



CHATHAM URBAN TRANSPORTATION STUDY

TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

MPC Conference Room
110 EAST STATE STREET

April 15, 2004

3:00 P.M.

Members Present:

Allan Black, P.E.
John Broderick
Leroy Crosby
Andy Edwards
George Fidler, P.E.
MarRonde Lumkin-Lotson
Helen McCracken
Keith Melton
Teresa Scott
Thomas L. Thomson, P.E., AICP
Mike Weiner, P.E.
Mark Wilkes, P.E., AICP

Representing

Chatham County Engineering
CAT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
FHWA
Savannah Airport Commission
Town of Thunderbolt
CAC
GDOT - Atlanta
GDOT – Jesup
Executive Director MPC, Chair
City of Savannah
MPC

Others Present:

Al Bungard, P.E.
Bill Herrington
Wykoda Wang

Representing

Chatham County Engineer
Interested Citizen
MPC

I. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Thomson called the April 15, 2004 meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee to order. He suggested that the group clear all items on the agenda in order to devote more time to the TIP Workshop.

II. Action Items

A. Approval of February 18, 2004 CUTS TCC Meeting Minutes

Mr. Wilkes **moved** to approve the minutes. Mr. Weiner seconded the motion.

TCC Action: **The motion carried with none opposed.** The motion was to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2004 CUTS TCC meeting. Voting were Mr. Melton, Mr. Edwards, Ms. Scott, Mr. Broderick, Mr. Wilkes, Mr. Weiner, Mr. Black, and Ms. McCracken. Ms. Lumkin-Lotson and Mr. Crosby were not in the room when the vote was taken. Mr. Fidler abstained from voting because the minutes were not included in his pre-meeting materials.

B. Endorsement of final FY 2005 Unified Planning Work Program

Mr. Wilkes stated that the document that is before the committee is very similar to the draft document. Minor adjustments were made to the CAT 5303 funds. The Q23 funds for long range transportation planning were also included.

Mr. Thomson added that staff thought it would be prudent to approve an update and amend it later if necessary in order to meet deadlines.

Mr. Weiner asked if the UPWP includes a plan to address the amenity issues.

Mr. Wilkes replied that it is not a separate work element. It could be pursued under Special Studies.

Mr. Edwards asked if there were any funds carried over from the previous year.

Mr. Wilkes replied that such information would be available upon receipt of final accounting from GDOT.

Mr. Melton stated that he would ask about availability of carry over dollars if it were the wishes of the group.

Mr. Wilkes added that it would be helpful if staff could see the accounting summary.

Mr. Melton replied that he could get that information.

Mr. Melton moved to endorse the final FY 2005 UPWP. Mr. Weiner seconded the motion.

TCC Action: **The motion carried with none opposed.** The motion was to endorse the final FY 2005 UPWP. Voting were: Mr. Melton, Mr. Edwards, Ms. Scott, Ms. Lumkin-Lotson, Mr. Fidler, Ms. McCracken, Mr. Crosby, Mr. Weiner, Mr. Wilkes, and Mr. Black.

C. Endorsement of the Proposed Intermodal Connector Addition in Chatham County to the National Highway System (NHS)

Mr. Melton stated that the city of Port Wentworth requested the addition of Grange Road to the state route system. Following a review of the request it was decided that Grange Road did not meet the criteria for GDOT for local funding maintenance availability, etc. In lieu of that GDOT suggested that a summation be prepared for FHWA to propose the addition of Grange Road and a section of SR25/US 17 as a national highway system intermodal connector route to the national highway system. Grange Road serves several port facilities. The designation would bring availability of certain federal funds for maintenance.

Ms. Scott stated that there is a lot of truck traffic that goes straight into a gate. Port Wentworth does not have the funds to upgrade the road. Port Wentworth would be required to upgrade the road before it could be added to the system. This way it makes the road eligible to be upgraded with federal funds.

Mr. Thomson stated that staff would send a cover memo along with the request to the Georgia Ports Authority telling the GPA what action was taken and requesting any comments that the TCC should be aware of prior to action by the Policy Committee.

Col. Bungard added that input from the Ports would be important. They might have a railroad crossing planned for the 307; they are also working on an overpass. There is also a drainage problem in the area.

Mr. Melton stated that there is nothing in the resolution that would obligate the MPO to anything except basically to nominate the road to be a connector. If the MPO chooses as a body to not do a project or to do a project that would be a separate issue.

Ms. Scott added that the timing is not urgent on this matter.

Mr. Black **moved** to continue the matter until June in order to allow time for staff to transmit a copy of the action and to request input from Port Wentworth and the Georgia Ports Authority. Ms. Lumkin-Lotson seconded the motion.

TCC Action: **The motion carried with none opposed.** The motion was to continue the matter until June in order to allow time for staff to transmit a copy of the action and to request input from Port Wentworth and the Georgia Ports Authority. Voting were Mr. Black, Mr. Broderick, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Crosby, Mr. Fidler, Ms. McCracken, Mr. Melton, Ms. Lumpkin-Lotson, Ms. Scott, Mr. Weiner, and Mr. Wilkes.

III. Status Reports

A. Congestion Management System

Mr. Wilkes stated that following a review of the initial draft document staff felt that it was worth requesting several modifications before distributing the document. The requested changes included a greater degree of specificity in some of the recommendations and addition of certain maps. It is anticipated that the final report would be completed by April 30, as noted in the schedule.

B. Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Mr. Thomson stated that staff is within a week or two of scheduling a workshop on the model output. The consultant on this project will be contacting TCC members in order to obtain information about operating, maintenance and other revenue streams for transportation and how they are used as background for the LRTP. The goal is to have a draft report within a 30 day timeframe.

Mr. Melton asked if there was a standing TCC Subcommittee that would review the model runs for the LRTP update.

Mr. Wilkes replied that a subcommittee has been identified. Ms. McCracken is the CAC representative on this subcommittee.

Mr. Thomson stated that staff is at the position where bi-weekly meetings could be scheduled.

It was the consensus of the TCC to hold meetings to discuss the LRTP on the following Thursday mornings at 10:00: April 22, May 6, and May 20.

Ms. Wang reviewed the public involvement opportunities for the LRTP.

Mr. Melton suggested that staff investigate using the MPC website to inform residents about the LRTP process.

C. East-West Corridor Study

Mr. Thomson stated that ten responses were received to a Request for Qualifications. Copies have been distributed to the review committee. Finalists would be selected to present a written proposal followed by a presentation on May 21, 2004. This is a continuation of a new study in order to come to a successful conclusion about what could be done to address certain transportation problems. The process would lead to a point where a Concept Report could be presented for pre-construction funds. The public would be heavily involved in this process.

Mr. Edwards suggested that staff talk with the Planning Director of the Macon-Bibb County Planning Commission because that area is undergoing a similar study.

IV. Informational Reports

Mr. Thomson asked if anyone present has vital information to share to do so now in order to spend as much time on the TIP as possible.

No one indicated that they had urgent information.

V. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Workshop

Mr. Wilkes stated that a table based on the current TIP including FY 2004, 2005, and 2006 was included in pre-meeting materials. An additional table that was provided by GDOT is available at the meeting which includes the GDOT TIP proposal for the next six years. CAT has also provided a table of information on transit funds. Using these sources of information the group needs to start a dialogue about priorities in the upcoming TIP, which is due June 1.

Mr. Thomson stated that Mr. Fowler has indicated that the end of June might be OK.

Mr. Melton added that his understanding is that whatever the deadline is for the 05-07 TIP if you don't have it adopted by that deadline you are still acting under the 04-06 TIP and you can slide until such point as you have 05-07 passed. It is not problematic from a funding standpoint. The LRTP update is more important in terms of authorizing dollars than the TIP.

Mr. Thomson stated that PE could be represented in the TIP. This is useful to help to establish priorities. Two important questions for this MPO are does the order in which these projects are being addressed generally consist of priorities that are set somewhere although he does not know what those are yet. The second question now that we are a TMA is particularly are we spending the Q23 funds in the way the MPO wants to spend them versus the state? As you look at this those are two questions, programming to match your priorities and are we spending our money on the projects we think they should be spent on.

Mr. Melton noted that the issue of Congressional district balancing is important to remember also.

Mr. Thomson suggest that each jurisdiction including CAT make a list of those things that may not be in here or may be in here and we could prioritize them and look at them. If there is something in here that is a lower priority than something that the city and county are working on that discussion can occur.

Mr. Melton stated that the TCC could nominate these projects for the LRTP update to the extent that they need to be in the LRTP update and they need to be modeled, etc. If they are capacity projects they need to be modeled. Once that is done and they become eligible

for the TIP and then projects move in and out of the six year program based on a lot of factors.

Mr. Edwards asked whether something had been developed for ranking yet. If not, prioritization materials may be available from Atlanta, Rome, Columbus, or Augusta, all of whom are going through the same process.

Col. Bungard stated that he would prepare a list of his specific concerns.

Mr. Thomson asked that everyone prepare a list of specific projects that need to be addressed and bring the list to the table. He would give some thought to how to array this that would include the fact that there are projects in the pipeline with local funds so they could be more visible. Everyone should look at the GDOT list and compare it to the adopted list and make a list of any comments. Get the comments to staff in order for the comments to be organized in a useful way.

It was the consensus of the group to have a TIP meeting on Friday, May 7, 2004, at 10:00 A.M. This meeting would be held in the MPC Conference Room.

Each appropriate jurisdiction would look at what they are doing and try to identify things that need to be brought to the table to insert or to discuss. Also to review the proposed and adopted GDOT list and provide us any comments on that. Staff would research some priority setting ideas although we might build consensus at this time.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business, the April 15, 2004, meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark A. Wilkes, P.E., AICP
Director of Transportation Planning
Metropolitan Planning Commission