

Fiscal Years 2016 – 2019
Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan for the
Alabama Counties of
Mobile, Baldwin and Escambia

Adopted by the Mobile Metropolitan Planning Organization: September 6, 2017
Adopted by the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization: September 21, 2017
Adopted by the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission
Board of Directors: September 21, 2017

Prepared by



THE SOUTH ALABAMA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Mobile, Alabama

In cooperation with the

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

and the

ALABAMA ASSOCIATION OF REGIONAL COUNCILS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Section 1: Purpose, Goal, and Overview	1
Purpose	1
Goal	1
Overview	1
Section 2: Funding Sources	4
Section 5310 Funds	4
Section 5316 Funds, Job Access Reverse Commute Funds (JARC)	6
Section 5317 Funds, New Freedom Funds	7
Other Funding Sources	8
• Section 5307	8
• Section 5311	9
• Section 5339	9
Section 3: Description of the Area	10
Mobile County	10
Baldwin County	13
Escambia County	15
Section 4: Methodology	17
Section 5: Findings	19
Service Areas and Restrictions of Transportation Providers	19
Capacity of Transportation Providers	25
Section 6: Transit Dependent Populations	30
Mobile County	30
Baldwin County	30
Escambia County	37
Section 7: Unmet Needs and Duplication of Service	41
Unmet Transportation Needs	41
Duplication of Transportation Services	43
Section 8: Common Origins/Destinations	48
Common Origins and Destinations Based on Surveys	48
Potential Transit Destinations Based on Industry/Service	52
Section 9: Mobile Urban Area Transit System	57
The Wave Transit System	57
Other Mobile Urban Area Transit Services	60
Section 10: Action Plan	62

Section 11: Strategies and Recommendations..... 69

Section 12: Conclusions 71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Population Projections..... 10

Table 2: Communities in Baldwin County 13

Table 3: Service Areas and Restrictions for 5310, 5316, or 5317 providers in Mobile County 19

Table 4: Service Areas and Restrictions for other service providers in Mobile County 21

Table 5: Service Areas and Restrictions for 5310, 5316, or 5317 providers in Baldwin County 22

Table 6: Service Areas and Restrictions for other service providers in Baldwin County 23

Table 7: Service Areas and Restrictions for 5310, 5316, or 5317 providers in Escambia County .. 24

Table 8: Service Areas and Restrictions for other service providers in Escambia County 24

Table 9: Public Transportation Providers Serving the Region that Responded to the Survey 25

Table 10: 5310, 5316 and 5317 Transportation Providers’ Vehicles and Capacities in Mobile County 25

Table 11: Other Transportation Providers’ Vehicles and Capacity in Mobile County that Responded to the Survey..... 26

Table 12: 5310, 5316 and 5317 Transportation Providers’ Vehicles and Capacity in Baldwin County 27

Table 13: Other Transportation Providers’ Vehicles and Capacity in Baldwin County that Responded to the Survey..... 27

Table 14: 5310, 5316 and 5317 Transportation Providers’ Vehicles and Capacity in Escambia County 28

Table 15: Other Transportation Providers’ Vehicles and Capacity in Escambia County that Responded to the Survey..... 29

Table 16: Transportation Services Deficiencies..... 41

Table 17: Common Origins for Elderly, Disabled and Low income Population in Mobile County 48

Table 18: Common Origins for Elderly, Disabled and Low income Population in Baldwin County	50
Table 19: Common Origins for Elderly, Disabled and Low income Population in Escambia County	51
Table 20: Wave Transit System Routes	57
Table 21: Action Plan	62

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes of the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission Region	3
Figure 2: Mobile County Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes	12
Figure 3: Baldwin County Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes	14
Figure 4: Escambia County Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes	16
Figure 5: Mobile County Elderly Population per Square Mile by Block Group.....	31
Figure 6: Mobile County Disabled Population per Square Mile by Block Group	32
Figure 7: Mobile County Poverty Status per Square Mile by Block Group	33
Figure 8: Baldwin County Elderly Population per Square Mile by Block Group.....	34
Figure 9: Baldwin County Disabled Population per Square Mile by Block Group	35
Figure 10: Baldwin County Poverty Status per Square Mile by Block Group	36
Figure 11: Escambia County Elderly Population per Square Mile by Block Group.....	38
Figure 12: Escambia County Disabled Population per Square Mile by Block Group	39
Figure 13: Escambia County Poverty Status per Square Mile by Block Group	40
Figure 14: 5310, 5316, 5317 Combined Service Areas for Mobile County.....	45
Figure 15: 5310, 5316, 5317 Combined Service Areas for Baldwin County	46
Figure 16: 5310, 5316, 5317 Combined Service Areas for Escambia County	47
Figure 17: Most Common Destinations for Transit Dependent Populations in Mobile County	54

Figure 18: Most Common Destinations for Transit Dependent Populations in Baldwin
County 55

Figure 19: Most Common Destinations for Transit Dependent Populations in Escambia
County 56

Figure 20: The Wave Transit System Routes and Service Area 59

APPENDICES

Appendices 72

Appendix A: Stakeholder Committee List 73

Appendix B: Adopting Resolutions..... 77

SECTION 1 PURPOSE, GOAL, AND OVERVIEW

Purpose

The Federal Transportation Authorization Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act or “FAST Act” requires that specialized transit projects for the elderly, the disabled, and people with low incomes be included in a locally developed, coordinated human service transportation plan and that the plan be developed and approved through a process that includes participation by seniors, individuals with disabilities, people with low incomes, and private and nonprofit transportation providers.

Goal

It is the goal of the Mobile Metropolitan Planning Organization and the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission to enhance access to transit service in Southwest Alabama through the coordination of existing and future services. In order to achieve this goal, this plan was developed to:

- Identify common origins and destinations for targeted populations
- Inventory existing transit services
- Identify unmet needs
- Identify possible wasteful duplication of efforts
- Recommend provisions for cost-efficient transit services

Overview

The *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU) required the development of a coordinated human service transportation plan in for three Federal Transit Administration programs (Section 5310 - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program, Section 5316 - Job Access and Reverse Commute, and Section 5317 - New Freedom). The *Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act* (MAP-21) extended the coordinated human service transportation plan requirement for the Section 5310 program. Under Map-21, the Section 5316 and 5317 programs were consolidated with the Section 5307, 5310, and 5311 programs and no longer have the planning requirement. This carried over into the FAST Act, However, remaining Section 5316 and 5317 funding must be allocated based on a coordinated human service transportation plan.


FTA proposes that the key elements of a Coordinated Plan include the following:

- An assessment of available services that identifies current providers (public, private and nonprofit);
- An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes This assessment may be based on the experiences and perceptions of the planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts, and gaps in service;
- Strategies and/or activities to address the identified gaps and achieve efficiencies in service delivery; and
- Relative priorities for implementation based on resources, time, and feasibility for implementing specific strategies/activities identified.

To this end, the Multimodal Bureau of the Alabama Department of Transportation approached the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission (SARPC) and the eleven other Regional Commissions, collectively referred to as the Alabama Association of Regional Councils (AARC) and contracted with the AARC to develop Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plans for the counties of Alabama. The South Alabama Regional Planning Commission was charged with developing and updating the Coordinated Plan for Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile Counties (Figure 1).

For transit programs to receive any Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities, Sections 5316 Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC), and Sections 5317 New Freedom program funds, the projects they propose must be consistent with the strategies and recommendations contained in this document.

Figure 1
 Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes of the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission Region



SECTION 2 FUNDING SOURCES

This section provides an explanation of each of the federally funded special needs transit programs under study in this document. It included the policies, requirements and funding associated with each program. For the purposes of this study, special needs populations are defined as elderly, physically or mentally disabled, and persons living in poverty. MAP-21 repealed the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom programs. The JARC program was merged into the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grant and the Section 5311 Rural Area Formula Grant programs. Activities eligible under the New Freedom program are now eligible under the Section 5310 program. Funds authorized under the JARC and New Freedom programs and not yet obligated or expended remain available for obligation in a grant under the terms and conditions of 49 U.S.C. 5316 and 49 U.S.C. 5317, respectively, as those sections existed prior to the enactment of the FAST Act, until the applicable statutory period of availability expires, or until the funds are fully expended, rescinded by Congress, or otherwise reallocated.

Coordination Provisions, Sections 5310, JARC and New Freedom. Federal transit law, as amended by SAFETEA-LU, required that projects funded from the Section 5310, JARC, and New Freedom programs be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human service transportation plan (“coordinated plan”). A coordinated plan should maximize the programs’ collective coverage by minimizing duplication of services. **A coordinated plan may incorporate activities offered under other programs sponsored by federal, state, and local agencies to greatly strengthen its impact. FTA also encourages participation in coordinated service delivery as long as the coordinated services will continue to meet the purposes of all programs.**

Under the FAST Act, Section 5310 is the only program that still has this coordinated plan requirement. However, recipients with unobligated JARC and New Freedom funds must continue to certify that projects are included in a coordinated plan. Therefore, FTA encourages recipients with unobligated JARC and New Freedom funds to continue to include the Section 5310 program funds when developing the coordinated plan.

Section 5310 Funds - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program

The Section 5310 program was established in 1975 as a discretionary capital assistance program. In cases where public transit was unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate, the program awarded grants to private nonprofit organizations to serve the transportation needs of seniors and persons with disabilities. Title 49 U.S.C. 5310 authorizes the formula assistance program for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program and provides formula funding to states and designated recipients (recipients) to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities.

This program provides grant funds for capital and operating expenses to recipients for:

- Public transportation projects planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities when public transportation is insufficient, inappropriate, or unavailable;
- Public transportation projects that exceed the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.);
- Public transportation projects that improve access to fixed-route service and decrease reliance on complementary paratransit; and
- Alternatives to public transportation projects that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities with transportation.

The FAST Act requires that not less than 55 percent of a recipient's Section 5310 funds be available for capital projects that are "traditional" Section 5310 projects. A recipient may use more of its Section 5310 funds for these capital projects, but may not use less.

Traditional Section 5310 projects are those public transportation capital projects planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities when public transportation is insufficient, inappropriate, or unavailable.

- The FAST Act allows up to 45% of a recipient's Section 5310 apportionment to be utilized for other eligible capital and operating expenses.
- Section 5310 operating funds were not available under SAFETEA-LU

Eligible Traditional Capital Projects include, but are not limited to: Purchase of vehicles, computers, ITS, and purchase of transportation services.

Other Eligible Operating and Capital Projects include, but are not limited to: Voucher Programs; Travel Training and Acquisition of vehicles and equipment designed to accommodate mobility aids that exceed the dimensions and weight ratings established for wheelchairs under the ADA regulations.

Eligible Sub-recipients (Traditional Program):

- Private Non-Profit Organizations
- State or local governmental authorities that certify there are no non-profit organizations readily available in the area to provide the service
- State or local governmental authorities approved to coordinate services for seniors and individuals with disabilities

Eligible Sub-recipients (Other Section 5310 Projects):

- Private Non-Profit Organizations
- Governmental Authorities
- Operators of public transportation

Cost Sharing/Match Requirement:

The federal share of eligible capital costs shall be in an amount equal to 80% of the net cost of the activity. Local share is 20% of the net cost of the activity. The federal share of the eligible operating costs may not exceed 50% of the net operating costs of the activity. Local share is 50% of the net cost of the activity. Other non-DOT federal funds can be used as match.

Section 5316 - Job Access Reverse Commute Funds (JARC)

The Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program was a formula grant program for projects that improve access to employment-related transportation services for welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals, and that transport residents of urbanized and rural areas to suburban employment opportunities. Emphasis is placed on projects that use mass transportation services.

Grants may finance capital projects and operating costs of equipment, facilities, and associated capital maintenance items related to providing access to jobs; promote use of transit by workers with nontraditional work schedules; promote use by appropriate agencies of transit vouchers for welfare recipients and eligible low income individuals; and promote use of employer-provided transportation including the transit pass benefit program.

Eligible Projects:

Capital and Operational projects designed to meet the needs of the targeted population including reverse commute services. (Reverse commute services are available to everyone regardless of income as long as it is a work route)

Eligible Sub-recipients:

- Private non-profit Organizations
- State and Local Government Authorities (examples include Cities, Counties, Tribes)
- Operators of public transportation services including private providers of public transportation

Cost Sharing/Match Requirement:

The federal share of eligible capital costs shall be in an amount equal to 80% of the net cost of the activity. Local share is 20% of the net cost of the activity. The federal share of the eligible operating costs may not exceed 50% of the net operating costs of the activity. Local share is 50% of the net cost of the activity. Other non-DOT federal funds can be used as match.

Section 5317, New Freedom Funds

The New Freedom program was a formula grant program that provided funding for capital and operating expenses that support new public transportation services beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and new public transportation alternatives beyond those required by the ADA, designed to assist individuals with disabilities with accessing transportation services. The purpose of the New Freedom formula grant program was to provide additional resources to overcome existing barriers facing individuals with disabilities seeking integration into the workforce and full participation in society.

Eligible Projects:

Capital and Operational projects designed to reduce barriers to transportation services and expand the transportation mobility options available to persons with disabilities beyond the requirements of the ADA.

From the SAFETEA-LU Conference Report (House Bill, Section 3018), examples of projects and activities that might be funded under this program include, but are not limited to:

- Purchasing vehicles and supporting accessible taxi, ride-sharing, and vanpooling programs.
- Providing paratransit services beyond minimum requirements (3/4 mile to either side of a fixed route), including for routes that run seasonally.
- Making accessibility improvements to transit and intermodal stations that are not key stations.
- Supporting voucher programs for transportation services offered by human service providers.
- Supporting volunteer driver and aide programs.
- Supporting mobility management and coordination programs among public transportation providers and other human service agencies providing transportation.

Eligible Sub-recipients:

- Private non-profit Organizations
- State and Local Government Authorities (examples include Cities, Counties, Tribes
- Operators of public transportation services including private providers of public transportation

Cost Sharing/Match Requirement:

The federal share of eligible capital costs shall be in an amount equal to 80% of the net cost of the activity. Local share is 20% of the net cost of the activity. The federal share of the eligible operating costs may not exceed 50% of the net operating costs of the activity. Local share is 50% of the net cost of the activity. Other non-DOT federal funds can be used as match.

Other Funding Sources

For the purposes of the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan, the above three funding categories (Section 5310, JARC and New Freedom) are the only funds required to be included in the plan. Capital and operating projects aided with the following funding sources, although they may be in conjunction with sources and programs listed above, are not subject to the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan, but very well may affect Elderly, Disabled and Low Income public transportation.

Section 5307

This program (49 U.S.C. 5307) makes Federal resources available to urbanized areas and to states for transit capital (and operating assistance for areas under 200,000) in urbanized areas and for transportation related planning. An urbanized area is an incorporated area with a population of 50,000 or more that is designated as such by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Eligible purposes include planning, engineering design and evaluation of transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies; capital investments in bus and bus-related activities such as replacement of buses, overhaul of buses, rebuilding of buses, crime prevention and security equipment and construction of maintenance and passenger facilities; and capital investments in new and existing fixed guideway systems including rolling stock, overhaul and rebuilding of vehicles, track, signals, communications, and computer hardware and software. All preventive maintenance and some Americans with Disabilities Act complementary paratransit service costs are considered capital costs.

For urbanized areas with a 200,000 population and over, funds are apportioned and flow directly to a designated recipient selected locally to apply for and receive Federal funds. For urbanized areas under 200,000 in population, the funds are apportioned to the Governor of each state for distribution.

A few areas under 200,000 in population have been designated as transportation management areas and receive apportionments directly.

For urbanized areas with populations of 200,000 or more, operating assistance is not an eligible expense. In these areas, at least one percent of the funding apportioned to each area must be used for transit enhancement activities such as historic preservation, landscaping, public art, pedestrian access, bicycle access, and enhanced access for persons with disabilities.

Section 5311

Section 5311 is the “other than urbanized area formula” funding program. Only transit systems that are not inside of urban areas with populations greater than 200,000 are eligible for these funds. The program provides both capital and operating assistance for rural and small urban public transportation systems. This federal program is administered through the Alabama Department of Transportation and only two agencies in the region receive this money. The Escambia County Commission receives these funds to assist in the operations of ECATS and the Baldwin County Commission receives these funds to assist in the operations of BRATS.

Section 5339

FTA 5339 makes federal resources available to states and direct recipients to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities including technological changes or innovations to modify low or no emission vehicles or facilities. Funding is provided through formula allocations and competitive grants. A sub-program, the [Low- or No-Emission Vehicle Program](#), provides competitive grants for bus and bus facility projects that support low and zero-emission vehicles.

Eligible recipients include direct recipients that operate fixed route bus service or that allocate funding to fixed route bus operators; state or local governmental entities; and federally recognized Indian tribes that operate fixed route bus service that are eligible to receive direct grants under 5307 and 5311.

Subrecipients include eligible recipients that receive grant funding under the formula or discretionary programs may allocate amounts from the grant to subrecipients that are public agencies or private nonprofit organizations engaged in public transportation.

Capital projects to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses, vans, and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities, including technological changes or innovations to modify low or no emission vehicles or facilities.

SECTION 3 DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

According to the 2010 U.S. Census 127,054 individuals 60 years of age or over reside in Mobile, Baldwin and Escambia Counties. That is 20.1% of the region’s total population, and 13.6% of the State of Alabama’s population of people 60 years of age or older. There are 89,701 individuals age 65 and over residing in the region. That is 14.2% of the region’s total population, and 13.8% of the state’s elderly population. (The Federal Transit Administration defines elderly as age 65 and over). These numbers show only a slight increase in the aging population in the region from the previous census.

Based on the American Community Survey 2013 Five Year Estimates (2009 – 2013), there were 114,833 individuals living below poverty status in the SARPC region. That is 18.4% of the region’s total population and 12.3% of the population that live below poverty status in the State. There are 9,012 individuals age 65 and over that live below poverty status in the region.

According to the American Community Survey 2013 Five Year Estimates (2009 – 2013), there were 96,931 people with a disability living in the three county region. That is 15.5% of the region’s total population and 10.4% of the State’s total disabled population. There are 37,399 people age 65 and over with a disability in the region.

Based on the Alabama Department of Public Health’s County Health Profiles of Alabama 2013, the average life expectancy was 75.6 in Alabama, 78 in Baldwin County, 74.8 in Escambia County, and 75.6 in Mobile County.

Table 1

Population Projections for 2015, 2020 and 2025

County	2010	2015	% Change from 2010 to 2015	2020	% Change from 2015 to 2020	20 25	% Change from 2020 to 2025
Baldwin	182,265	206,251	13%	227,727	10%	248,436	9%
Escambia	38,319	41,371	8%	42,100	2%	42,660	1%
Mobile	412,992	426,288	3%	435,084	2%	443,553	2%

Source: Alabama State Data Center


Mobile County

Mobile County (Figure 2) is the second largest county in the state with a population 412,992 in the 2010 Census. The County seat is the City of Mobile, Alabama’s only seaport. Mobile County is known for its bustling seaport, thriving seafood industry, corn, soybean, pecans, berries, subtropical fruits, crude-oil and natural gas production.

Mobile County has a total area of 1,644 sq. miles of which 1,233 square miles is land and 411 square miles is water. The population density is 335 persons per square mile. Mobile has eleven incorporated cities: Bayou La Batre, Chickasaw, Citronelle, Creola, Dauphin Island, Mobile, Mount Vernon, Prichard, Saraland, Satsuma and Semmes; and there are four unincorporated communities: Eight Mile, Grand Bay, Theodore and Tillman's Corner.

The Mobile Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is located within Mobile County. The MPO is the transportation planning authority governing federal transportation dollars in the Mobile Urbanized Area. The land within the MPO is called the Mobile Area Transportation Study (MATS). The MATS covers an area substantially larger than the City of Mobile, but smaller than Mobile County. The study area measures approximately 44 miles north to south and 26 miles east to west; the boundaries can be generally described as Salco Road and Walter Moore Road to the north, Mobile River (and Spanish River) to the east, Bayou La Batre to the south, and Big Creek Lake and Grand Bay to the west. This area includes all of the Mobile urban area as defined by the U. S. Department of Commerce and also includes all contiguous portions of Mobile County which are expected to be urbanized by the year 2040.

Figure 2
 Mobile County Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes



Baldwin County

Baldwin County was established in 1809, and it is the largest county east of the Mississippi River. According to the 2010 Census, the population was 182,265. Baldwin County has experienced rapid growth since the 1990's, and it has remained one of the top three fastest growing counties in Alabama. Figure 3 depicts Baldwin County and its municipalities.


The County has a total area of 2,027 square miles, of this 1,596 square miles is land and 431 square miles is water. The population density is 114 persons per square mile. Because of the large land area; Baldwin County has six diverse regions: North, Eastern Shore, Central, South, Southwest and East. The County has 13 incorporated municipalities, ranging in size and density, with a majority of Baldwin County residents living in rural, unincorporated areas. The thirteen municipalities include, Fairhope, Gulf Shores, Orange Beach, Perdido Beach, Silverhill, Summerdale, Daphne, Foley, Magnolia Springs, Robertsdale, Spanish Fort, and Bay Minette, the county seat. In addition to the municipalities are two towns, Elberta and Loxley. There are also numerous unincorporated communities throughout Baldwin County.

The Eastern Shore Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is located within Baldwin County. The MPO is the transportation planning authority governing federal transportation dollars in the Eastern Shore Urbanized Area. The Study Area of the Eastern Shore MPO includes all of the Eastern Shore Urbanized Area as defined by the U. S. Department of Commerce which includes all, or portions of the city limits of the cities of Spanish Fort, Daphne, Fairhope, and Loxley, as well as some unincorporated areas of Baldwin County. The Study Area also includes all contiguous portions of Baldwin County which are expected to be urbanized by the year 2040 including all, or portions of the cities of Robertsdale and Silverhill,

Table 2
Communities in Baldwin County

Barnwell	Bayside	Belforest	Blackwater	Blakely	Bon Secour
Bromly	Clay City	Fort Morgan	Houstonville	Josephine	Lillian
Magnolia Beach	Malbis	Marlow	Miflin	Montrose	Oak
Oyster Bay	Park City	Perdido	Weeks Bay	Perdido Key	Pine Grove
Pine Haven	Point Clear	Rabun	River Park	Romar Beach	Seacliff
Stapleton	Stockton	Swift	Tensaw	Turkey Branch	

Figure 3
 Baldwin County Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes



Escambia County

Escambia County (Figure 4) was established in 1868, and it has an area of 963 square miles of which 912 square miles is land. According to the 2010 Census, the population was 38,319 with a population density of 42 persons per square mile. There are three cities and three towns in Escambia County: The City of Atmore, City of Brewton, City of East Brewton, Town of Flomaton, Town of Pollard, and the Town of Riverview, population 99. Escambia County includes the Poarch Creek Indian Reservation, the only federally recognized tribe in Alabama.

Throughout Escambia County's history, the timber and agricultural sectors have been vital to the economic base of the county. Employed persons typically work in manufacturing, retail trade, and education, health, and social service industries.

The Poarch Creek Indian reservation and its headquarters are located in western Escambia County. Historically, the tribe has been situated in this locality, maintaining community autonomy separate from the surrounding non-Indian communities. The community of Poarch, the center of tribal activities and the location of tribal headquarters is the namesake of the tribe. The tribal enrollment is 2,208, with 357 elders age 55 or older and of those 266 is 60 or older. It is culturally appropriate for elders to be cared for in or near their own homes by friends and family members.


Figure 4
 Escambia County Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes

Escambia County, Alabama

Political Boundaries and Major Transportation Routes



September 2015



- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | Interstate | | Proposed Interstate | | City Limits |
| | Principle Arterial | | Proposed Principle Arterial | | County Boundary |
| | Minor Arterial | | Proposed Minor Arterial | | RPO Study Area Boundary |
| | Major Collector | | Proposed Major Collector | | Native American Tribal Land |
| | Minor Collector | | Unclassified Roadways | | Waterways |



SECTION 4 METHODOLOGY

In 2006 the MPO-SARPC Transportation Planning staff first began gathering information regarding the needs for transit service in the region. A list of groups who should be invited to participate in the plan was developed in conjunction with planning and transit agencies from the eleven other Regional Planning Commissions from around the state and the Alabama Department of Transportation, Multimodal Division.

From this, a stakeholders list was developed including the email, address, and/or phone number, and contact person when available. The stakeholders list also included known advocates of public transit from the general public. Over the past ten years, the stakeholders list has been updated as staff becomes aware of other service providers, advocacy groups, and individuals interested in this planning process.

The above referenced contact list was communicated with via email with a link to an online survey. The survey was developed to collect information on the transportation services provided in each area by program, the kind of vehicle including accessibility, ride schedules, and funding sources. The survey collected information on any underserved population and/or areas, any underutilized transportation services, any overlapping transportation services, and any other information the stakeholders thought should be included in the plan.

In addition to the survey, stakeholder meetings were held in Mobile and Baldwin Counties. The purpose of each meeting was to confirm the findings of the survey, to request information on the individual transportation needs of stakeholders, and to solicit possible solutions for future coordination. In addition, stakeholders were presented with the flexibility available to them in developing a plan that best supports and grows transportation services for the elderly, disabled and low income populations in each County. This flexibility encourages stakeholders to become involved in all aspects of the plan from data collection to implementation.

These stakeholder meetings were open to the public and advertised in the area newspapers. The results of these meetings, the survey, and follow-up phone calls, personal interviews, and the transportation planning staff's knowledge of transit needs in the region were used to develop this plan. Details of the inventory, survey and interviews are described in the following sections.

In addition to the surveys and public outreach described above, the Alabama Department of Public Health (ADPH) assisted the Regional Planning Commissions in the development of this Plan. The ADPH developed a statewide, Alabama Community Health Improvement Plan (ACHIP), based on the results of a comprehensive statewide Community Health Assessment (CHA) – in collaboration with a varied cross-section of stakeholders. The purpose of this plan was to address the top three statewide healthcare priorities. The highest identified priority is Access to Care, and the associated ACHIP workgroup's defined goal is as follows: "To measurably improve access to care for all Alabamians by reducing transportation barriers, addressing the shortage of providers, closing insurance coverage gaps, and improving health literacy."

To begin addressing the issues surrounding transportation barriers, ADPH conducted a series of email surveys and interviews (telephone and in-person) with representatives of 114 safety-net healthcare providers across the state. This sample of providers primarily included rural hospitals, rural health clinics, federally-qualified health centers, community mental health centers, and Department of Public Health social workers.

One objective of this assessment was to contribute to identifying the areas and patient demographics most impacted by a lack of transportation. A second objective was to identify potential gaps in information between healthcare providers, patients, and transportation agencies by collecting information on transportation issues and available resources from the providers' perspective. Based on their experiences in treating their respective patient populations, representatives of each healthcare provider were asked to provide their input on the following topics:

- Types of transportation resources within their operating area, including those offered directly by the provider, that patients may use for their health care needs.
- Other local agencies or organizations that could potentially assist with providing non-emergency patient transportation.
- Groups of patients that have the most difficulty obtaining reliable transportation for their healthcare needs.
- The types of appointments representing the greatest challenges to people without reliable transportation.
- The scope and scale of transportation-related issues faced by their patients, and the accessibility and availability of transportation resources within their operating area.
- Other general comments regarding patient transportation issues and potential access-to-care solutions.

This statewide assessment included input from representatives of eleven safety-net healthcare providers operating within the three counties of the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission.

SECTION 5 FINDINGS

The surveys and public outreach efforts provided valuable information to determine the transportation options of the elderly, disabled, and low income populations of Mobile, Baldwin and Escambia Counties. It also revealed issues and concerns with the current transportation options. The survey requested various types of information from transportation providers including the number and type of vehicles, the type of service offered, the hours and days of operation, and the funding source. In addition the survey encouraged both providers and consumers to detail unmet transportation needs and to share any other information about transportation services for the elderly, disabled and low income population.

To further detail the transportation needs of the elderly, disabled, and low income population, the survey requested that destination stakeholders provide details on the location of their clients. The information was used to form a general origin and destination pattern for segments of the population. This origin/destination pattern will enable transportation providers to better gauge the needs of the population.

Service Areas and Restrictions of Transportation Providers

One purpose of this Plan is to determine the current available private/nonprofit, and public agency transportation options for the elderly, disabled, and low income population of the region. The survey results provided a clearer picture of the various hurdles present for this population. Various nonprofit agencies offer transportation services; however, oftentimes, these services are not offered to their home or destination or at the time transportation is needed. In addition, most agencies place restrictions on who may use the transportation service they provide. Table 3 details the service areas and restrictions of 5310, JARC (5316), and New Freedom (5317) providers in Mobile County, and Figure 17 illustrates the service areas of these providers.

Table 3
Service Areas and Restrictions for 5310, 5316, or 5317 Providers in Mobile County

Agency Name	Service Area	Days/Hours	Restrictions	Federal Funds
City of Saraland	Saraland City Limits	Weekdays - 8 am to 5 pm	Must be elderly or disabled	5310
City of Satsuma	Satsuma City Limits	Weekdays - 8 am to 2 pm	Must be elderly or disabled	5310
City of Prichard	Prichard City Limits	Weekdays – 8:30 am to 1:30 pm	Must be elderly or disabled	5310
Goodwill Easter Seals	Mobile County	Weekdays - 8 am to 5 pm	Participant in a Goodwill Easter Seals Program	5310

South Alabama CARES	Mobile County	Weekdays	NA	5310
Dumas Wesley Community Center	Emerson Garden, Frank L. Boykin Tower, Central Plaza Tower, Bayou Street Senior Apartments, Oaklawn Homes (Baltimore Street), Roger Williams, R.V. Taylor Plaza, Birdville, and Happy Hill; area around these Mobile Housing Board Projects	Weekdays - 8 am to 4 pm	60 years old and above	5310
Dearborn YMCA	Old Shell Road, Spring Hill Avenue, Summerville, St. Stephens Road, M.L. King	Weekdays - 7:30 am to 2:30 pm; Saturday - 8 am to 12 pm	60 years old and above	5310
Alta Pointe	Mobile County	Weekdays	Program participant	5310
The Learning Tree	Mobile County	Weekdays	Program participant	5310
Mobile Association of Retarded Citizens (MARC)	Mobile County	Weekdays	Program participant	5310, 5316
MOWA Band of Choctaw Indians	Tribal Lands	Weekdays	Tribal Elderly	5310
Mulherin Custodial Home	NA	NA	Must be a resident of the home	5310
Volunteers of America	Volunteers of America Group homes, apartments and day training programs	Weekdays, Weekends	Program participant or resident	5310
Mount Calvary Baptist Church	City Limits of Mobile, Prichard, Chickasaw, Saraland, Satsuma, and Creola	Weekdays	Must be elderly	5310
Independent Living Center of Mobile	15 mile radius of Independent Living Center	Weekdays	60 years old and above or disabled	5310
City of Bayou La Batre	Bayou La Batre City Limits	Weekdays 8:30 am to 3:30 pm	Must be elderly or disabled	5310

AHEPA	AHEPA 310 Apartment Residents	9:00 am to 5:00 pm	Must be elderly or disabled residents of AHEPA 310 Apartments	5310
Mercy Life	Prichard, Saraland, downtown Mobile, Northwest Mobile, Southwest Mobile, Theodore Dawes, Irvington, Bayou La Batre, Dauphin Island	Weekdays - 8 am to 6 pm	55 years or older; health problems that qualify for nursing home care	5310
Mobile Bay Transportation	Mobile County	everyday	Must be elderly, Disabled, or low income	5310, 5316, 5317

The Federal Transit Administration only requires 5310, 5316 and 5317 funds be coordinated by the Coordinated Human Services Plan, but because the United We Ride Initiative will eventually require coordination of all federal funds, all funding sources were inventoried in the survey to the stakeholders. Table 4 details the transportation providers that receive other funding sources.

Table 4
Service Areas and Restrictions for Other Service Providers in Mobile County

Agency Name	Service Area	Days/Hours	Restrictions	Federal Funds
The Wave Transit System	Fixed routes throughout the City of Mobile with some service in the City of Prichard	Weekdays 5am to 7pm; Saturdays 6am to 7pm	No restrictions	5307, 5339
U.J Robinson Memorial Center Inc.	Within 10.5 miles of center	Weekdays	Enrolled in Adult Daycare program	Older Americans Act
Catholic Social Services - SAIL Sites	Mother of Mercy SAIL -Plateau, Magazine Point, Hills Prince of Peace SAIL - Birdville, Texas Street	Weekdays only	Enrolled in program at either Mother of Mercy SAIL or Prince of Peace SAIL	5309
Providence SAIL/ Providence Hospital Outreach Services	2 mile radius of Senior Center (35 N. Cody Road)	Weekdays	60 years old and above, a program participant, and/or their spouse	Private, Title III
City of Citronelle/ SAIL	Citronelle City Limits	Weekdays from 9 am to 1 pm	60 years old and above	5309
Thomas Sullivan SAIL	2 mile radius of Senior Center (351 N. Catherine Street)	Weekdays - 9 am to 2 pm	Program Participant	City of Mobile, Title III

H.E. Savage Center, Healthcare for the Homeless	Mobile City Limits	Weekdays 8 am to 5 pm	Homeless	330 Grant
City of Mobile Parks and Recreation Department/ Trinity Gardens SAIL Center	Fixed route in Trinity Gardens area	Weekdays 9 am to 1 pm	SAIL participant	5309
City of Chickasaw	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	5309, Title III
Hillsdale SAIL Center	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	5309
Wilmer SAIL	Wilmer Community	Weekdays	60 years or older	CDBG
Town of Mt. Vernon	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	5309
City of Satsuma	City of Satsuma	NA	Delivers Meals	Title III
City of Mobile	City of Mobile	NA	Delivers Meals	CDBG, local funds
Senior Citizens Services Inc.	Within 8 - 10 miles of center	Weekdays	Demand Response	Older Americans Act

Table 5 details the service areas and restrictions Section 5310, JARC (5316), and New Freedom (5317) providers in Baldwin County, and Figure 18 illustrates the service areas of these providers.

Table 5
Service Areas and Restrictions for 5310, 5316, or 5317 Providers in Baldwin County

Agency Name	Service Area	Days/Hours	Restrictions	Federal Funds
City of Orange Beach	City of Orange Beach	Recreational use	Participant must be 60 years or older	5310
Baldwin County Mental Health	Baldwin County	Everyday	Residents of Baldwin County Mental Health Center Group homes or participants in day treatment programs	5310
City Of Robertsdale	Thirty Mile Radius of Thames Senior Center	Weekdays	Participant must be 60 years or older	5310
Goodwill Easter Seals	Baldwin County	Weekdays only (hours vary)	Participant in a Goodwill Easter Seals Program	5310

South Alabama CARES	Baldwin County	Weekdays	NA	5310
---------------------	----------------	----------	----	------

Table 6 details the service providers in Baldwin County that utilize other funding sources to deliver transportation to the elderly, low income or disabled population.

Table 6
Service Areas and Restrictions for Other Service Providers in Baldwin County

Agency Name	Service Area	Days/Hours	Restrictions	Federal Funds
Town of Loxley Senior Program (New Recipient)	NA	NA	Civic Center Use only	5309
City of Daphne	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	5309, Title III
City of Gulf Shores (New Recipient)	NA	NA	NA	5309
City of Bay Minette	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	5309
James P. Nix Center/City of Fairhope	Within a 10 mile radius of the Fairhope/Montrose City Limits	Weekdays 7:30 am to 2 pm	NA	5309
Community Action Agency of Baldwin	Baldwin County	Weekdays	Head Start participant	Other
City of Bay Minette Senior Program	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	5309, Title III
City of Orange Beach	City of Orange Beach	Recreational use	Participant must be 60 years or older	5309
Baldwin Regional Area Transportation System (BRATS)	Baldwin County	Weekdays 5:30 am to 7 pm; Limited service on weekends and holidays	No Restrictions	5307, 5309, 5311, JARC, Title III
Town of Summerdale	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey	Title III

Table 7 details the service areas and restrictions 5310, JARC (5316), and New Freedom (5317) providers in Escambia County, and Figure 19 illustrates the service areas of these providers.

Table 7

Service Areas and Restrictions for 5310, 5316, or 5317 Providers in Escambia County

Agency Name	Service Area	Days/Hours	Restrictions	Federal Funds
City of Atmore Senior Center	Within a 5 mile radius of the Atmore City Limits	Other	SAIL Center participant	5310
Poarch Creek Indians	Poarch Creek Indian Tribal Lands	NA	Elderly or disabled member of the tribe	5310
Escambia County Alabama Transit System (ECATS)	Escambia County	Weekdays	No Restrictions	5316
South Alabama CARES	Escambia County	Weekdays	NA	5310

Table 8 details the service providers in Escambia County that utilize other funding sources to deliver transportation to the elderly, low income or disabled population.

Table 8

Service Areas and Restrictions for Other Service Providers in Escambia County

Agency Name	Service Area	Days/Hours	Restrictions	Federal Funds
Southwest Alabama Mental Health/ Mental Retardation Board, Inc.	Fixed route system over entire county	Weekdays	Compass (school age kids only), Disabled Adults	Medicaid
Escambia County Alabama Transit System (ECATS)	Escambia County	Weekdays	No Restrictions	5309, 5311, JARC
Escambia County Agency on Aging	Escambia County	Weekdays	Meals on Wheels and elderly	5309, Title III
City of Atmore Senior Center	Within a 5 mile radius of the Atmore City Limits	Other	SAIL Center participant	5309
Poarch Band of Creek Indians	Tribal Lands	NA	Member of the tribe	Title III
Town of Flomaton	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Title III
City of East Brewton	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Title III

If an individual does not qualify or is not in a service area of any private/nonprofit or public agency

transportation service providers, then the individual has to either not take the trip or use private transportation providers. While the benefit of these services is unlimited mobility, the cost is often prohibitive to the majority of the population. Table 9 details the private transportation providers throughout the region that responded to the survey.

Table 9
Public Transportation Providers Serving the Region

Company	Service Area	Hours/Days
Mobile Bay Transportation Company, Inc	Mobile and Baldwin Counties	Everyday 5 am to 11 pm
Mobile Airport Authority	Mobile City Limits	Everyday 4:30 am to last flight
Home Instead Senior Care	NA	NA
Colonial Trailways	State of Alabama	24 hours a day/7 days a week

Capacity of Transportation Providers

There are numerous transportation providers that cater to the elderly, disabled, and low income citizens of the region. The providers range from public businesses to senior centers to nonprofit associations to agencies. Each agency/company has limitation on the volume of services they can offer. Because of equipment requirements, each entity may not be able to offer services to individuals of varying degrees of mobility. Table 10 details the type of vehicles, the type of service operated and the level of mobility served for 5310, 5316 and 5317 transportation providers serving Mobile County.

Table 10
5310, 5316 and 5317 Transportation Providers' Vehicles and Capacity in Mobile County

Program/Company	Vehicle Type (#)	Lift (#)	Type Service
Goodwill Easter Seals	Van (3), Van with wheelchair section (3)	Yes (3)	Demand Response
City of Prichard	Buses (4)	Yes (2)	Demand Response
City of Satsuma	Buses (2) Van (1)	Yes (3)	Demand Response
City of Saraland	Vans (5)	Yes (5)	Demand Response
South Alabama CARES	Bus (1)	Yes (1)	Demand Response
Dumas Wesley Community Center *	Station Wagon (1), Goshen Vans (1), Van (1)	No	Demand Response
Dearborn YMCA	Bus (1)	No	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations
AHEPA 310	Vans (5)	Yes (5)	Demand Response

Mercy Life	Buses (8) Van (1) Car (1)	Yes (all but car)	Demand Response
Mobile Association of Retarded Citizens (MARC) *	Vehicles (35)	Yes	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations
MOWA Band of Choctaw Indians	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey
Volunteers of America *	Goshen Coach (3), Goshen (2), Van (2)	Yes (2)	Other
Mount Calvary Baptist Church	Unknown	Unknown	Demand Response
Independent Living Center *	Van (5)	Yes (5)	Demand Response
Mulherin Home	NA	NA	Other
Mobile Bay Transportation	Van (2)	Yes (2)	Demand Response
Bayou La Batre SAIL	Bus (1), Van (2)	Yes (1)	Demand Response
City of Satsuma	Commuter Van (1)	No	Demand Response
City of Saraland	Commuter Van (1)	No	Demand Response
Highpoint Baptist Church	Modified Van (1)	Yes	Demand Response
Murray House	30 passenger bus (1)	Yes	Demand Response
South Alabama Rehabilitation Recreation Center	Modified Van (1)	Yes	Demand Response
City of Mobile Parks and Recreation Dept.	Modified Van (2)	Yes (2)	Demand Response
Alta Pointe	12 Passenger Van (1), Mini Van	Yes (3)	Demand Response
The Learning Tree	Mini Van	Yes ()	Demand Response

* Additional vehicles may be shown not funded with 5310, 5316 or 5317

Table 11 details the service providers in Mobile County that utilize other funding sources to deliver transportation to the elderly, low income or disabled population.

Table 11
Other Transportation Providers' Vehicles and Capacity in Mobile County

Program/Company	Vehicle Type (#)	Lift (#)	Type Service
U.J Robinson Memorial Center Inc.	Vans (3)	No	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations

Colonial Trailways	Bus (26)	Yes (1)	Bus Charters
Mobile Bay Transportation Company Inc.	Vans, Minivans, Sedans, Wheelchair Vans	Yes ()	Demand Response
Catholic Social Services, SAIL Sites	Astro Vans (2)	No	Demand Response
The Wave Transit System *	Bus (43), Paratransit (33)	Yes	Fixed Route, Demand Response
Providence SAIL/ Providence Hospital	Van (1)	No	Demand Response
City of Citronelle SAIL	Bus (1)	No	Demand Response
Mobile Airport Authority	Vehicles (2)	Yes (1)	Demand Response
City of Saraland/ Saraland SAIL	Van (1)	No	Demand Response
Thomas Sullivan SAIL	Van (1)	No	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations
H.E. Savage Center, Healthcare for the Homeless	SUV (1), Van (1)	No	Demand Response
City of Mobile Parks and Recreation/ Trinity Garden SAIL	Van (1)	Yes (1)	Fixed Route
Senior Citizens Services, Inc.	Bus (1), Van (1)	Yes (1)	Demand Response

Table 12 details the type of vehicles, the type of service operated and the level of mobility served for 5310, 5316 and 5317 transportation providers serving Baldwin County.

Table 12
5310, 5316 and 5317 Transportation Providers' Vehicles and Capacity in Baldwin County

Program/Company	Vehicle Type (#)	Lift (#)	Type Service
Goodwill Easter Seals	Van (1), Van with wheelchair section (1)	Yes (1)	Demand Response
South Alabama CARES	Bus (1)	Yes (1)	Demand Response
City of Orange Beach *	Bus (2)	Yes (2)	Demand Response
Baldwin Regional Area Transportation System (BRATS) *	Bus (49) Vans (2)	Yes (Lifts 49) Ramps (2)	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations
Baldwin County Mental Health *	Goshen Coach (2), Commuter Van (2)	No	Other

* Additional vehicles may be shown not funded with 5310, 5316 or 5317

Table 13 details the service providers in Baldwin County that utilize other funding sources to deliver transportation to the elderly, low income or disabled population.

Table 13

Other Transportation Providers' Vehicles and Capacity in Baldwin County

Program/Company	Vehicle Type (#)	Lift (#)	Type Service
Colonial Trailways	Bus (26)	Yes (1)	Bus Charters
Mobile Bay Transportation Company, Inc	Vans, Minivans, Sedans, Wheelchair Vans	Yes (1)	Demand Response
City of Robertsdale	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey
City of Daphne	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey
City of Gulf Shores	NA	NA	NA
City of Bay Minette	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey	Did not Respond to Survey
Town of Loxley	Commuter Van (1)	No	Other
James P. Nix Center/ City of Fairhope	Bus (1), Van (1)	Yes (1)	Demand Response
Community Action Agency of Baldwin County	Buses (10), Vans (3)	Unknown	Fixed Route

Table 14 details the type of vehicles, the type of service operated and the level of mobility served for 5310, 5316 and 5317 transportation providers serving Escambia County.

Table 14

5310, 5316 and 5317 Transportation Providers' Vehicles and Capacity in Escambia County

Program/Company	Vehicle Type (#)	Lift (#)	Type Service
City of Atmore *	Vans (2)	No	Other
South Alabama CARES	Bus (1)	Yes	Demand Response
Poarch Creek Indians	Van (1)	Yes (1)	Demand Response
Escambia County Alabama Transit System (ECATS) *	Van (10)	Yes (4)	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations

* Additional vehicles may be shown not funded with 5310, 5316 or 5317

Table 15 details the service providers in Escambia County that utilize other funding sources to deliver transportation to the elderly, low income or disabled population.

Table 15

Other Transportation Providers' Vehicles and Capacity in Escambia County

Program/Company	Vehicle Type (#)	Lift (#)	Type Service
Colonial Trailways	Bus (26)	Yes (1)	Bus Charters
Mobile Bay Transportation Company, Inc	Vans, Minivans, Sedans, Wheelchair Vans	Yes (1)	Demand Response
Southwest Alabama Mental Health/ Mental Retardation Board, Inc.	Vans (3) - Atmore Compass; Vans (5) - Brewton Day Rehab	No	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations
Escambia County Agency on Aging	Bus (5), Van (2)	No	Demand Response with fixed transfer stations

SECTION 6 TRANSIT DEPENDENT POPULATIONS

Transit services that provide transportation that are subject to this coordination serve the elderly, the physically and mentally disabled, and those that live in poverty. For the purposes of this study, populations of those demographics will be referred to as transit dependent populations. Using U. S. Census block group data, population density maps were created to identify pockets of these populations.

Mobile County

As can be seen in Figures 5 through 7, the highest concentrations of the elderly, the disabled, and the poverty stricken in Mobile County are in the urban areas of the cities of Mobile, Semmes, Bayou La Batre, Satsuma, Creola, Saraland, Prichard, Chickasaw, and in the rural areas southwest of Mobile (known as Tillman's Corner, Theodore and Grand Bay). There are also high concentrations in Citronelle in the north of the county. In addition, there are significant concentrations to the north of Bayou La Batre and west of Prichard and Mobile. It should be noted that except for Bayou La Batre and Citronelle, most all of these dependent populations are concentrated near major transportation routes.

According to the 2010 Census, in Mobile County, there are 76,439 people (18.5% of the total population) age 60 or over. There are 53,321 people (12.9% of the total population) age 65 or over. Based on American Community Survey 2013 Five Year Estimates, in Mobile County the per capita income is \$22,501. There are 79,994 people (19.8% of the total population) that live in poverty, and there are 63,786 people (15.7% of the total population) that have a disability.

Baldwin County

In Baldwin County, the highest concentrations of the elderly are in Bay Minette, Spanish Fort, Daphne, Fairhope, and Foley. There are significant concentrations in the rural areas around Bay Minette and in Robertsdale, Foley, Magnolia Springs, Elberta, Gulf Shores, Orange Beach, and just to the east of Perdido Beach (Figure 8). The highest concentrations of the disabled are in and around Bay Minette, Spanish Fort, Daphne, Fairhope, Point Clear, Robertsdale, Magnolia Springs, Foley, and Gulf Shores, with significant populations in Silverhill, Elberta, Perdido Beach, and Orange Beach (Figure 9). The highest concentrations of those who live in poverty are in portions of Bay Minette, Spanish Fort, Daphne, Fairhope and Foley. There are significant populations in Robertsdale, Summerdale, Elberta, Gulf Shores, and Orange Beach (Figure 10).

According to the 2010 Census, in Baldwin County, there are 42,580 people (23.4% of the total population) age 60 or over. There are 30,568 people (16.8% of the total population) age 65 or over. Based on American Community Survey 2013 Five Year Estimates, in Baldwin County the per capita income is \$26,766. There are 25,752 people (13.9% of the total population) that live in poverty, and there are 25,923 people (14.0% of the total population) that have a disability.

Figure 5
 Mobile County Elderly Population per Square Mile by Census Block Group




Figure 6
 Mobile County Disabled Population per Square Mile by Census Block Group




Figure 7
 Mobile County Poverty Status per Square Mile by Census Block Group




Figure 8
 Baldwin County Elderly Population per Square Mile by Census Block Group




Figure 9
 Baldwin County Disabled Population per Square Mile by Census Block Group





Figure 10
 Baldwin County Poverty Status per Square Mile by Census Block Group



Escambia County

In Escambia County, the highest concentrations of the elderly are in Brewton and Atmore, with significant concentrations in portions of East Brewton (Figure 11). The highest concentrations of disabled are in Brewton and Atmore, with significant concentrations in and around East Brewton and portions of Flomaton, and in the rural areas between Atmore and Flomaton and around the Poarch Creek Native American Reservation (Figure 12). The highest concentrations of poverty status are in Brewton, East Brewton, and Atmore, with significant populations in small pockets a few miles north of Atmore near the Poarch Creek Native American Reservation (Figure 13).

According to the 2010 Census, in Escambia County, there are 8,035 people (21.0% of the total population) age 60 or over. There are 5,812 people (15.2% of the total population) age 65 or over. Based on American Community Survey 2013 Five Year Estimates, in Escambia County the per capita income is \$16,540. There are 9,087 people (25.4% of the total population) that live in poverty, and there are 7,222 people (20.3% of the total population) that have a disability.

Figure 11

Escambia County Elderly Population per Square Mile by Census Block Group




Figure 12
Escambia County Disabled Population per Square Mile by Census Block Group





Figure 13
Escambia County Poverty Status per Square Mile by Census Block Group



SECTION 7
UNMET NEEDS AND DUPLICATION OF SERVICES

Unmet Transportation Needs

In addition to assessing the status of transportation services for the elderly, disabled and low income populations, this Plan was designed as a precursor to the coordination of transportation in the future. It needs to address the deficiencies in the current system in order to create a coordinated transportation system that includes every segment of the population across the region. To prepare for this planning process, we asked transportation providers, destinations, and consumers to identify shortcomings in the current transportation system. The comments and concerns ranged from certain areas that are lacking service to times when service is unavailable to individuals that are not adequately served by services. Table 16 summarizes the concerns and comments.

Table 16
Transportation Services Deficiencies

Type of Comment	Comments
Areas/Locations with Deficient Transportation Services	Past the Mobile City Limits, West Mobile, Prichard, Dauphin Island, Semmes, Old Shell Road, Bayou La Batre, Grand Bay, Coden, Rural Mobile County, Theodore, Alabama Port, Mobile Regional Airport, Even side of Spring Hill Avenue at I-65, Little River, Tensaw
Destinations Outside Mobile County not Served by Transportation Service	Some rural areas of Baldwin and Escambia Counties
No Transportation Services During Various Times	Weekends, early morning, ride share after hours, smaller shuttles late at night
Parts of Population Lacking Transportation Services	Individuals that utilize wheelchair, individuals with medical conditions that require specially trained transportation providers (ex. Individuals with epileptic seizures) Individuals with limited income that are unable to pay fare box
Lack of organization	There needs to be a Mobility Manager to coordinate existing services and funding throughout the region
General Comments	Needs Home to Job transportation service, need more flexible transportation options, the current systems are affordable but inconsistent

Mobile County

Within the core urban area, Mobile is served by several transportation providers. However, towards the outer urban areas, fewer agencies provide transportation services. The rural parts of Mobile County have very few options for transportation. Although there are private providers, this option can be costly. It should be noted that there are agencies (that have received 5310, JARC) in Mobile County that have a service area of the entire county. However, these agencies only provide services to their clients, and they barely have enough capital equipment to provide that service.

A major need in Mobile County is a public, rural transit provider. Two major trip patterns are North Mobile County to the core of the urban area and South Mobile County to the core of the urban area. Mount Vernon, Bayou La Batre and Citronelle are three municipalities in areas outside of the U.S. Census designated urban area of Mobile County that need transportation options. All three municipalities are supplied by principal arterials with no regular transit service and have very limited transit options for elderly, disabled, and low-income clients. A rural transit provider would be eligible for various forms of federal assistance to provide transit for employment or healthcare. It can be assumed that agencies providing service to their own clients to these areas of Mobile County cannot supply the overall demand with the very limited vehicles they have. There is an unmet need within the Mobile's urban boundary as well. The cities of Creola, Satsuma, Saraland, Semmes, Prichard, Chickasaw and Bayou La Batre are currently not being served by a fixed route system, and the agencies that do include them in their service area, have limited resources as well. The Wave Transit System, which serves the City of Mobile and a small portion of the City of Prichard, lacks the funds to serve other areas.

Since regulations specify only three funding sources to be coordinated, only the vans/busses assisted with those funds are subject to coordination. So even though an agency receives one of the mandated coordinated funds, not all of the agency's transportation capacity may be subject to the coordination effort. Throughout the entire county there is an overall need for transportation for low income, elderly, and disabled clients that are outside of the Wave Transit's Mobility Assistance Program and Access-A-Ride Program. This need cannot be satisfied by the agencies currently providing transportation for their own clients with vans purchased through the funds subject to coordination. Coordination of all transit services including a public, rural transit provider is needed in Mobile County.

Baldwin County

Baldwin County is fortunate to have the support of the Baldwin County Commission in providing funding for the Baldwin Regional Area Transportation System (BRATS). BRATS' service area is the entire county and already does quite a bit of coordination. Based on the high concentrations of transit dependent populations (see Figures 8 - 10) and high number of common destinations on the Eastern Shore (Spanish Fort, Daphne, and Fairhope) and South Baldwin County (Orange Beach, Foley, and Gulf Shores) of Baldwin County (see Figure 18), it is evident that a fixed route transit system is needed in both parts of the County. Although BRATS does provide limited service to these areas, it is apparent that there is a need for fixed route services.

Although the service does run the entire county, there is a need for more frequent service. The demand to run to the most remote parts of the county is not there to justify daily trips. Although service is run every two days or twice weekly, in order for the low income, elderly and disabled to get daily transportation for jobs and medical services, there needs to be more funding from local, state and federal levels.

Escambia County

Escambia County also is fortunate to have the support of the Escambia County Commission, not just for the Escambia County Area Transportation System (ECATS) but also for the Escambia County Agency on Aging as well. Both agencies receive federal assistance and support from the Escambia

County Commission. However, Escambia County being a predominantly rural county may not have the demand to run daily trips to remote areas of the county. Service of any type is costly and to increase frequency of the service will require more local, state and federal funds. The elderly have vans in the City of Atmore for some transportation, but this excludes potential low income client's transportation to jobs.

Regional Transportation

The populations of Mobile, Baldwin, and Escambia County do not always have to travel exclusively within the boundaries of their respective political jurisdictions and need transportation across political lines. There is a high demand for entry level employment opportunities in south Baldwin County that could be potentially supplied by areas of the regional that have concentrations of low-income populations. In addition the population of Mobile County also needs transportation options to Mississippi, where there is a large number of industrial and service industry positions.

According to the US Census Local Employment Dynamics data (LED), 19.5% (23,404) of the labor force worked outside of Mobile County with 4.7% (5,613) commuting to Baldwin County. The population of Baldwin County needs transportation to Mobile County for both employment and healthcare. 41.7% (17,126) of Baldwin County's labor force worked outside Baldwin County with 24.8% (10,193) commuting to Mobile County. Escambia County additionally needs transportation service to Baldwin County for both healthcare and employment. Escambia County lacks a large hospital that has specialized medical care available, and already has established van pools commuting to Baldwin County. 41.1% (3,776) of Escambia County's labor force worked outside Escambia County with 10.4% (957) commuting Baldwin County, 7.0% (643) commuting to Mobile County, 4.0% (364) commuting to Monroe County, and the last 19.8% commuting throughout the rest of the region, according to the US Census Local Employment Dynamics data (LED).

Duplication of Transportation Services

This Plan was also charged with addressing the duplication of transportation service that has been assisted with federal funds subject to coordination. To address possible duplication of transportation services, it must first be defined. This would entail the capacity, cost, eligibility restrictions, service area, driver requirements, and hours of operation. It is apparent that the transportation services that are subject to coordination currently being provided are sparsely located outside the core of the urban area (roughly the limits of the City of Mobile).

Based on the data presented in this document, the only notable duplication of service is in Mobile County. Baldwin County has only two other agencies in the County other than BRATS, as shown in Figure 15, that have received funds subject to coordination. One of those agencies is Baldwin County Mental Health of which BRATS already coordinates services with on a regular basis. Likewise, the City of Atmore has received one van for their senior program of which clients most likely utilize ECATS. Figure 16 details the combined service areas for coordination for Escambia County.

For Mobile County, only five agencies have a “service area” of the entire county. That on a map, as shown in Figure 14, would appear to be a duplication of service. However the reality is that those five agencies combined include several restrictions and limitations, and they barely have enough capital equipment to provide service for their clientele. For example, the Mobile Association of Retarded Citizens (MARC) has several vehicles subject to coordination. However, their drivers must be medically trained to handle situations that may occur with their clients. Although MARC already does some coordination with other agencies, this most likely will restrict another agency from providing service for MARC. As for the other agencies that have “county wide” service, Volunteers of America has possibly two vehicles subject to coordination, the Independent Living Center has possibly four vehicles subject to coordination and South Alabama Cares has one van to service twelve counties.

The city limits of Mobile and a portion of the city of Prichard is where there is a slight duplication of service. The Wave Transit’s Mobility Assistance Program and Access-A-Ride Program services 3/4 mile beyond the fixed route system in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Once a trip is beyond those boundaries of the Wave’s ADA service area and neighborhood routes, it becomes a stretch to call it a duplication of service as the service becomes very limited. Table 3 of this document details the service areas and hours of operation for transportation providers subject to coordination.

Figure 14
 5310, 5316, 5317 Combined Service Areas for Mobile County

Mobile County, Alabama

FTA 5310, 5316, and 5317 Combined Transit Service Areas



September 2011




Figure 15
 5310, 5316, 5317 Combined Service Areas for Baldwin County





Figure 16
 5310, 5316, 5317 Combined Service Areas for Escambia County



SECTION 8
COMMON ORIGIN / DESTINATIONS

Common Origins and Destinations Based on Surveys

To obtain a complete picture of the transit needs of the elderly, disabled and low income populations of Mobile, Baldwin and Escambia Counties, the stakeholders were to describe the common origins of their clients or patrons. By describing where the trips originate, the transit needs of these populations can be better addressed. Table 17 details the common origins for the elderly, disabled and low income populations in Mobile County.

Table 17
Common Origins for Elderly, Disabled and Low income Population in Mobile County

Stakeholder	Origins
Franklin Primary Health Center	Throughout Mobile County
South Alabama Medical Clinic, LLC	Throughout Mobile County
Springhill Medical Center	Throughout Mobile Area
Mobile Association of Retarded Citizens (MARC)**	Throughout Mobile County
Epilepsy Foundation of Alabama	Most clients must use public transportation as many suffer from epilepsy and cannot obtain a driver's license. They come from throughout Mobile County
Area IX Public Health Social Work Director	Throughout Mobile County
South Alabama CARES**	Mobile County Health Department, Agency address
FMC - Port City Dialysis Center	Downtown, Midtown, Spanish Fort, Grand Bay, Theodore, Bayou La Batre
Dumas Wesley Community Center**	Emerson Garden, Frank L. Boykin Tower, Central Plaza Tower, Bayou Street Senior Apartments, Oaklawn Homes (Baltimore Street), Roger Williams, R.V. Taylor Plaza, Birdville, and Happy Hill; areas around these Mobile Housing Board Projects; Toulminville, Crichton
Serenity Care Inc.	Eight Mile, Downtown, Tillmans Corner
South Bessemer Avenue Food Stamp Office	Zip Codes: 36508 (Axis), 36512 (Bucks), 36513 (Calvert), 36521 (Chunchula), 36522 (Citronelle), 36525 (Creola), 36560 (Mount Vernon), 36571 (Saraland), 36572 (Satsuma), 36575 (Semmes), 36582 (Theodore), 36609 (Mobile), 36610 (Prichard), 36611 (Chickasaw), 36612 (Whistler), 36613 (Eight Mile), 36617 (Toulminville), 36618 (West Mobile), 36619 (Tillmans Corner), 36693 (Theodore), 36695 (Mobile), 36663 (Eight Mile PO Boxes), 36671 (Chickasaw PO Boxes), 36685 (Plaza De Malaga), 36690 (West Mobile PO Boxes), 36691 (Cottage Hill PO Boxes)

Dearborn YMCA**	Mayesville Housing Project, Bay Oaks Apartments, Crichton Towers, Prichard area
Broad Street Food Stamp Office	Zip Codes: 36509 (Bayou La Batre), 36523 (Codan), 36528 (Dauphin Island), 36541 (Grand Bay), 36644 (Irvington), 36568 (St. Elmo), 36601 (Mobile), 36602 (Mobile), 36603 (Mobile), 36604 (Mobile), 36605 (Bayside area), 36606 (Westlawn area), 36607 (Crichton), 36608 (Hillsdale area), 36615 (Brookley area), 36616 (Bel Air area PO Boxes), 36622 (Mobile PO Boxes), 36628 (Mobile PO Boxes), 36630 (Mobile PO Boxes), 36633 (Mobile PO Boxes), 36640 (Midtown PO Boxes), 36644 (Mobile PO Boxes), 36652 (Mobile PO Boxes), 36660 (Loop PO Boxes), 36670 (Mobile PO Boxes), 36688 (USA campus PO Boxes), 36689 (Springhill PO Boxes)
Independent Living Center of Mobile**	Throughout Mobile County, but typically between 5 and 20 miles of Center
Alabama Career Center	Throughout Mobile County
Thomas Sullivan SAIL Center*	District II
Bayou La Batre SAIL Center*	Bayou La Batre, Codan, Irvington, St. Elmo, Grand Bay
Bayou La Batre Area Health Development Board	Throughout South Mobile County
Family Oriented Primary Health Care Clinic	Throughout Mobile County and Baldwin Counties
Providence SAIL/ Providence Hospital Outreach Services*	Within two miles of senior center
Citronelle SAIL*	Senior Center or homes with Citronelle City Limits
Creola SAIL	Town of Creola and Town of Satsuma
Grand Bay SAIL*	Grand Bay to I-10 to Irvington
Hillsdale SAIL*	Hillsdale subdivision to USA Campus to Ziegler Boulevard
Mother of Mercy SAIL (Catholic Social Services)*	Plateau area only
Mount Vernon SAIL*	Town of Mt. Vernon
Prichard SAIL*	City of Prichard
Prince of Peace SAIL (Catholic Social Services)*	I-10 to Michigan Avenue to Government Boulevard
Trinity Gardens SAIL*	Trinity Garden Area
Wilmer SAIL	Former town of Wilmer to Big Creek

Goodwill Easter Seals**	Mobile County
Volunteers of America**	Group homes, apartments and day training programs throughout Mobile County
Mt. Calvary Baptist Church**	The cities of Prichard, Chickasaw, and Saraland and the towns of Satsuma and Creola
City of Saraland*	Saraland City Limits
H.E. Savage Center/ Healthcare for the Homeless*	Mobile City Limits
City of Chickasaw*	City limits of Chickasaw
U.J. Robinson Memorial Center Inc.*	Mobile and Prichard City Limits
The Wave Transit System**	Within 3/4 mile of fixed route system or within the two neighborhood route service areas

*Transit Provider

**Transit Provider Subject to Coordination

Table 18 details the common origins for the elderly, disabled and low income populations in Baldwin County.

Table 18
Common Origins for Elderly, Disabled and Low income Population in Baldwin County

Stakeholder	Origins
Franklin Primary Health Center	Throughout Baldwin County
Ecumenical Ministries Inc	Eastern Shore and South Baldwin County
Baldwin County Catholic Social Services	Throughout Baldwin County
Baldwin County Department of Human Resources	South Baldwin County (Summerdale, Foley, Silverhill, Marlow, Rosington); North Baldwin County (Little River, Stockton, Perdido, Latham)
Area IX Public Health Social Work Director	Throughout Baldwin County
American Red Cross- Alabama Gulf Coast Chapter - Baldwin County	Rural and North Baldwin County
Thomas Hospital	Throughout Baldwin County
Baldwin County Mental Health**	Throughout Baldwin County
James P. Nix Center*	Fairhope, Montrose

Community Action Agency of Baldwin County*	Robertsdale, Daphne, Bellforest, Magnolia Springs, Montrose, Stockton, Bay Minette, Loxley
Family Oriented Primary Health Care Clinic	Throughout Baldwin County
Bay Minette SAIL*	City of Bay Minette
Daphne SAIL*	City of Daphne
Loxley SAIL*	City of Loxley/County Road 66/City of Robertsdale
Summerdale SAIL*	Town of Summerdale
Vaughn SAIL	Town of Stockton, Little River/Lathan
Baldwin Area Rural Transit System (BRATS)**	Throughout Baldwin County
Volunteers of America**	Group homes, apartments and day training programs in Baldwin County
Goodwill Easter Seals**	Baldwin County
South Alabama CARES**	Baldwin County Health Department
City of Orange Beach**	City limits of Orange Beach
City of Gulf Shores (New Recipient)*	New Recipient
City of Robertsdale	City of Robertsdale

*Transit Provider

**Transit Provider Subject to Coordination

Table 19 details the common origins for the elderly, disabled and low income populations in Escambia County.

Table 19

Common Origins for Elderly, Disabled and Low income Population in Escambia County

Stakeholder	Origins
Franklin Primary Health Center	Throughout Escambia County
ACH Family Physicians ACH Med Plus ACH Primary Care	Throughout Escambia County
DW McMillan Memorial Hospital	Throughout Escambia County
Atmore SAIL**	City Limits of Atmore
East Brewton SAIL*	City Limits of East Brewton
Flomaton SAIL*	Flomaton Area
Poarch Creek SAIL*	Creek Reservation

Huxford SAIL*	Communities of Huxford, Little Rock and McCullough
Brewton SAIL*	City Limits of Brewton
City of Atmore**	City of Atmore
South Alabama Mental Health/ Mental Retardation Board, Inc.**	Community Mental Health Center, Compass School, Atmore, Flomaton, East Brewton, Escambia Activity Center,
South Alabama Behavioral Health Care Systems	Escambia County
Escambia Count Alabama Transit System (ECATS)**	Throughout Escambia County
South Alabama CARES**	Escambia County

*Transit Provider

**Transit Provider Subject to Coordination

Potential Transit Destinations Based on Industry/Service

The most common destinations for elderly, low income and disabled individuals typically fall into eight categories: employment, healthcare, social services, transportation, education, quality of life, and senior centers. Employment destinations typically offer a significant number of entry level positions. The types of employment range from retail base industry, manufacturing, agricultural/food processing, healthcare, and service base industry. Healthcare destinations include hospitals, clinics, VA Clinics, county health departments, surgery centers, and dialysis centers. Social Service destinations include drug/alcohol abuse treatment centers, Easter Seals/United Way workshops and centers, mental health and mental retardation facilities, vocational rehabilitation centers, Department of Human Resources, and Veterans Service Officers. Transportation destinations include transit stations, fixed route stops, and airports. Educational destinations can range from High schools to Head Start programs to colleges/universities. Quality of life destinations include childcare centers, shopping centers/malls and grocery stores. Senior center destinations include both public and faith based centers. Figures 17 through 19 illustrate the various destinations in Mobile, Baldwin and Escambia Counties.

In Mobile County, by far the highest numbers of common destinations are in the City of Mobile, with significant numbers in Prichard, Chickasaw, Saraland, Satsuma, Citronelle, and Bayou La Batre as shown in Figure 17. This corresponds with the highest concentrations of transit dependent populations shown in Figures 5 through 7 in section six and with the area having the highest levels of existing transit service shown in Figure 14.

In Baldwin County, the highest numbers of common destinations are in the Cities of Bay Minette, Spanish Fort, Daphne, Loxley, Fairhope, Robertsdale, Foley, Gulf Shores and Orange Beach, with significant numbers in Elberta, Silverhill and Summerdale as shown in Figure 18. As would be expected, this corresponds with the highest concentrations of transit dependent populations shown in Figures 8 through 10 in section six; however, BRATS is only able to provide limited transit services in these areas with high volumes of transit dependent populations and common destinations. This indicates that there may be a need for fixed route transit service along the eastern shore of Mobile Bay (Fairhope, Daphne, and Spanish Fort) and in South Baldwin County (Foley, Orange

Beach and Gulf Shores).

In Escambia County the highest numbers of common destinations are in the Cities of Atmore and Brewton, with small clusters appearing in Flomaton and along interstate 65 near the Poarch Band of the Creek Indians tribal lands as shown in Figure 19. This corresponds with the highest concentrations of transit dependent populations shown in Figures 11 through 13 in section six. These areas are the most frequently served by the transit operators in Escambia County as shown in Figure 16 and table 19.

Figure 17
 Most Common Destinations for Transit Dependent Populations in Mobile County




Figure 18

Most Common Destinations for Transit Dependent Populations in Baldwin County





Figure 19
 Most Common Destinations for Transit Dependent Populations in Escambia County



SECTION 9 MOBILE URBAN AREA TRANSIT SYSTEM

The Wave Transit System

Mobile's public transportation is provided by The Wave Transit System. The Wave Transit operates a network of 13 fixed routes and one downtown circulator in Mobile, Alabama. According to posted schedules, all fixed-route services operate Monday through Saturday, with weekday operations beginning between 5 a.m. and 6 a.m. Nine weekday routes in the Wave Transit system end at 7:25 p.m. or earlier, with the remaining weekday routes ending between 9:55 p.m. and 10:25 p.m. Weekend service routes begin between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m., ending around the same time as weekday service routes. All fixed-route services operate on a 60-minute frequency, with the exception being *moda!*, a fare-free downtown circulator that arrives every 10 to 20 minutes. Figure 20 shows the existing Wave Transit system. Routes and days of operation for each route are shown in Table 20. The Wave Transit Systems regular fare is \$1.25, with 10 cents for transfers.

Table 20
Wave Transit System Routes

Route Number	Route Name	Days of Operation	Start Location	End Location	Length/ Area (Sq. Miles)
Route 1	Airport Blvd.	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Providence Hospital	13.55
Route 4	Springhill	Mon-Sat	GM&O	USA Health Clinic	18.59
Route 5	Highway 45	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Butler/ Berkley	9.35
Route 7	Dauphin Street	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Bel Air Mall	6.30
Route 9	Broad/Southside/Bel Air Mall	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Bel Air Mall	16.93
Route 10	Crosstown	Mon-Sat	Bel Air Mall	Chickasaw Center	12.91
Route 11	Dauphin Island Parkway	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Boykins/ DIP	13.79
Route 12	Highway 90/ Tillmans Corner	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Tillmans Corner Wal-Mart	17.28
Route 14	MODA!	Mon-Fri	Downtown Loop	Downtown Loop	2.08
Route 15	Toulminville	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Bayshore/ Frederick	10.93
Route 16	Plateau/ Prichard	Mon-Sat	GM&O	Eight Mile Shopping Center	11.91
Route 18	Cottage Hill/ USA	Mon-Sat	Bel Air Mall	USA Health Clinic	14.83
Route 19	Schillinger/ Airport Blvd.	Mon-Sat	Meets Route 1	NA	10.00

Source: The Mobile MPO 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan


The downtown circulator service, *moda!*, was implemented in FY 2003. The current route begins on Monroe Street at Fort Conde and turns left onto Church Street. The shuttle continues on Church Street, taking a right onto Washington Avenue, until at Dauphin Street. Once on Dauphin Street, a right turn is made onto Water Street, taking it back to Fort Conde. This route circles the downtown area, allowing riders access to employment sites and a myriad of tourist activities in the downtown area. This service alleviates some downtown parking issues by having *intercept parking* (parking provided at the edge of congested areas), thereby enabling riders to circulate around downtown without having to park each time. Future plans for the expansion of *moda!*, include a north-south route, once the Maritime Museum and ferry terminal, are complete. Also in the future, a north-south route will travel to the GM&O Transportation Center to allow riders to transfer to the fixed route system.

The Wave operates one neighborhood service, one in the Schillinger Road/Airport area (Route 19). Route 19 operates differently than the fixed routes. The service operates on demand response. The riders contact the service 24 hours in advance to set up an appointment and then the route is planned for the following day. The concept works by providing service to low density neighborhoods and utilizing the hub concept, where smaller vehicles carry riders into hubs or transfers centers that connect to fixed routes. There are no set stops or time points except for the scheduled route anchors, where passengers can transfer to other Wave fixed-route services. Route 19 serves Schillinger/Airport Blvd, with anchor points at Providence Hospital.

The Wave Transit Systems Mobility Assistance Program (MAP), operated out of its Brokered Transportation Department, is a shared ride service for which reservations must be made at least one day in advance. The cost of this service is \$2.50 one way and the hours of operation are Monday-Saturday, 5:00 a.m. – 9:00 p.m. Passes for MAP can be purchased at the GM&O Transportation Center or the Beltline (Administrative Building) location.

As defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, persons with a physical or functional disability that limits their capacity to use accessible fixed-route public transportation, may be eligible for transportation services through The Wave Transit's Mobility Assistance Program (M.A.P.). Since it is an Origin-to-Destination and curb-to-curb service, both the starting point and destination of the trip must be located within three-quarters mile of the extended fixed-route service, and MAP vehicles are not allowed to go into driveways or parking lots. Also, services are limited to Mobile County. To apply for MAP, an application has to be completed for the individual, and a qualified, licensed healthcare professional, such as the treating physician, social worker, case worker, counselor, or director of a social service agency must approve. Within twenty-one (21) days the individual will be notified by mail for approval or denial of the eligibility of the program. If approved, individuals will receive a complimentary ride to purchase and pick up an identification card.

Figure 20
The Wave Transit System Routes and Service Area



Other Mobile Urban Area Transit Services

- Campus Shuttle Service

The University of South Alabama (USA) has an on-campus shuttle system, known as JagTran, to encourage students to make USA a walking campus. The system has four daily routes that run from 7:10 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., with a lighter service continuing from 2:30 p.m. - 9:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Two shuttle routes will be near the fixed-route system of The Wave, allowing riders to seamlessly interface between the two systems. The shuttle and parking system has been fully operational since January 2005. More than 1,000,000 riders have used the shuttle system since start-up. There have been no injuries or at-fault collisions involving JagTran vehicles. There has been a 25 percent reduction in traffic accidents in parking lots and a 50 percent reduction in pedestrians/vehicle accidents since the system has been operating.

- Regional Services - Bayline

The Wave Transit System service area is based on governmental jurisdictions, rather than the type of trips made. The public transportation systems in Mobile and Baldwin Counties are completely independent. In order to provide more effective public transportation service, the scope of the systems was expanded to include appropriate regional services. Bayline, which began in November of 2007, is the result of efforts by the Baldwin Regional Area Transportation Service, the Wave Transit, elected officials, community leaders, the Baldwin County Public Transit Coalition, and other transit stakeholders. Bayline allows for regional connectivity between Baldwin and Mobile County. Currently there are three (3) routes in the morning originating at various points along the Eastern Shore in Baldwin County. All of the routes end in Bienville Square in Mobile, where a connection to the Wave Transit is available. The routes then reverse and return to the Eastern Shore. Average monthly ridership for Fiscal Year 2012 was 1,316, and, for 2013 was 1,372. Connecting the two systems increases rider accessibility to both systems and provides greater coverage of the region as a whole.

Mass transit service in the Mobile area has predominantly been consumed by those with no other means of transportation. A Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) was completed during FY 2004 on the fixed route system to determine the productivity of individual routes and the reliance of underserved populations on each route. The COA was used to redesign the fixed route system to service underserved populations and eliminate underutilized routes, in addition, the COA supported the creation of two neighborhood routes (Demand Response) to feed the fixed route system and service large population centers. The resulting fixed route system, with the addition of the two neighborhood routes, was implemented in May of 2004. The resulting system serves an increased population, as well, as more desirable destinations. In FY 214, a Transportation Development Plan (TDP) was completed to evaluate the changes implemented by the COA. Currently, the Wave Transit System is starting the process of implementing the changes recommended in the TDP.

Finance plays a central role in shaping urban transportation policy and transit system design. The provision of transit service in Mobile is a direct function of available fiscal resources to run the system. Historically, the system's dependence on the declining source of federal funding has hurt

the system and has underscored the necessity for a dedicated source of funding to insure its vitality. The operating budget currently consists of four major sources: (1) directly generated revenue (farebox), (2) local capital allotment, (3) local operating grants, and (4) annual 5307 grants. It should be noted that neither the State of Alabama nor any local government other than the City of Mobile provides funding to The Wave Transit System even though service is provided to other political jurisdictions.

SECTION 10 ACTION PLAN

The following table is a preliminary action plan designed to assess the pertinent and viable issues identified in the unmet needs section. It recommends actions needed to address these needs and generates specific recommendations for accomplishment, including possible funding sources, time frames, priority, and proponent agency, where applicable and possible.

Table 21
Action Plan

Problem	Strategy Needed/ Desired	Discussion	Timeframe, Priority and Proponent Agency
Fees and fares for transit services greater than what patients can afford	Cost sharing for transit trips for elderly, disabled and low income populations	A voucher program that transit providers could give to patrons to assist with costs that pays a portion or all of the cost of transportation. A Regional Mobility Manager could facilitate this program	A regional transit authority or a private or non-profit agency should take on the responsibilities of a Mobility Manager
Lack of local match funding	Local governments need to appropriate more local funds for transportation, or local agencies need start funding transportation in the community	Operating funds for all FTA grant programs require 50% local match, and capital funds require a 20% local match. Without cash or in kind match, transit providers cannot access all their federal dollars. It would be beneficial to expand local contracting opportunities since they can be used to offset the match.	Although the issue of funding is predominately political in nature, the public affects the willingness of politicians to allocate funds for transit. The local population must perceive value in investing in transit for their communities.
Limited service hours of public transit fixed routes (limited night, evening and early morning service)	Expand hours of service	As already discussed, funding issues impede increasing service. For example in FY 2006, the Wave fixed route busses cost \$56.75 per hour to operate, and paratransit service costs \$28.16 per hour. To expand service hours requires an additional expenditure of funds and requires additional revenue streams to offset these costs. In addition, increased service will in turn increase the costs for dispatch and management.	Although the issue of funding is predominately political in nature, the public affects the willingness of politicians to allocate funds for transit. The local population must perceive value in investing in transit for their communities.

Limited service hours on affordable transit providers for elderly, disabled and low income clients (limited night, evening or early morning service)	Expand hours of service	Current federal transit funds are highly competitive and scarce. The cost of operating transit has outpaced the funding for it. The elderly, disabled, and low income populations have disproportionately been negatively impacted by this lack of funding. These populations tend to be transit dependent so they cannot just choose a different mode.	The federal, state and local government must begin funding transit at the rate of inflation at least. In addition, the general population must perceive a value in providing transit to these populations.
Referrals to out-of-county specialty care are more difficult	Coordinated transit services that cross county lines	The creation of a Mobility Manager should be considered to coordinate transit services of existing providers.	A regional transit authority or a private or non-profit agency should take on the responsibilities of a Mobility Manager
Limited service days on public transit fixed routes (limited service on Saturdays and no service on Sundays)	Add additional service to weekends.	As already discussed, funding issues impede increasing service. For example in FY 2006, the Wave fixed route busses cost \$56.75 per hour to operate, and paratransit service costs \$28.16 per hour. To expand service hours requires an additional expenditure of funds and requires additional revenue streams to offset these costs. In addition, increased service will in turn increase the costs for dispatch and management.	Although the issue of funding is predominately political in nature, the public affects the willingness of politicians to allocate funds for transit. The local population must perceive value in investing in transit for their communities.
Limited service days on affordable transit providers for elderly, disabled and low income clients (limited service on Saturdays and Sundays)	Add additional service to weekends.	Current federal transit funds are highly competitive and scarce. The cost of operating transit has outpaced the funding for it. The elderly, disabled, and low income populations have disproportionately been negatively impacted by this lack of funding. These populations tend to be transit dependent so they cannot just choose a different mode. The lack of service on weekends limits the access of low income populations to entry level jobs in many service areas.	Although the issue of funding is predominately political in nature, the public affects the willingness of politicians to allocate funds for transit. The local population must perceive value in investing in transit for their communities.

<p>Unrealistic expectations/ Lack of education</p>	<p>Educate public on transit capabilities and limitations, and educate transit providers on the needs of transit riders.</p>	<p>As part of an effective public involvement plan, the transit providers should evaluate their service at least bi-annually to determine if it is still effectively serving the population. Transit riders need to express their needs to transit providers, while understanding the funding issues that limit the system.</p>	<p>The public and the transit provider must be willing to compromise. In addition, both the transit service and the public must have a realistic understanding of the capabilities of both parties.</p>
<p>The service area of the public transit system is so large that the transit is unable to adequately maximize the use of its vehicles to meet the riders needs.</p>	<p>Increase the number of vehicles so that the service area of each vehicle can be maximized to serve the needs of the elderly, low income and disabled population.</p>	<p>As already discussed, funding issues impede increasing service. In FY 2006, the paratransit service costs \$28.16 per hour for The Wave Transit System. While the cost per hour for other providers is unknown, it can be estimated from Wave cost per hour. To expand service areas requires an additional expenditure of funds and requires additional revenue streams to offset these costs. In addition, increased service will in turn increase the costs for dispatch, management, and staff.</p>	<p>Although the issue of funding is predominately political in nature, the public affects the willingness of politicians to allocate funds for transit. The local population must perceive value in investing in transit for their communities.</p>
<p>Lack of coordination between current 5310, 5316 and 5317 transportation providers</p>	<p>Create a state level commission charged with effectively promoting the development and delivery of coordinated transportation services. This commission will have regulatory authority to require participation in a community transportation planning process.</p>	<p>The legislation forming the commission must detail the pertinent issues of the commission, while leaving room for change as new technology and funding becomes available. They need to have the ability to obtain new or increased funding, while having the power to distribute or deny the funding based on the participation of transportation providers. The commission needs to be the champion of the coordination effort, while being held accountable by everyone from the federal level to the individual transit rider.</p>	<p>Currently, 10% of 5310, 5316 and 5317 funds can be used to administer, plan, and provide technical assistance for the coordination effort. The development of a coordinated plan is an eligible planning activity and can be funded at an 80% FTA share under the planning programs (5303, 5304, and 5307) or urbanized area formula program (5311). Legislative action is needed to allocate a dedicated funding source, whether a % of taxes or a fee added to an automobile related expense.</p>

Problem	Strategy Needed/ Desired	Discussion	Timeframe, Priority and Proponent Agency
Inability of transportation providers to bring rural riders into urban areas and vice versa	Allow an exception to the FTA regulation or change legislation that requires 5311 funds only be used in rural areas and 5307 funds only be used in urban.	FTA regulations require that all trips using 5311 funds originate in rural areas, and all trips using 5307 funds originate in urban areas. For example, regulation allows a 5307 van to bring a client to an urban area, but on the same trip the van cannot take individuals from the urban area back out to the rural area. This regulation allows empty vans to cross the urban/rural boundary even though there is a critical need for transportation both directions.	This issue is extremely political and unfortunately does not just affect our area. FTA must provide the exception or rewrite the regulation to allow individuals, especially the low income population for trips to Baldwin County and the disabled and elderly for trips to Mobile County, to pursue healthcare and employment.
Lack of fixed routes (Baldwin County)	Increase the number of busses and vans operating so that some can be used for fixed transit routes along congested corridors.	To expand the current demand response/fixed transfer point service requires an additional expenditure of funds and requires additional revenue streams to offset these costs. In addition, increased service will in turn increase the costs for dispatch, management and staff. Feasibility and implementation studies have been completed for South Baldwin County and the Eastern Shore of Baldwin County for fixed route transit systems.	Although the issue of funding is predominately political in nature, the public affects the willingness of politicians to allocate funds for transit. The local population must perceive value in investing in transit for their communities.
Lack of dedicated funds for transit at state level	Pass legislation dedicating funding for transit.	Only five states, Alaska, Alabama, Colorado, Hawaii and Utah, do not have dedicated state funding for transit. The State of Alabama has a Constitutional prohibition on the use of gas tax dollars for anything other than “roads & bridges”.	The overall perception of transit in Alabama must change. Alabamians are notoriously attached to their vehicles, but many Alabamians are transit dependent. The only way to obtain dedicated funding is to make riding transit a desirable and viable option for the non-transit dependent population.

Lack of local funds to operate in rural areas/ Lack of affordable transportation options in rural areas	Rural and county governments need to appropriate more funds for transportation, or local agencies need to start funding transportation in the community. Another option would be to subsidize private transportation providers in rural areas so that this option is affordable.	Funding is an impediment to increasing rural transportation because a traditional fixed route system will not be cost effective. To expand service areas for demand response requires an additional expenditure of funds and requires additional revenue streams to offset these costs.	Although the issue of funding is predominately political in nature, the public affects the willingness of politicians to allocate funds for transit. The local population must perceive value in investing in transit for their communities. Once a value is perceived, multiple options exist for extending transit service to rural areas including a voucher system to be used for private providers and expanded demand response capacity and service area of the public transit agency. The local population must determine the best option for their area.
Lack of affordable transportation options in Mobile County (urban localities outside the current transit fixed routes)	Increase the number of busses and vans operating so that fixed routes can be extended or new routes can be added.	The Wave Transit System operates the only public transit agency in Mobile County. Many local city and town governments cannot or will not allocate funding for public transit in their communities. Until these areas begin contributing to the funding of the transit system, The Wave has no choice but to operate a majority of their fixed routes within the municipalities that fund them.	Local governments need to allocate funds to support the local transit system. All areas need to research additional funding sources to increase access to the transit system. In addition, the governments and population of the county need to support a dedicated state funding source for transit.
Lack of Affordable, timely access to jobs and job related training	Car Pool Program and Emergency Ride Home Program	This is an inexpensive, effective means of providing transportation for workers	The Regional Planning Commission is initiating this program in the Urban and Rural Areas
Lack of coordination between current 5310, 5316 and 5317 transportation providers	Mobility Manager	Focuses on meeting individual customer needs through a wide range of transportation options and service providers; coordinating these services and provider in order to achieve a more efficient transportation delivery system	Unknown

<p>Lack of affordable transportation options in Escambia County (urban localities outside the current transit fixed routes)</p>	<p>Increase the number of busses and vans operating so that fixed routes can be extended or new routes can be added.</p>	<p>The Escambia County Alabama Transit System (ECATS) operates the only public transit agency in Escambia County. ECATS serves a predominately rural county, so most trips in the county tend to be long. With fewer and smaller municipalities responsible for dedicating funds, the pool of money to start with is much smaller.</p>	<p>Local governments need to continue allocating funds to support the local transit system while researching additional funding sources to increase access to the transit system. In addition, the governments and population of the county need to support a dedicated state funding source for transit.</p>
<p>Lack of understanding between transportation providers on the options to better serve their clients</p>	<p>Increase the efforts to coordinate the services of transportation providers with the goal of eliminating duplication while increasing availability.</p>	<p>The Interagency Transportation Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility (CCAM) has made recommendations to simplify and coordinate transportation services for the elderly, disabled and low income population. In addition the upcoming United We Ride Initiative will further recommend ways to coordinate.</p>	<p>Vehicle Sharing: In order to reduce duplicate transportation services, as well as idle time for drivers and vehicles, the CCAM recommends that vehicles used in human service transportation be made available to other federally funded programs, consistent with the Common Grant Rule. Cost Sharing: In order to ensure that adequate resources are available for transportation services for persons with disabilities, older adults and individuals with lower incomes, and to encourage the shared use of vehicles and existing public transportation services, the CCAM recommends where statutorily permitted that standard cost allocation principles for transportation be developed and endorsed by federal human services and transportation agencies.</p>

<p>Inefficient usage of existing busses and routes.</p>	<p>Increase ridership and sharing of assets and resources between all of the various local providers</p>	<p>The Interagency Transportation Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility (CCAM) has made recommendations to simplify and coordinate transportation services for the elderly, disabled and low income population. In addition the upcoming United We Ride Initiative will further recommend ways to coordinate.</p> <p>Demand Response (DR) is, by its very nature, highly inefficient. Optimizing scheduling processes and procedures (scheduling software) and greater liaison between various providers may allow some success on this item.</p> <p>Passengers who consistently schedule and then do not ride or who cancel at the last minute add to this inefficiency.</p>	<p>Vehicle Sharing: In order to reduce duplicate transportation services, as well as idle time for drivers and vehicles, the CCAM recommends that vehicles used in human service transportation be made available to other federally funded programs, consistent with the Common Grant Rule.</p> <p>Cost Sharing: In order to ensure that adequate resources are available for transportation services for persons with disabilities, older adults and individuals with lower incomes, and to encourage the shared use of vehicles and existing public transportation services, the CCAM recommends where statutorily permitted that standard cost allocation principles for transportation be developed and endorsed by federal human services and transportation agencies.</p>
---	--	---	--

SECTION 11 STRATEGIES & RECOMMENDATIONS

From an analysis of input received as a result of the stakeholders meetings and public involvement processes, as well as the demographics of the region it is clear that the issue of coordinated transportation covers almost the entire spectrum. Clear opportunities for coordination exist, with many having been identified and implemented throughout the region and within each county. In some areas of the region coordination already exists. Where lines of communication and coordination exist, transit providers are willing and eager to provide service; but they lack the resources to meet these increased or special demands. Where transit systems do not exist, the communities and the agencies within them are willing to implement transit services; they simply do not have the means or the wherewithal to do so.

Based on this analysis, the following recommendations and priorities have been developed. The implementation of any of these is contingent upon the availability of the political support, funding and resources. Not only is federal operating assistance critical but also federal capital funds to expand and modernize fleets are essential. These funds, however, are of no use unless and until stable sources of local funding can be identified to match the operating and administrative costs. Key to all of this is to additionally identify operating funding for our Section 5310 vehicles located in the senior centers and various other non-profit and social service agencies throughout the region. Most of these Section 5310 recipients provide services only for their specific supported populations. This is, in large part, a byproduct of the manner in which these agencies are funded and the lack of any operating funds for these organizations. While all of these organizations represent a significant pool of capital resources for expanded transportation services, the lack of any viable or reliable funding mechanism to address operational costs mitigates against utilizing these assets to provide general public transportation services.

These strategies listed below offer a framework of activities and services that, if implemented, would provide for enhanced and expanded access, mobility and transportation across the region.

1. Maintain current transit service.
2. Maintain current transit contracts and coordination efforts.
3. Expand current transit service
 - a. Night service.
 - b. Weekend service.
 - c. Rural areas of county.
 - d. Inter-county service.
4. Increase the number of vehicles so that the service area of each vehicle can be maximized to serve the needs of the elderly, low income and disabled population.
5. Support/Establish additional transportation providers.

6. Support/Establish alternate transit options, such as car/van pools and transportation stipends.
7. Support efforts to establish a state transit funding source.
8. Support efforts to combine and/or leverage funding sources.
9. Establish rural public transportation systems in Mobile County.
10. Expand/enhance the rural public transportation systems in Baldwin and Escambia Counties and to enable them to expand service and service hours.
11. Educate public on transit capabilities and limitations, and educate transit providers on the needs of transit riders.
12. Allow an exception to the FTA regulation or change legislation that requires 5311 funds only be used in rural areas and 5307 funds only be used in urban.
13. Provide additional funds for capital and operating to the existing public transportation providers to enable them to expand service and service hours.
14. Increase the efforts to coordinate the services of transportation providers with the goal of eliminating duplication while increasing availability.
15. Across the region, increase/expand access and transportation opportunities for various target groups (elderly, disabled, economically disadvantaged, at risk youth) attempting to access and utilize various social service delivery agencies, job training and education facilities, nontraditional educational opportunities, “latch-key” programs, rehabilitation opportunities, etc.
16. Across the region, increase/expand/provide access to “out of region” or “out of service area” health care facilities for “fragile” and “at risk” populations and aging, disabled or wounded veterans.
17. Continuously monitor the unmet needs identified in this plan and determine if and when changes can be implemented that will allow for greater access to public and social service transportation for our citizens as well as greater flexibilities and resources for our transit and transportation providers.
18. Work with local and regional 5310 and social service providers to sustain, and where possible expand, their existing transportation capabilities. Until such time as many of the needs addressed in this plan are addressed, these agencies must be able to maintain and sustain their current level of service for their supported populations. Should a regional transportation system grow from these efforts then the assets and resources controlled by these various 5310 and social service providers will/could provide a foundation for and an instant influx of transportation resources to support the region.
19. Mobility Managers and Mobility Management focused on meeting individual customer needs through a wide range of transportation options and service providers; coordinating these services and provider in order to achieve a more efficient transportation delivery system.
20. Increase ridership and sharing of assets and resources between all of the various local providers.
21. A voucher program that transit providers could give to patrons to assist with costs that pays a portion or all of the cost of transportation. A Regional Mobility Manager could facilitate this program.
22. Transit services that are cross county lines, providing services region wide and beyond as needs dictate.

SECTION 12 CONCLUSIONS

In those counties and cities within our region where public transportation systems do not exist, most other forms of reliable and accessible transportation are generally not available either. This is an extraordinarily difficult problem to solve. It requires a significant investment in political will and long term stable financial resources by local government. While the desire may well exist, the financial reality is that many of our rural counties do not have the financial resources to meet the match requirements to implement transit service. In our more sparsely populated counties, opportunities for contract revenue from local social service agencies are also extremely limited.

This Plan recognizes that a lack of transportation can be a major obstacle for people with disabilities, older adults, children and youth, and other at risk populations that need various quality of life, social and health services. This lack of transportation also has a limiting effect on access and mobility for certain portions of the general population. Interagency partnerships are essential to increase coordination and collaboration among transit, human services transportation and mobility services providers. While we address improving these interagency partnerships, this should not be construed as a statement that they do not currently exist. While there may not be stylized, formal processes or coordination activities, these actions occur on a daily basis across the region. Given the intimate nature of the service offered by the transit systems within our region, one-on-one and agency-to-agency coordination occurs on a continuous and an almost daily basis. One should not assume that the lack of a structured environment suggests a lack of communications and coordination. In fact, this daily coordination and communication is the framework for the mobility management functions that do occur within the region.

It is also important that service providers continue to coordinate and collaborate with funding and planning agencies and with special needs populations and organizations. Coordination and collaboration are central considerations to any recommendations and strategies. In response to the need for coordination and collaboration, and in recognition of the planning area's large geographic range and specific demographics, this Plan's recommendations and strategies are broad in scope. This is intended to allow agencies flexibility for funding and provide creativity in suggesting programs and services.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Stakeholder Committee List

The following is a list of contacts that were consulted with during the development of this plan. These stakeholders were contacted via email, mail outs, phone calls, or personal interviews. Not all stakeholders responded, but they were contacted.

ECATS

BRATS

The Wave Transit

Mobile County Commission

Baldwin County Commission

Escambia County Commission

City of Citronelle

Town of Mount Vernon

Town of Dauphin Island

City of Gulf Shores

City of Orange Beach

City of Bay Minette

City of Daphne

City of Foley

City of Robertsdale

Town of Silverhill

City of Spanish Fort

Town of Summerdale

City of Fairhope

Town of Elberta

Town of Loxley

Town of Perdido Beach

Town of Magnolia Springs

City of Brewton

Town of Flomaton

City of East Brewton

City of Atmore

Town of Riverview

Town of Pollard

City of Prichard

City of Creola

City of Chickasaw

City of Satsuma

City of Saraland

City of Semmes

City of Mobile
City of Bayou La Batre
Poarch Band of Creek Indians
Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians
Alta Pointe
AHEPA 310
Alabama Institute for the Deaf and Blind
American Red Cross
Apostolate with Persons with Disabilities
Audrey's Way Transportation
Baldwin County Mental Health
Cancer Center of Southern Alabama
Catholic Social Services
Circle of Care
Colonial Trailways Charter Coach Dept
Community Action Commission
Davis Community Development Center (Love Joy Holiness Church)
Dearborn Y.M.C.A.
Dumas Wesley Community Center
ecumenical Ministries Inc.
Epilepsy Foundation of South AL
Family and Friends Transportation
FMC West Mobile
Gardens of Daphne
Goodwill Easter Seals
Grand Bay - St. Elmo Senior Center
H.U.D.
Hearthstone at Heritage Woods
Highpoint Baptist Church
Home Instead Senior Care
Independent Living Center
James P. Nix Senior Citizens Center
L. J. Conaway Adult Daycare
Mobile Association for Retarded Citizens (MARC)
Mobile Bay Transportation Co Inc
Mobile Infirmary Medical Center
Mt. Calvary Baptist Church
Mt. Zion Baptist Church
Murray House
Newman's Medical Services
On the Move

Providence Hospital Outreach Services
Serenity Care, Inc.
South Alabama CARES
South Alabama Leisure Rehabilitation Recreation Center
Southwest Alabama Mental Health
Springhill Manor Nursing Home
Springhill Medical Center
Springhill Senior Residence
Team Adaptive Inc
Thomas Hospital
Transportation Unlimited
U.J. Robinson Memorial Center
United Cerebral Palsy of Mobile
VIA-Senior Citizen Services, Inc.
Volunteers of America Southeast Inc.
Wilmer Hall Children's Home
WINNERS
YMCA
Mercy Medical
The Learning Tree, Inc
Unique Touch Transportation
Rebecca Green
Area XI Public Health Social Work Director
DW McMillan Memorial Hospital
South Alabama Medical Clinic, LLC
ACH Family Physicians
ACH Med Plus
ACH Primary Care
Franklin Primary Health Center, Inc.
Family Oriented Primary Health Care Clinic
Bayou La Batre Area Health Development Board, Inc.
Southwest Alabama Behavioral Health Care Systems
Epilepsy Foundation of Alabama
SAIL Bayou la Batre
SAIL Brewton
SAIL Citronelle
SAIL Creola
SAIL Dearborn
SAIL Dumas Wesley
SAIL Grand Bay
SAIL Hillsdale

SAIL Mother of Mercy
SAIL Mount Vernon
SAIL Prichard
SAIL Prince of Peace
SAIL Providence
SAIL Sullivan
SAIL Theodore
SAIL Trinity Gardens
SAIL Wilmer

Appendix B: Adoption Resolutions

The following are resolutions adopting the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan by the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission Board of Directors, The Mobile Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, and the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization. (These resolutions will be made available after the next meetings of these Boards.)

RESOLUTION 17-018

**MOBILE AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY (MATS)
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)**

Adopting the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan Update

WHEREAS, the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission (SARPC) serves as the host agency for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), planning and coordinating transportation improvements in the urban area of Mobile County in cooperation with the Alabama Department of Transportation(ALDOT); and,

WHEREAS, The SARPC has developed a Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan (HSCTP) which is an assessment of transportation needs as they pertain to the remaining funds of SAFETEA-LU under FTA Section 5316 (JARC), FTA Section 5317 (New Freedom), and apportioned funds of the FAST ACT, FTA Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility Of Seniors And Individuals With Disabilities.) Urban and Rural transit funding for the Counties of Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile; and,

WHEREAS, the Updated Fiscal Years 2016 – 2019 Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan has been duly reviewed, discussed and approved by the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization (RPO); and,

WHEREAS, the Updated Fiscal Years 2016 – 2019 Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan has been duly reviewed, discussed and recommended for approval by the Mobile MPO Technical Coordinating/Citizens Advisory Committee on August 23rd, 2017; now,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that after review and evaluation, the MATS Metropolitan Planning Organization in session this 6th day of September, 2017, does adopt the Updated Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan as summarized above.

ATTEST:



Chairman, TCC



Chairman, MPO

Resolution

South Alabama Rural Planning Organization (RPO)
adopting the Fiscal Years 2016 – 2019
Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan
as prepared by the
South Alabama Regional Planning Commission (SARPC)


WHEREAS, the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization (RPO) was established to serve as the decision-making body and to provide guidance in conducting the non-metropolitan cooperative planning process for portions or all of Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile Counties in Alabama, as provided in amended 23 USC 134 (Fixing America's Surface Transportation - FAST Act, Section 1201 and 1202, December 2015); and

WHEREAS, the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization is interested in the continued development of the non-metropolitan transportation consultation process as described in 23 CFR 450.210(b) through on-going public involvement and data collection regarding the rural transportation needs and issues of the citizens in Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile Counties; and

WHEREAS, The South Alabama Regional Planning Commission has developed a Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan which is an assessment of transportation needs as they pertain to FTA Section 5316 (JARC), FTA Section 5317 (New Freedom), and FTA Section 5310 (Elderly and Disabled) transit funding for the Counties of Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile, and

WHEREAS, the Fiscal Years 2016 – 2019 Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan has been duly reviewed and discussed by the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, this 21st day of September, 2017 that the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization does hereby adopt and endorse the Transportation Plan.


Chairman


Attest:

RESOLUTION 2017-08
SOUTH ALABAMA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

**APPROVING THE HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION
PLAN FOR MOBILE, BALDWIN AND ESCAMBIA COUNTIES**

WHEREAS, The SARPC has developed a Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan (HSCTP) which is an assessment of transportation needs as they pertain to the remaining funds of SAFETEA-LU under FTA Section 5316 (JARC), FTA Section 5317 (New Freedom), remaining funds of MAP-21 FTA 5307 (Urban Transit) and FTA Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility Of Seniors And Individuals With Disabilities) Urban and Rural transit funding for the Counties of Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile, and apportioned FTA funds of THE FAST ACT signed into law December 4th, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission (SARPC) serves as the host agency for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), planning and coordinating transportation improvements in the urban area of Mobile County in cooperation with the Alabama Department of Transportation(ALDOT); and,

WHEREAS, the Mobile Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), on the 18th of November, 2015 did adopt the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan for the South Alabama Region; and,

WHEREAS, the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization (RPO) was established to serve as the decision-making body and to provide guidance in conducting the non-metropolitan consultation planning process for portions or all of Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile Counties in Alabama, as provided in amended 23 USC 134 (MAP-21, Section 1201 and 1202, July 2012) as amended by THE FAST ACT; and

WHEREAS, the South Alabama Rural Planning Organization on the 23rd of September, 2015 did adopt the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan for the South Alabama Region; and,

WHEREAS, The South Alabama Regional Planning Commission has developed a Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan which is an assessment of transportation needs as they pertain to FTA Section 5316 (JARC), FTA Section 5317 (New Freedom), FTA Section 5310 (Elderly and Disabled), and FTA 5339 (limited capital) transit funding for the Counties of Baldwin, Escambia, and Mobile, and has been duly reviewed and discussed by the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, this 21st day of September, 2017 that the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission does hereby adopt and endorse the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan.

ATTEST:



William S. Stimpson, Chairman



Larry W. White, Secretary