,776 | 11/01/2016 |


| Status | Authorized |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Authorized | $10 / 30 / 2015$ |  |
|  | Authorized | $7 / 29 / 2016$ |
|  | Authorized | $11 / 18 / 2015$ |
|  | Authorized | $1 / 28 / 2016$ |
|  | Authorized | $2 / 16 / 2016$ |
|  | Authorized | $9 / 6 / 2016$ |
|  | Authorized | $12 / 16 / 2015$ |
|  | Authorized | $4 / 12 / 2016$ |
|  | Authorized | $9 / 9 / 2016$ |
|  | Authorized | $9 / 22 / 2016$ |


|  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Prior FY Carryover | $\$ 3,622,856$ |
| FY Apportionment | $\$ 1,255,735$ |
| FY Special Allocation | $\$ 0$ |
| Total Funds | $\$ 4,878,591$ |


| TOTALS FOR FISCAL YEAR | 2016 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Authorized Projects | $\$ 4,343,984$ |
| Planned Projects | $\$ 0$ |
| Total Project Funds | $\$ 4,343,984$ |


| Unobligated Balance | $\$ 534,607$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Remaining Balance | $\$ 534,607$ |



## TOTALS FOR FISCAL YEAR

| Prior FY Carryover | \$266,907 | Authorized Projects | \$0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY Apportionment | \$1,359,977 | Planned Projects | \$0 |
| FY Special Allocation | \$0 | Total Project Funds | \$0 |
| Total Funds | \$1,626,884 |  |  |


|  | $\$ 1,626,884$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Unobligated Balance | $\$ 1,626,884$ |  |
| Remaining Balance |  |  |

Prior FY Carryover $\quad \$ 1,626884$

| Prior FY Carryover | \$1,626,884 | Authorized Projects | \$0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY Apportionment | \$1,417,360 | Planned Projects | \$0 |
| FY Special Allocation | \$0 | Total Project Funds | \$0 |
| Total Funds | \$3,044,244 |  |  |


| Unobligated Balance | $\$ 3,044,244$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Remaining Balance | $\$ 3,044,244$ |


|  |  | TOTALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prior FY Carryover | \$3,044,244 | Authorized Projects | \$0 | Unobligated Balance | \$4,461,604 |
| FY Apportionment | \$1,417,360 | Planned Projects | \$0 | Remaining Balance | \$4,461,604 |
| FY Special Allocation | \$0 | Total Project Funds | \$0 |  |  |
| Total Funds | \$4,461,604 |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | TOTALS FOR FISC | 2021 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prior FY Carryover | \$4,461,604 | Authorized Projects | \$0 | Unobligated Balance | \$5,878,964 |
| FY Apportionment | \$1,417,360 | Planned Projects | \$0 | Remaining Balance | \$5,878,964 |
| FY Special Allocation | \$0 | Total Project Funds | \$0 |  |  |
| Total Funds | \$5,878,964 |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |
| Prior FY Carryover | $\$ 5,878,964$ |
| FY Apportionment | $\$ 1,417,360$ |
| FY Special Allocation | $\mathbf{\$ 0}$ |
| Total Funds | $\$ 7,296,324$ |


| TOTALS FOR FISCAL YEAR |  | 2022 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| Authorized Projects | $\mathbf{\$ 0}$ |  |
| Planned Projects | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total Project Funds | $\$ 0$ |  |


| Unobligated Balance | $\$ 7,296,324$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Remaining Balance | $\$ 7,296,324$ |  |
|  |  |  |


|  |  | TOTALS FOR FIS | 2023 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prior FY Carryover | \$7,296,324 | Authorized Projects | \$0 | Unobligated Balance | \$8,713,684 |
| FY Apportionment | \$1,417,360 | Planned Projects | \$0 | Remaining Balance | \$8,713,684 |
| FY Special Allocation | \$0 | Total Project Funds | \$0 |  |  |
| Total Funds | \$8,713,684 |  |  |  |  |

## EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 2019-

# Authorizing the Use of MPO Surface Transportation Funds for the Design of a Roundabout at County Road 64 and Rigsby Road and to Design the Widening of County Road 64 from State Route 181 to County Road 54 East 

WHEREAS, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the organization designated by the Governor of the State of Alabama as being responsible, together with the State of Alabama, for implementing the applicable provisions of 23 USC 134 and 135 (amended by the FAST Act, Sections 1201 and 1202, December 2015); 42 USC 2000d-1, 7401; 23 CFR 450 and 500; 40 CFR 51 and 93; and

WHEREAS, the Eastern Shore MPO has three years to allocate MPO Surface Transportation Project funds through the adoption of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and FY16-19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the Baldwin County Commission has submitted a project to design a roundabout at County Road 64 and Rigsby Road and to design the widening of County Road 64 from State Route 181 to County Road 54 East for inclusion in the FY 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, the roundabout at the intersection of County Road 64 and Rigsby Road and the widening of County Road 64 from State Route 181 to County Road (ALDOT Project Number: PE $=100069347$ ) has been submitted for funding through MPO Surface Transportation Funds which require a twenty percent (20\%) local match; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 2019-04 allocated $\$ 260,000(\mathrm{MPO}=\$ 208,000$, Local $=\$ 52,000)$ with the Baldwin County Commission proving the local $20 \%$ match; and

WHEREAS, the project has an additional estimated design cost of $\$ 275,000(\mathrm{MPO}=\$ 220,000, \mathrm{Local}=\$ 55,000)$ with the Baldwin County Commission providing the local $20 \%$ match; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board approves the use of MPO Surface Transportation Funds to fund the design of a roundabout at the intersection of County Road 64 and Rigsby Road and to design the widening of County Road 64 from State Route 181 to County Road 54 East, and authorizes MPO staff to take all steps necessary to accommodate the allocation of funds.

The foregoing resolution was adopted and approved on the 23rd day of January 2019, by the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board.
$\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$
Dane Haygood, Chairman

## ATTEST:

Date:

## Eastern Shore MPO

## Agenda Action Form

Policy Board Work Session - January 9, 2019
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019
Citizens Advisory Committee - January 15, 2019
Technical Advisory Committee - January 16, 2019
Policy Board - January 23, 2019

## SUMMARY

MPO staff has prepared a Public Transit Plan for the Metropolitan Planning Area and BRATS.
The draft plan was sent to Advisory Committees and the Policy Board in November 2018. Minor comments were received and have been incorporated into the final version.

## RECOMMENDATION

- BPAC recommends:
- CAC recommends:
- TAC recommends:


## Attachment(S)

1. Public Transit Plan
2. Resolution

## EASTERN SHORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION NO. 2019-

## Adopting the Public Transit Plan

WHEREAS, the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the organization designated by the Governor of the State of Alabama as being responsible, together with the State of Alabama, for implementing the applicable provisions of 23 USC 134 and 135 (amended by the FAST Act, Sections 1201 and 1202, December 2015); 42 USC 2000d-1, 7401; 23 CFR 450 and 500; 40 CFR 51 and 93; and

WHEREAS, the Eastern Shore MPO is tasked with planning for Public Transit in the urbanized area; and
WHEREAS, the Baldwin Regional Area Transit System (BRATS) is the designated public transit provider for the urbanized area and the Eastern Shore MPO; and

WHEREAS, MPO staff has prepared a Public Transit Plan for BRATS to meet the work requirements set forth in the Unified Planning Work Program section 6.6 Public Transportation; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization, has reviewed the proposed 2019 Public Transit Plan and does hereby approve the aforementioned plan.

The foregoing resolution was adopted and approved on the $23^{\text {rd }}$ day of January 2019, by the Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board.
$\qquad$

## ATTEST:

Date: $\qquad$



[^0]:    *ULB = Useful Life Benchmark

[^1]:    Source: Alabama Department of Transportation

