



CORE MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Minutes
April 18, 2024, at 2:00pm

April 18, 2024, CORE MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Voting Members	Representing	Present
Charles Ackridge	City of Bloomingdale	
Nathan Clark	City of Richmond Hill	
Deanna Brooks	Chatham County Engineering	X
Caila Brown	Bike Walk Savannah	X
Matt Saxon	City of Pooler	
Kaniz Sathi	GDOT – Planning	X(online)
James Aiello	Savannah Airport Commission	
Katie Proctor	GDOT – District Five	X(online)
Rhonda Ferrell	City of Garden City	
Omar Senati-Martinez	City of Port Wentworth	
Don Masisack	Coastal Regional Commission	
Peter Gulbranson	City of Tybee Island	
Mary Moskowitz	Chatham Area Transit	X
Melanie Wilson	MPC Executive Director	X
Jamie McCurry	Georgia Ports Authority	
Wykoda Wang	CORE MPO	X
Michele Strickland	City of Savannah	X
Steve Candler	Effingham County	X
Robert Milie	Town of Thunderbolt	
Vacant	Town of Vernonburg	
Voting Alternate	Representing	
Leon Davenport	City of Pooler	X(online)
Heath Maines	Savannah Airport Commission	X
Others	Representing	
Asia Hernton	CORE MPO	X
Pamela Everett	MPC	X(online)
Genesis Harrod	CORE MPO	X(online)
Anna McQuarrie	CORE MPO/MPC	X
Kieron Coffield	CORE MPO	X
Hind Patel	MPC IT	X
Joe Shearouse	City of Savannah	X

Rhodes Hunt	Kimley-Horn	X
Edward Hicks	GDOT	X
Kiarra Fields	City of Savannah	X(online)
Joseph Longo	FHWA	X(online)
Vivian Canizares	GDOT	X(online)
Eric Van Otteren	Bryan County	X(online)
Paul Teague	Bryan County	X(online)
Richard Fangmann	Pond Company Architects/Engineers/Planners	X

I. Approval of Agenda

Ms. Mary Moskowitz motioned to approve the April 18th, 2024 TCC meeting agenda; seconded by Ms. Calia Brown. The motion passed with none opposed.

II. Action Items

1. Approval of the February 15th, 2024, CORE MPO TCC Meeting Minutes

Ms. Michelle Strickland motioned to approve the February 15th, 2024, Meeting Minutes; seconded by Ms. Calia Brown. The motion passed with none opposed.

2. Approval of the March 21st, 2024, CORE MPO TCC Special Called Meeting Minutes

Ms. Michelle Strickland motioned to approve the March 21st, 2024, Meeting Minutes; seconded by Ms. Mary Moskowitz. The motion passed with none opposed.

3. Adoption of Updated MOU

Ms. Wykoda Wang, CORE MPO Director, stated we have talked about the MOU at several meetings. The latest update is the adoption of the MPO Boundary in February, which is included in Exhibit A (Scenario 1 for Bryan County). Another update, the formula for membership dues calculation, is finalized, because we did the poll and the majority of members are in favor of voting on the CORE MPO Board. That means Chatham County will not pay for the other municipalities within Chatham County. We recalculated the final MPO membership dues, which are attached to the agenda. Chatham County will pay about \$62,000 without paying the 25% of the municipalities' dues.

Summary of CORE MPO MOU Updates is listed below.

MOU Document

- **Signatory Parties** – added in Bryan County and the Cities of Guyton, Rincon and Springfield – both within document and the signature pages.
- **MPA Boundary** – updated the language regarding the CORE MPO MPA boundary as adopted by the MPO Board in February 2024.
- **MPO Organization**
 - CORE MPO Board, TCC and EDFAC - unchanged.
 - ACAT and CAC – deleted.
 - TEPIAC (consolidated and restructured from CAC and ACAT) and BPAC (newly established) – added.
- **Members' Roles and Responsibilities** – checked, confirmed and updated.

Exhibit A – The CORE MPO MPA boundary map has been revised to reflect the new boundary adopted by the MPO Board on February 28, 2024.

Exhibit B – The MPO Membership Dues Structure has been updated.

- Base Amount - local governmental member's contribution base amount of \$1,000 - unchanged.
- Counties and Municipalities – population based share
 - Effingham County - Effingham County will pay 100% of the county's share of the membership dues, covering all of the Effingham municipalities located within the CORE MPO MPA boundary.

- Bryan County - Bryan County and the City of Richmond Hill will split the county's share of the membership dues based on their respective population within the CORE MPO MPA boundary.
- Chatham County - Chatham County and its municipalities will split the county's share of the membership dues based on their respective population within the CORE MPO MPA boundary.
- Modal Shares
 - CAT - The Chatham Area Transit Authority would contribute a fixed amount based upon the 60th percentile of the counties and municipalities contributions.
 - GPA and SAV - Georgia Ports Authority and the Savannah Airport Commission would contribute a fixed amount based upon the 70th percentile of the counties and municipalities contributions.
- Others
 - GDOT – GDOT pays 10% of the transit planning (Section 5303) local match. Thus, no additional membership dues will be assessed from GDOT.
 - MPC and Advisory Committees - not be assessed dues.

Exhibit B – the 2020 Census Population within the CORE MPO MPA boundary has been updated for each County and Municipality.

We feel this document is ready to go. We are hoping the CORE MPO Board will execute the updated MOU. After that, we will forward the MOU to all the member agencies, including modal representatives and municipalities for final execution.

Ms. Melanie Wilson motioned to endorse the adoption of the Updated MOU; seconded by Ms. Calia Brown. The motion passed with none opposed.

4. FY 2024 - FY 2027 TIP Amendments April 2024

Ms. Asia Hernton stated in March 2024, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) requested that TIP amendments be made to the SR 404 Spur/US 17 at Back River project and the SR 26/US 80 @ Lazaretto Creek project. Additionally, Chatham County requested a TIP amendment be made to the Garrard Avenue Improvement project. The following summary outlines the proposed changes to the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP.

Regarding the Public Participation, CORE MPO advertised a fifteen (15) day public comment period in the Savannah Morning News on Sunday, April 7, 2024 (Appendix B). The notice was sent to the local news media and the consultation agencies as well as neighborhood associations and posted on the CORE MPO website. The comment period starts on April 10, 2024 and closes on April 24, 2024. A public hearing has been advertised – it will be held in conjunction with the rescheduled CORE MPO Board meeting on May 3rd, 2024. We have not received public comment or input on the TIP amendments so far.

SR 404 SPUR/US 17 @ BACK RIVER

Per March 2024 GDOT request, the CST funding amount has increased, the funding code has been updated from Y001 to Y001 and Y001F, and the CST phase is being moved to FY 2026. **Amendment** - Increase CST funding amount by more than \$29 million, move the CST phase to a later year and add a new fund source.

SR 26/US 80 @ LAZARETTO CREEK

Per March 2024 GDOT request, the funding amount for the ROW phase has increased, and the funding code has been updated from Z919 to Z919 and Y240. **Amendment** - Increase the ROW funding amount from \$120,300 to \$140,394 and add a new funding source.

GARRARD AVENUE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

In March 2024, Chatham County requested that the ROW phase be moved from FY 2024 to FY 2025.

Amendment - Move the ROW phase from FY 2024 to FY 2025.

Comparisons of original TIP project pages and updated TIP project pages are attached to the agenda. Our public involvement process, MTP/TIP consistency check, and original requests for amendments can be found in the TIP amendment report.

Ms. Calia Brown motioned to endorse the FY 2024 - 2027 TIP Amendments; seconded by Ms. Mary Moskowitz. The motion passed with none opposed.

III. Other Business

5. Selection of Projects for Grant Funding Application

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that we have identified 10 Unfunded Studies in the FY 2025 UPWP. We would like to apply for funding (Discretionary PL funds, PROTECT grant funds, etc.) for some of them in the 1st half of FY 2025. The next round for Discretionary PL funding application is in September 2024, so we will need to submit an application in August. After we adopt the 2050 MTP in August, we might have staff available to manage some of these studies.

We would like to work with TCC to determine which studies should be selected, as we cannot pursue funding for all of them. We will probably do two to three studies, based on our staff availability. After choosing the studies, we will check the scopes, revise the cost estimates if needed, and have the resolutions prepared in June, so we can submit the applications in August.

CORE MPO

- Regional Truck Parking Study
- Resilience Improvement Plan (RIP)
- Urban Flooding Model Study Phase II
- Bike/Pedestrian Plan Implementation Tool

Chatham County

- Islands Expressway Between Truman Parkway and US 80 Effingham County

Effingham County

- US 80 Corridor Study Phase II

CAT

- Transit Oriented Development Study
- Bus Stop Amenities Study
- Mobility Hub Study and Program
- Bus Rapid Transit Feasibility Study

Ms. Melanie Wilson, Director and CEO of the MPC, stated for the CORE MPO staff, since we were adamant about the Urban Flooding Model Phase I, we want to start Phase II. She just returned from a national planning conference where resiliency was a main focus. She believes we would be remiss not to have something with a resiliency component as we move forward with funding for modalities and agencies. Since we have already spent money on Phase I, maybe we could also have funds spent on Phase II so that we could continue to apply resiliency, especially with our newly adopted MPO boundary and areas that were not covered previously.

Chairperson Deanna Brooks stated she agrees that looking at the Urban Flood Model Study and expanding it to our new areas would be a good idea.

Ms. Calia Brown, Bike Walk Savannah, asked about the Islands Expressway Study - is that just for motor vehicles volumes, or does the study include a multiuse path? We discussed the feasibility of the President Street and Islands Expressway.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we do have that study included in our UPWP, so we can check the scope.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated for the projects under Chatham County, would that still need to go through the CORE MPO, or would Chatham County be allowed to manage that study?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Chatham County would need the CORE MPO's resolution supporting the application for funding for Chatham County. The County currently has 3 ongoing projects in our UPWP; would it be okay to take a break? CORE MPO would like to take a break and pursue the Truck Parking Study next year in March.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated that Chatham County will be moving into construction projects next year, so she is not sure about the staffing capabilities to do additional studies.

Ms. Michele Strickland, Traffic Engineer of City of Savannah, stated that we would like to consider the expansion of the Ports and the Hyundai Plant with the inundation of increased truck and trailer traffic, looking into regional truck parking options.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that we can take a break and do March 2025 applications. What we are talking about right now is an August 2024 submittal. If we apply for the funds and do get them, the contracting process will take about 6 months, so the earliest time we can start any of the studies would be April 2025. If we start the application in March 2025, the earliest time we could start would be in September 2025. Please think about the CORE MPO staff ability and availability. For example, Ms. Hernton will be working on the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan as well as the Title VI and Participation Plan update, therefore our staff has limited capacity.

Ms. Michele Strickland asked if the CORE MPO staff has a recommendation for Top 3 studies?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated Ms. Melanie Wilson did recommend the Urban Flooding Model Study Phase II. We can take one of those, as it is related to Resiliency Improvement Plans. We can choose both or either.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated since we did the first phase, it makes sense to go through the second phase of the Urban Flooding Model Study. It is also an opportunity to capture the new areas in our boundary change, like parts of Bryan and Effingham Counties.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she has pulled up the project description for Islands Expressway Between Truman Parkway and US 80.

Ms. Deana Brooks said looking at the project description, we should be able to push the application to March 2025.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz, CAT, stated she knows there are other funding sources for Transit Planning Studies and CAT's priority would be to go after funding for the mobility hubs.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if we wanted to vote on the Top 3 so that we can prepare the resolutions and update the scopes and costs, because that will involve amendments to the UPWP as well. Urban Flooding Model Phase II is one project. Any other studies for recommendation?

Ms. Calia Brown stated she will recommend the Bike/Pedestrian Plan Implementation Tool. Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the Bike/Pedestrian Committee will be in charge of that project.

Ms. Wang then asked is Effingham County online and do they want to do the US 80 Corridor Study Phase II?

Mr. Steve Candler, Director of Development Services in Effingham County, stated that Effingham County is interested in the US 80 Corridor Study Phase II.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if Effingham County wants to apply for funding for the study in September 2024 or March 2025? Mr. Steve Candler stated March.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will have **two projects** for September 2024 – **1) Urban Flooding Model Phase II, and 2) the Bike/Pedestrian Plan Implementation Tool**. That is settled. We will revisit the scope and the cost estimates and determine if we need to do UPWP amendments in June. Then we will prepare the applications and resolutions.

IV. Status Reports

[6. 2050 MTP Update](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for the 2050 MTP we are at the stage of Financial Plan Development. We are talking about Revenues, Project Selection, and Financial Balance. We had a special-called TCC meeting in March and already talked about this, so we will go over it quickly.

Highway Revenues

Highway revenue forecasts for 2025 - 2050 are provided by the GDOT Office of Financial Management (GDOT OFM) and are based on census population and the state's obligation authority without considering project-based forecasts.

- **2%** inflation rate for IIJA years and **1%** after 2026
- Projects and Maintenance revenues separated
 - LIMG funds are **Not** included in Maintenance Revenue
- Revenue projections are **matched** (estimated Federal OA + match)

CORE MPO Adjustments (**TCC input on March 21, 2024**):

- Keep **Project** and **Maintenance** revenues separated.
- Use **2%** annual inflation rate for all years 2026 – 2050 for both Project and Maintenance.
- Use revenues from the adopted **FY 2024 – 2027 TIP and STIP for FY 2025, 2026 and 2027** to replace projections since these are considered committed funds.
 - Project – Projects' Total
 - Maintenance – Lump Sum Total
- Add **state and local** funds for eligible roadways (collectors and above within CORE MPO MPA)
 - **Project**
 - Assume **no** available HB 170 funds
 - Assume **\$3 million** annual local funds (SPLOST, TSPLOST, general funds) and adjust with annual inflation rate of **2%**
 - Assume **no** other funding sources (grants, discretionary funds, PPP, etc.)
 - **Maintenance**
 - Assume **no** LIMG funds

After the March TCC meeting, Ms. Wang made the adjustments based on the TIP and STIP which are shown in the spreadsheet and slideshow attached to the agenda.

- The regional TIP numbers are listed at the top, 2025, 2026, 2027, etc. In February we made an amendment to the Truman Linear Park Trail Phase II-B, but that was in FY 2024, so it does not impact our FY 2050 Plan.
- Ms. Asia Hernton just spoke about the 3 TIP amendments that we made.
 - For SR 404 SPUR/US 17 Back River Bridge, we are moving the project's CST phase from 2025 to 2026. There is a cost increase, so the revenue will be deducted from 2025 and included in 2026.
 - We just added about \$20,000 in 2024 for the Lazaretto Creek Bridge project, but received word from GDOT that we might have further amendments to this project. When that is done, we will move the money. Basically, the HIP funds are lapsing for a few projects and we will talk about that later.
 - The ROW phase for Garrad Avenue is moving from 2024 to 2025, which means revenues addition to 2025.
- We have double checked the Bryan County projects. There are two projects, but they are not within our boundary, so it does not impact us. In the STIP no lump sum specifics are listed for Bryan County, so we assume zero dollars.
- There are 4 projects listed in Effingham County. One project is in FY 2024, so it would not impact the 2050 MTP. The other 3 projects do have funds listed in 2025, 2026, and 2028. We will add the revenues from these projects into the 2050 MTP revenue projections.
- Additional project – the City of Savannah received a grant from the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Program for I-16 Exit IMR follow up steps. This project comes with its own funding and these are the additional revenues we will consider.

The updated highway revenues numbers for 2025, 2026, 2027 and 2028 (highlighted in red) will replace the original numbers for these years. The total estimated Highway Revenues for 2050 MTP are about \$1.87 billion.

Revenue Allocations to Cost Bands (TCC Input on March 21, 2024):

- Cost Band One: 2025 – 2032 (8 years; overlaps with current and next TIPs; mid-years are 2028 and 2029)
- Cost Band Two: 2033 – 2041 (9 years; mid-year is 2037)
- Cost Band Three: 2024 – 2050 (9 years; mid-year is 2046)

Revenue Allocations to Category (TCC Input on March 21, 2024):

- Maintenance – 2050 MTP Survey Top Response is for Maintaining Existing Roadways.
- Projects
 - Operational Set Aside – **12%** based on lump sum percentage in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP
 - Transit Set Aside - **\$1,300,000** each year
 - Bike/Ped/Trail Set Aside - **3%** (mode share) each year for bike/ped projects for 2028 - 2050. **Specific amounts** for bike/ped projects from TIP are for FY 2025 - 2027.
 - Specific Highway Projects – rest of the project revenues

The 2050 MTP Highway Revenue Allocation by Cost Band and Category chart is attached to the agenda. There we can see how much money will be available for specific projects – around \$418 million in Cost Band One, \$457 million in Cost Band Two, and \$548 million in Cost Band Three.

Using these revenues, we tried to see what the Highway Project List would look like. We have decided that 2045 MTP Cost Band One projects that have not been implemented, most of which are already included in the TIP, will be carried forward to 2050 MTP Cost Band One. These include US 17 at Back River, US 17 Widening, Bull River Bridge Replacement, etc. After adding these projects, the revenue is about \$100 million for Cost Band One for use by other projects. The projects to be selected to use these revenues will come from the project prioritization process.

The Operational Set Aside revenues will accommodate projects such as signal coordination, intersection improvements, turn lane, etc. For Bike/Ped/Trail Set Aside revenue, we already have several projects - Chevis Road, Garrard Avenue, and Green Islands Road; and the rest of the revenue will be used for other identified projects.

The next steps would be to go through the Project Prioritization, and selected priority projects will be inserted into the various Cost Bands.

Transit Revenues

For 2050 MTP transit revenue projections, we decided to use the adopted FY 2024 – 2027 TIP as the basis.

TIP Information for Reference

1. Transit Revenues vary by year.
2. Use the year with only formula funds as the basis (FY 2027 - without additional grant funds)
3. Capital Revenue = Total Revenue minus Operational Revenue (around \$3 million)
4. Adjustments

Assumptions (TCC Input on March 21, 2024):

1. Transit Revenues for Capital Projects - \$7.5 million annual transit funds
2. Inflate transit revenues to year of expenditure (YOE) with annual inflation rate of 2%
3. Allocate transit revenues to cost bands

Potential Adjustments

1. Bryan County
2. Effingham County

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated Bryan and Effingham Counties have below \$500,000 for transit improvements each year according to the STIP. It is her understanding that the funds are allocated to the Coastal Region Commission and are used to purchase transportation services. CRC leases the buses from GDOT and purchases the services for senior citizens, etc. So, the funds are really not capital related. Is it safe to say we can assume zero dollars for transit capital improvements for these two counties?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz, CAT, stated that CAT does not provide services outside of Chatham County. If Bryan and Effingham Counties are receiving funds, they do go to CRC. She is not familiar with any capital improvements; it makes sense to assume no additional transit revenues. Ms. Wykoda Wang stated then we will assume no additional transit revenues for these two counties.

Highway Project Selection

We do have a big matrix for project selection. The matrix has about 180 projects. We are considering the regional input first - Travel Demand Model, Congestion Management Process, Freight Plan, 2045 MTP, and the Coastal Empire Study. The sub-area studies will confirm the needs.

Project Selection - review existing plans and study recommendations.

- Projects included in Cost Band One of 2045 MTP that have not been implemented will be considered priority projects and carried over to 2050 MTP.
- Projects included in Cost Bands Two and Three of 2045 MTP and projects from study recommendations were placed into a **matrix** and analyzed.
- Projects with the most frequent recommendations throughout the studies, denoted with 'X' marks in the matrix, were assigned to a higher tier. The goal is to have a total of 30 projects for the 2050 MTP.
 - Projects mentioned four times, with four checks, were assigned to Tier 1.
 - There are 7 Tier 1 projects.
 - Projects mentioned three times, with three checks, were assigned to Tier 2. The Tier 2 projects will have to be further analyzed to determine which projects qualify for the 2050 MTP project list selection.
 - There are 42 Tier 2 projects.
 - Projects mentioned two times, with two checks, were assigned to Tier 3.
 - Projects mentioned 1 time, with one check, were assigned to Tier 4.

After going through the top 10, we realized that a lot of the projects are operational improvements. For the project prioritization, those operational improvements projects will compete against themselves, and the capital projects will compete against themselves. That way an operational project will not compete with a capital project. Once we have selected 50 projects, we will do the prioritization.

Top Tier projects will go through further project prioritization process.

- Highest priority – Cost Band One
- Higher priority – Cost Band Two
- Priority – Cost Band Three

Project Prioritization – 3 tier screening process

- 1st – Needs screening
- 2nd – Sustainability/Resiliency screening
- 3rd - Equity screening

Transit Project Selection and Financial Plan Development

The transit project selection is based on the Transit Asset Management Plan, Master Transit Plan, Transit Development Plan and the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP. After speaking with CAT, we have added the Para and Micro Transit Maintenance Facility to the transit project list that has been identified. CAT will prioritize the projects and we will see how much revenue we will allocate to these projects in Cost Band One, Two, and Three.

Highway Financial Plan Development

The financial plan development process is for the funding balance to allocate the available revenues to the projects that have been identified.

Back in March the TCC was okay with our approach for cost estimating using the cost estimating tool, and we also decided on a 4% annual inflation rate for projects.

Base Year Cost Estimating

- Use project specific cost estimates (if available) for TIP years FY 2025 - 2027
- Use project costs from contributing plans and studies, adjust to 2025, adjust for possible resiliency contingency
- Use project costs from Cost Estimating Tool, adjust to 2025, adjust for possible resiliency contingency

Year of Expenditure (YOE) Inflation Factors

- Annual Growth Rate – **4%**
- Inflation Factors
 - Cost Band One
 - FY 2025 – 2027 – Use **1** (no inflation factor as TIP project costs are already inflated)
 - FY 2028 – 2032 – Use **1.125** (Base Year 2025, Inflation Year 2028)

- Cost Band Two: 2033 – 2041 (9 years; mid-year is 2037) – **1.60**
- Cost Band Three: 2042 – 2050 (9 years; mid-year is 2046) – **2.28**

At the March TCC meeting, we asked the TCC members to provide feedback on the Proposed Policies for Set Asides. We have not received any input so far, so it seems that everybody is okay with the language included. We might want to include some kind of resiliency umbrella policy underneath this. We have proposed set asides for Operational Improvements, Maintenance, Transit, and Non-motorized.

Next Steps

1. Finalize revenue estimates and allocations per committee input
2. Complete Project Selection and Prioritization
3. Develop Cost Estimates
4. Develop Financially Constrained 2050 MTP

Project Prioritization Needs Based - implementing the ‘needs’ scoring criteria. There are about 50 projects to prioritize. This prioritization framework relies on a range of variables chosen to approximate need and generate prioritization scores that can be used to rank projects according to this need. These variables are derived from standardized regional data sources, including:

- Travel Demand Model (TDM)
- CORE MPO 2023 Regional Freight Transportation Plan (RFTP) Update
- Other accepted regional planning sources

The factors we are considering, like Level of Service, Truck Traffic, etc., can be found in the agenda attachments.

Highway Projects Prioritization – Categories (we will have two tables for operational and capital projects respectively)

- Intersection Improvements
- Operational Improvements
- Roadway Capacity Improvements
- New Roadway and/or Extension Projects

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked if anyone has any questions?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated because these are segmented roads, what if we were looking into a corridor project and it fell within two levels of service, how would you make that determination?

Ms. Wang Wykoda stated here is an example - I-16 widening. The original study recommendation is to widen I-16 from 4 to 6 lanes between I-95 and SR 67 in Bulloch County. CORE MPO staff would divide the project into 3 projects. One project is to widen I-16 between I-95 and Pooler Parkway - that project already has a PI number which means it is more advanced for implementation. The second project is to widen I-16 between Pooler Parkway and Bryan/Effingham County line, because that is within our CORE MPO Boundary. The third project to widen I-16 would be from Bryan County to Bulloch County, but that is not within our CORE MPO Boundary, so we will not select it for 2050 MTP consideration. Project One has a LOS F, Project Two has a LOS E, and Project Three will not be considered no matter what LOS.

Resiliency Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization - Ms. Anna McQuarrie, MPC/MPO Staff, stated she will talk about how resiliency is inserted into the various sections Ms. Wykoda Wang has already discussed.

What is resilience? A capability to anticipate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from significant multi-hazard threats with minimum damage to social well-being, the economy, and the environment. -FHWA

Resilience to Natural & Man-Made Threats

- Natural Hazards
 - Increasing temperature and precipitation
 - Sea level rise and storm surge
 - Flooding (coastal, riverine, and sunny day)
- Man-Made Hazards
 - Infrastructure failures
 - Cybersecurity threat
 - Terrorism
 - Active shooters

- Hazardous materials

Related MTP Goals & Objectives

- Goal: Safety & Security
 - Reduce the rate, frequency, and severity of crashes, injuries, and fatalities for all modes and freight and at-grade rail crossings
 - Improve emergency response and incident clearance times
 - Increase the resiliency of infrastructure to risks; helping prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies, including extreme weather and environmental conditions
 - Increase resilience of infrastructure to reduce flooding on roadways
- Goal: System & Environmental Preservation
 - Meet industry, state, and national standards for infrastructure and asset quality, condition, and performance for all public transportation and transit infrastructure
 - Support funding for transportation maintenance
 - Reduce emissions and energy consumption
 - Increase the application of green infrastructure in projects
 - Reduce stormwater impacts of surface transportation
 - Maintain and improve our existing roads, transportation infrastructure, and facilities

How is resilience incorporated in the 2050 MTP?

- Highway Funds – Specific Projects
 - Project Prioritization – Screening for Suitability/Resiliency
 - Impacts to environmental, cultural, and social resources
 - Climate change vulnerability
 - Evacuation routes and redundancy
 - Project Cost Estimating – Resiliency Contingency Pct
- Highway Funds - Policy Statements for category projects
 - Resilience policy set aside discussed at TCC Special Meeting, in which TCC voted to not include in financial plan
 - **PROPOSING TODAY: Umbrella resilience policy to be included in all other category policies (Maintenance, Operational, Transit, Bike/Ped)**
- Transit Funds – Resiliency Integration with Transit Improvements
 - Electric Vehicle Infrastructure
 - ITS

Economic Benefits of Resilience Measures

- Reduction in the cost of repairs
- Reduction in user costs
- Reduction in regional economic losses

Policy Statements: Policy statements are developed for category projects to correspond to project revenue category expenditure set-asides and maintenance expenditures. TCC approved operational improvements, transit, and non-motorized set asides.

Creating the Umbrella Resilience Set Aside Policy:

- Language A statement that will apply to all policy set asides to ensure resilience is considered in each category.
 - “The project considers solutions to address natural and man-made hazards as part of resilience measures that result in minimum damage to social well-being, the economy, and the environment.”
- Examples
 - Operations and Maintenance:
 - Lifecycle of materials: Considers soil erosion, flooding, and temperature
 - Redundancy to avoid supply chain disruption
 - Bike/Ped:
 - Reduces GHGs emissions
 - Green infrastructure to protect bike paths from flooding
 - Transit:
 - Reduces GHGs emissions through EVs and reduction of single-occupant vehicles

Case Study: Florida MPOs:

FDOT Integrating Resiliency into the Transportation Planning Process: Current State of the Practice for Florida MPOs (2022)

- Sarasota/Manatee MPO developed a \$75 million boxed fund to address flooding and protect critical infrastructure. The funding will be available for projects identified in their upcoming resiliency and vulnerability study.
- North Florida TPO put aside funding for a Resilience Program to identify mitigation measures or design changes to improve transportation resiliency.
- Hillsborough TPO developed an investment program for vulnerability reduction (e.g. stormwater and drainage). Approximately \$1.5 billion was allocated towards Vulnerability Reduction for the period of 2026-2045.
- Space Coast MPO 2045 LRTP used three security strategies to ensure the capacity necessary for large scale evacuation was in place in the event of a disaster: 1) Prevention and Protection, 2) Redundancy, 3) Recovery

Need for Discretionary and Dedicated Resiliency Funding: Many participants indicated that a dedicated source of resiliency funds or discretionary funding sources would be hugely beneficial for conducting vulnerability assessments and resiliency corridor studies and developing plans and strategies. This funding may help reduce conflicts with other transportation system needs and dedicated resiliency funding could be used as a “carrot” to incentivize inclusion of resiliency strategies.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated before she moves on, does anyone have questions about the policy set aside? Is this something that the TCC members would like to have us consider including as opposed to being a separate policy set aside?

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked is there a specific amount for the set aside?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we would probably not have a dedicated amount for this set aside. When we do the cost estimating, we might consider 5% or 6% contingency costs.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated how the CORE MPO staff is defining resilience in specific projects seems very open and she assumes it is broad on purpose. She is very curious as to what we will be looking for in the projects that qualify for the resiliency set aside.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated some of that will be clarified once the resiliency chapter is finished. It will have specific sections on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction, Green Infrastructure, Stormwater Improvements, and Biodiversity in Wildlife Corridors. Also information from existing plans and studies in the area will be summarized. That resiliency chapter will identify more specifics and be more well-rounded to give a better picture.

FHWA GHG Rule Update - MPOs not required to submit targets/reports

- Twenty-two States filed two lawsuits challenging FHWA's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions Final Rule.
- Pursuant to negotiations in these cases, FHWA agreed to temporarily not seek to enforce the February 1, 2024, deadline for States to submit initial targets and reports through March 29, 2024.
- On March 27, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas vacated and remanded the Final Rule to DOT, in effect nullifying the rule Nationwide. Consistent with the Court's decision, States and MPOs are not required to submit initial targets and reports at this time.
- FHWA will provide more information at a later date.

Highway Project Prioritization – Resiliency Based

Tier 2 Project Prioritization

1. Vulnerability Score: Utilizing the FHWA Vulnerability Assessment Scoring Tool (VAST) for composite score
 - Considers exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity •
 - Assessment team determining inputs
2. Evacuation Route: Yes/No
 - Example:
 - i. I-95 Auxiliary Lanes: No
 - ii. I-95 at SR 204/Gateway Interchange: Yes

3. Road Redundancy: Alternative routes available
 - Example
 - i. I-95 Auxiliary Lanes: Yes (Highway 17)
 - ii. I-95 at SR 204/Gateway Interchange: n/a

Example: Vulnerability (VAST)- Exposure – can be found attached to the agenda. This is just looking at the exposure to climate stressors. We are considering temperature, precipitation, sea level rise, storm surge, and wind. The indicators describe the impacts of those, like change in total number of days above 95 degrees, change in annual maximum temperature 5 day average, location in a FEMA 100 year flood zone, etc. We can put in different projects and record the information, then weight the scores within each category. This will add up to a composite score, then combined with the sensitivity and adaptive capacity indicators.

Equity Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization - Ms. Asia Hernton, MPO Staff, stated she will talk about Equity and the 2050 MTP.

What is Equity?

- **Executive Order 13985 Definition**
 - Equity is the **consistent and systematic fair, just, and impartial treatment of all individuals**, including individuals who belong to underserved communities that have been denied such treatment.
 - Equitable Development refers to a positive development approach that employs processes, policies, and programs that **aim to meet the needs of all communities and community members**, with a particular focus on underserved communities and populations.
- **USDOT Definition**
 - Equity in transportation seeks fairness in mobility and accessibility to meet the needs of all community members.
 - An equitable transportation plan considers the circumstances impacting a community's mobility and connectivity needs, and this information is used to determine the measures needed to develop an equitable transportation network. To attain an equitable transportation network, all components of Title VI, environmental justice (EJ), and Nondiscrimination must be considered.

Equity is distinct from equality in that it heavily considers historical, societal, and individual context in decision-making.

Why Include Equity in Transportation?

- We have a duty to create a transportation system that is helpful and accessible to all travelers and residents.
- Increasing roadway size and speeds may make traffic flow faster and increase capacity but this may also decrease safety and accessibility for other people, especially those who do not own cars. Equity measures can prioritize the projects that do not create these problems.
- We want our transportation system to be accessible, useful, and convenient for all people.
- Past transportation choices led to a system that separated communities rather than providing connection and mobility - We can create a system that connects us rather than divides us; a system that provides rather than detracts.

A transportation system is only equitable if it is safe, useful, and offers connection for all people. It's not impossible. A great example is Hoboken, NJ. CORE MPO staff also want to acknowledge the City of Savannah's study of the I-16 exit ramp removal that will help reunite the community. We are getting the ball rolling on equity with planning and funding.

How is Equity being Incorporated into the 2050 MTP?

- Goals and Objectives
 - Safety and Security
 - Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity
- Needs Assessment
 - Non-Motorized Transportation Plan
 - Public Involvement (survey, etc.)
- Project Selection and Prioritization •
 - Equity Measures for 2050 MTP Highway Projects - **Prioritizing projects that improve equity*****
 - Equity Measures for Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

- Investments – 2050 MTP Fiscally Constrained Plan
 - Devoting highway funds to support transit development - transit set aside
 - Devoting more highway funds for bike, pedestrian, and trail projects – bike/ped set aside based on higher mode share
 - Transit investments to create transit/bike/ped connections (bus stop improvements, etc.)

Highway Project Prioritization and Equity

- This scoring framework prioritizes:
 - Projects with bike and pedestrian access
 - Projects that improve connectivity by connecting to vital resources
 - Projects that improve safety by including protective features that are known to reduce traffic accidents
- The basic idea is to promote projects that are helpful for all types of travel, whether it be by car, bike, or foot. We wanted to acknowledge and develop the multiple ways a person may travel.
- We also based our decision on what data was available and easy to score in a short time frame.

Scoring Criteria

Transit Connection and Accessibility:

Does the project include bike and pedestrian improvements?

- Yes > Move to next transit question
- No > Move to Connection and Accessibility to Critical Infrastructure

If yes, is the project:

- Within 0.25 miles of a transit stop or route > 5 points
- Within 0.5 miles of a transit stop or a transit route > 3 points
- Within 1 mile of a transit stop or a transit route > 1 point
- Over 1 mile from a transit stop or a transit route > 0 points

Justification

- Data is easily available
- Many people who use transit do not own a car. Projects with bike and pedestrian improvements and close proximity to transit will increase transportation accessibility for the general public, but especially for those who do not have personal vehicle access

Bike/Ped Connection and Accessibility

Does the project include bike/ped improvements?

- Yes > 5 points
- No > 0 points

If yes, is the project:

- Within 0.25 miles of existing bike/ped infrastructure > 10 points
- Within 0.5 miles of existing bike/ped infrastructure > 5 points
- Over half a mile (0.5) away from existing bike/ped infrastructure > 0 points

If yes, is the project:

- Within 0.25 miles of planned bike/ped infrastructure > 5 points
- Within 0.5 miles of planned bike/ped infrastructure > 3 points
- Over half a mile (0.5) away from planned bike/ped infrastructure > 0 points

If yes, does the project:

- Majorly intersect with highest zero-car household tracts
 - (Census tracts in which 50% or more households are a Zero-Car Household) > 5 points
- Majorly intersect with somewhat high zero-car household tracts
 - (Census tracts in which 30% to 49% or more households are a Zero-Car Household) > 3 points
- Not intersect with highest or somewhat high zero-car household tracts
 - (Census tracts in which under 30% of households are a Zero-Car Household) > 1 point

Justification

- Data is easily available
- Projects with bike and pedestrian improvements will increase transportation accessibility for the general public, but especially those who do not have personal vehicle access

Connection and Accessibility to Critical Facilities

Is the project:

- Within 0.25 miles of a hospital > 5 points
- Within 0.5 miles of a hospital > 3 points
- Within 1 mile of a hospital > 1 point
- Over 1 mile from a hospital > 0 points

Is the project:

- Within 0.25 miles of a grocery store > 5 points
- Within 0.5 miles of a grocery store > 3 points
- Within 1 mile of a grocery store > 1 point
- Over 1 mile from a grocery store > 0 points

Is the project:

- Within 0.25 miles of a library > 5 points
- Within 0.5 miles of a library > 3 points
- Within 1 mile of a library > 1 point
- Over 1 mile from a library > 0 points

Is the project:

- Within 0.25 miles of a school > 5 points
- Within 0.5 miles of a school > 3 points
- Within 1 mile of a school > 1 point
- Over 1 mile from a school > 0 points

Justification

- Data is easily available
- These facilities provide services for wellness or provide benefits to the community

Other Thoughts

- Adding road connections alone may not improve equity. Roadway expansion, especially if that expansion leads to higher speeds and traffic volumes, may make critical facilities LESS accessible.

Title VI/Environmental Justice Consideration

Does the project have bike and pedestrian improvements?

- Yes > Move to Next Title VI/EJ Question
- No > Skip
- Majorly intersect with Census tracts that have a 200% Poverty Line score of 54 or higher > 5 points
- Majorly intersect with Census tracts that have a 200% Poverty Line score between 27 and 53 > 3 points
- Majorly intersect with Census tracts that have a 200% Poverty Line score of 26 or lower > 1 point

Justification

- Data is easily available
- Providing roadway connections in areas experiencing poverty could improve accessibility to other areas.
- Adding road connection alone may not improve equity. Roadway expansion, especially if that expansion leads to higher speeds and traffic volumes, may make critical facilities LESS accessible.
- People in poverty may experience more transportation cost burden. Widening or adding roadways, especially if they decrease walkability and bike-ability, may contribute to that.

Safety

Does the project include a median?

- Yes > 5
- No > 0

Justification

- Data is easily available
- Research shows that medians with marked crosswalks reduce pedestrian crashes by 46%
- Additionally, pedestrian refuge islands reduced pedestrian crashes by 56%

Important note: Interstate projects do not improve access, connectivity, and safety for all people. Additionally, interstate projects often divide communities and negatively impact surrounding traffic conditions, especially for vulnerable road users. Thus, interstate projects will receive an equity score of ZERO within this framework.

What does the scoring process look like? – Example shown on slide presentation attached to agenda.

- This is a map of schools within the CORE MPO area and the projects that have been added to the 2050 MTP.
- Each school has a 0.25-mile, 0.5-mile, and 1-mile buffer surrounding it.
- This data will help us identify which projects intersect with these buffers.
- Once identified, each project will be given a score that corresponds to each buffer.

Additional Methods to Incorporate Equity in the Planning Process

Identify places in addition to prioritizing projects; Bake in equity from the beginning

- With new and robust data sources, equity can be incorporated at the beginning of a project suggestion rather than assessed after a project has been proposed.
- While assessing the equity of a given project is helpful, what is more powerful is identifying areas experiencing great inequities, and creating projects that address those specific inequities.
- Understand the context and history of a place from the beginning and suggest projects that do not further contribute to the problems of an area.
- CORE MPO can be that educational arm to assist in equity planning

Equity Data Sources

- Justice40
- USDOT ETC Explorer
- Census and American Community Survey
- Coastal Georgia Indicators Coalition
- FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures
- AARP Livable Communities

Ms. Wykoda Wang showed the map of the projects the CORE MPO Staff is going to evaluate based on needs, resiliency and equity. Once staff has completed the scoring, we will have a special-called TCC meeting in May to go over them.

[7. Congestion Management Process Update](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she received the latest draft from Ms. Genesis Harrod yesterday and will give a quick overview. Ms. Genesis Harrod was updating the CMP with new data sources. We will show the finding locations, mitigations, and resolutions.

Data sources used:

1. Georgia Crash Data
2. Bureau of Transportation Statistics
3. Census Bureau
4. GDOT
5. NPMRDS
6. Travel Demand Model

We received more model output data from GDOT. At the last TCC meeting, GDOT gave a presentation on the Travel Demand Model and showed the Base Year Model as well as the 2050 Do-nothing Model. Now GDOT has completed two more model runs. The Existing + Committed Projects Model includes existing projects, or projects already in construction, or projects that have construction programmed. The STIP Model includes Existing projects + Committed projects + projects with PE and ROW in TIP. The model runs show the roadway Level of Service, which is the basis for the Congestion Management Process to identify congestion locations. The CORE MPO has designated LOS D or greater as acceptable for the CORE MPO MPA region. Any level of service less than 'D' (LOS 'E' or 'F') needs congestion mitigation.

Most Congested Locations – Freeways and other Major Arterials are most prevalent on the list of most congested corridors in the CORE MPO MPA. Highlights are US 17, SR 307, Pooler Parkway, Victory Drive, etc. The full list can be found on the slide show attached to the agenda.

CORE MPO Staff will have to double check the projects, as some congested locations already have projects identified to address the issues.

The CMP identified some Congestion Management Strategies (demand management, alternative mode promotion, traffic operations, land use, etc.) for different facility types – freeways and non-freeways. The majority of these suggestions have yet to be utilized and could provide amelioration, given area studies as to their application. For example, HOV Lanes and Variable Speed Limits are proposed congestion mitigation strategies for freeways. The full list of CMP strategies can be found on the slide show attached to the agenda. Regarding each of those identified congestion locations, we will have to see what specific measures will be applicable from the criteria that we select.

The findings are included in the Congestion Management Process Report attached to the agenda. We are asking TCC members to please take a look at the report and send us comments.

[8. Non-Motorized Transportation Plan Status Report](#)

Ms. Asia Hernton gave the presentation for the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.

About the Plan:

- What is the Plan
 - The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan is a document that addresses the development of bike and pedestrian infrastructure in the CORE MPO planning area.
- What is the Goal
 - The goal of this plan update is to identify new projects, assess the needs of the community, and set new goals for bike and pedestrian infrastructure.
- What is the Timeline
 - We are aiming to adopt the plan in June 2024.

Main Updates

- Staff hosted a steering committee meeting on April 10th to discuss equity within the 2050 MTP and the scoring methodology of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP).
- The final document is being drafted to include the data, research, and input we received on this plan.
- Cost estimations have been updated for the projects in the 2014 version of the NMTP.
- The NMTP scoring methodology has been developed.

About the Scoring Methodology

- What is the Source
 - The data being used to score the projects is from multiple sources, but mainly the US Department of Transportation Equitable Transportation Community Explorer (USDOT ETC).
 - Data from SAGIS and crash data from Numetric will also be used.
- What Data is being used
 - This USDOT ETC dataset has helpful geographic information, letting us know the census tracts that experience high levels of transportation cost burden, poverty, high-volume road proximity, and much more.
 - Community data such as the location of schools and grocery stores from SAGIS and crash point data from Numetric show areas in need of bike and pedestrian infrastructure updates.
- How will the Data be used
 - The plan is to overlay bike and pedestrian projects over this geographic data to determine if the projects serve the needs of a given area.

Example Map (drive time to points of interest in minutes, map can be found on the slide show attached to agenda)

- This is a map of drive time data. The shorter the drive time, the darker the color will be.
- The white lines are the new bike and pedestrian projects.
- Using this data, we can prioritize projects that intersect with tracts that have a shorter drive time to points of interest (the darker purple tracts).

Example Scoring Matrix can be found on the slide show attached to agenda. Categories are Safety, Equity, Efficiency, and bonus points.

Updated Cost Estimation Methodology

- Cost Estimates for the Non-motorized Transportation Plan were derived from the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) 2016 Cost Estimate Excel Tool.
- The tool was used to provide updated cost estimates for projects to compare to cost estimates comprised at the origination of the project, which were created circa 2014.

- The new cost estimates rely on an inflation rate of **2%** and have a default construction year of **2026**, as depicted in the snapshot of the main cost estimate input page. All projects were researched in Google Maps.
- Any projects that could not have their costs estimated via the ARC Tool were grown linearly using a **2%** growth rate.
- The county is by default Fulton County given the ARC Tool only has the metropolitan Atlanta counties as options in the dropdown menu for selection.
- All areas were set as urban. No right of way was used in any project calculations. Total costs include preliminary engineering, construction, and contingency.

Mr. Steve Candler, Director of Development Services in Effingham County, asked if subdivision sidewalk networks that are connected can be included.

Ms. Asia Hernton responded she believes that bike projects, sidewalk projects, and any type of connectivity projects that is bike or pedestrian connectivity project would probably fit into the Non-motorized Transportation Plan. It specifically prioritizes projects that create connections to places, and not just a trail in the middle of the forest.

Ms. Calia Brown, Bike Walk Savannah, believes the current priority is to fill out the regional prioritized network and then build the ribs off of the spine. If the sidewalk networks are connecting those subdivisions to a job center or future bus stop or a grocery store, it would be given higher priority.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Truman Linear Trail Project has more than doubled in cost estimate, so should we assume 4% instead of 2% for the cost estimating?

Ms. Calia Brown asked what percent is used in the MTP?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated in the 2050 MTP we are using 4% annual growth rate for the cost increase.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated if we decided on 4% for the 2050 MTP, it would be good to be consistent and go with the 4%. She is also concerned the cost estimates do not include ROW. For a lot of the bike/pedestrian projects, ROW will be a big cost, especially with concern to network connectivity, which would be along existing roadways. She understands the tool didn't address that well, but she would like to consider ROW cost.

Ms. Calia Brown asked if it could be a percentage set aside for ROW? That could be included if the project needs it. Some the projects are on existing ROW or it would be more cost effective to purchase a field instead of a lawn.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated to check on the funding sources if we are looking for federal dollars and asking for ROW.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will boost up the costs. For the 2050 MTP consideration we will focus on the regional bike/ped projects and the cost estimating for those projects first.

[9. MPO Boundary Follow Up and Bylaws Updates](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated at the February 2024 CORE MPO Board meeting, the board members asked whether the CORE MPO Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary can be revised between censuses. The response from FHWA is Yes (see the attached documentation). Even if this is the case, staff thinks the update will entail a lot of additional work for the MPO. Besides updating the boundary, MOU and bylaws, we have to update/amend all of our planning documents – MTP, TIP, UPWP, Participation Plan, Title VI Plan, etc. Thus, staff strongly suggests that we should try to avoid updating the MPA boundary between censuses.

Staff will also work with the committees on the Bylaws update. The boundary portion has been updated in the Bylaws. Also for the CORE MPO Board, we added in the election portion, who will be eligible, etc.

For the TCC portion there have not been that many changes. The proposed updates are listed below.

- MPC will have one voting member.
 - Executive Director will be the only voting member.
 - Director of Transportation Administration will be removed as he/she is more of a staff member.
- Moved Vernonburg to an advisory role.
- Added in Staff Representative for Bryan County.
- Added in Staff Representative for Municipality within Effingham County
 - Rotating between Rincon, Springfield, and Guyton
- Moved Coastal Regional Commission to an advisory role.
- No business may be conducted by TCC unless a quorum of the membership is present, has been changed to **No Action Item** may be conducted.
- Quorum requirement has been updated to 1/3 of all members +1.

Please review the TCC Bylaws with proposed updates and send in any questions and comments. We will have a special called meeting to go over all updates.

[10. Roadway Functional Classification Update](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated last time the City of Savannah spoke about up-classifying Benton Boulevard. We asked GDOT what needs to be done, and GDOT provided the form which is attached to this agenda. We asked about the timeline. Previously after adopting the Adjusted Urban Area boundary, the next step is to update the functional classification. GDOT sends us the forms to fill out for the FC update. It seems that GDOT has changed the process. Staff has received the following GDOT response - "To the best of my knowledge, there is no particular timeline or special UAB-related review, and governments and MPOs are free to make FC requests at any time. I am waiting on confirmation on this and will let you know if I hear anything different."

So far, CORE MPO staff has not received any formal FC update requests from our member agencies. We will continue to work with our members to make the FC updates as needed. Since there are no deadlines, CORE MPO Staff will focus on the 2050 MTP. Once it is adopted, we will have more staff capacity for the FC updates. The only thing that might impact the 2050 MTP is in Bryan County, as priority projects like Harris Trail are located on local roadways and wouldn't be eligible for the 2050 MTP. That might be the only impact. For now, the plan is to focus on the FC update after August as the 2050 MTP takes precedence.

V. Information Reports (verbal)

[11. GDOT Project Status Update Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

[12. Chatham County Project Status Update Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

Ms. Wykoda Wang has a question about I-16 at Jimmy Deloach Parkway Interchange. She received a notice from GDOT that the HIP funds are lapsing on September 30th, 2024, so we need to authorize the funds now. Is Chatham County ready to receive the funds? We believe Chatham County has the ROW phase programmed with HIP funds for this project.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated she submitted the I-16 at Jimmy Deloach Parkway request when she submitted the Garrard Avenue request. She thought we needed to move the ROW for I-16 at Jimmy Deloach and was told they were already moved. We might need to look into that.

Ms. Wykoda Wang clarified this is the HIP funds.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated that she did try to ask about it when she submitted the request. We can talk more about it, as there is a ROW for this year and she is not sure if they will hit the deadline, because they have to do the value engineering study.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the ROW is not going to make it. We are trying to coordinate with GDOT on how to reallocate the lapsing HIP funds which is about \$308,000. Another project with HIP funds programmed is Lazaretto Creek bridge replacement. It will not make it either, so we are trying to identify projects to reallocate the funds. A heads up that Chatham County might lose HIP funds on the I-16 at Jimmy Deloach Parkway project.

[13. City of Savannah Project Status Update Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

[14. Savannah Hilton Head International Airport Project Status Update Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we did include the I-95 at Airways Avenue project in the 2045 MTP. We did have a scoping phase in our TIP, the funds were authorized, and GDOT took over that project. She believes that the project will be carried over 2050 MTP. Where are we now?

Mr. Heath Maines stated he does not have an update at the moment. They are looking into their master plan update and that will be included.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if the Savannah Airport Commission is going to donate ROW for that project. We need to know when we do the cost estimating.

Mr. Heath Maines stated he will follow up, as he is unsure at the moment.

[15. Chatham Area Transit Project Status Update Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

[16. LATS-SCDOT Project Status Update Report](#)

No April Meeting. No report at this time.

[17. TIP Funding Tracking Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

VI. Other Public Comments (limit to 3 minutes)

VII. Notices

[18. GAMPO Presentations](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Ms. Anna McQuarrie did an excellent job presenting at the GAMPO conference. Ms. Anna McQuarrie will follow up on the Federal Land Access Program (FLAP). One of the MPO gave a presentation about applying for the Federal Land Road Maintenance funds. Normally FTA and FHWA funds go through the MPO process, but we don't receive funds for Federal Land Program. This other MPO was applying for Federal Land funds which can be supplemental to LMIG funds. The good thing about these funds is the competition is low. We have to identify which roadways in our region have access to Federal Land, for example Fort Pulaski.

[19. Grant Opportunities](#)

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated the Supplemental LMIG Funds with 0% match are expiring soon, due date June 15th.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated EPA grant is another funding source. She has added in the EPA grant information for the EV charging stations at the Ports. The Georgia Ports Authority and GDOT are eligible.

[20. Next CORE MPO TCC Meeting June 20th, 2024, at 2:00pm](#)

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the April 18th, 2024, TCC meeting was adjourned.

The Chatham County- Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party