



CORE MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Minutes
June 20, 2024, at 2:00 pm

June 20, 2024, CORE MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Voting Members	Representing	Present
Charles Ackridge	City of Bloomingdale	
Nathan Clark	City of Richmond Hill	X
Deanna Brooks	Chatham County Engineering	X
Caila Brown	Bike Walk Savannah	X
Matt Saxon	City of Pooler	
Kaniz Sathi	GDOT – Planning	X
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	X
Don Masisack	Coastal Regional Commission	
Peter Gulbronson	City of Tybee Island	
Mary Moskowitz	Chatham Area Transit	X
Melanie Wilson	MPC Executive Director	X(online)
Jamie McCurry	Georgia Ports Authority	
Wykoda Wang	CORE MPO	X
Michele Strickland	City of Savannah	X
Tim Callanan	Effingham County	X
Robert Milie	Town of Thunderbolt	
Vacant	Town of Vernonburg	
Voting Alternate	Representing	
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
Roger Beall	MPC IT	X
Chris Marsengill	Kimley-Horn	X(online)

Rhodes Hunt	Kimley-Horn	X(online)
Edward Hicks	GDOT	X(online)
Kiarra Fields	City of Savannah	X(online)
Joseph Longo	FHWA	X(online)
Eric Van Otteren	Bryan County	X(online)
Paul Teague	Bryan County	X(online)
Ashely Goodrich	Thunderbolt	X
Allen Blake	Chatham County Engineering	X
Avery Young	MPC	X(online)

I. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Nathan Clark motioned to approve the June 20th, 2024, TCC meeting agenda; seconded by Ms. Calia Brown. The motion passed with none opposed.

II. Action Items

1. [Approval of the April 18th, 2024, CORE MPO TCC Meeting Minutes](#)

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

2. [Approval of the May 15th, 2024, CORE MPO TCC Special Called Meeting Minutes](#)

Mr. Omar Senati-Martinez motioned to approve the May 15th, 2024, TCC Special Called meeting minutes; seconded by Ms. Calia Brown. The motion passed with none opposed.

3. [FY 2024 - FY 2027 TIP Amendments June 2024](#)

Ms. Asia Hernton presented the proposed TIP amendments.

PI#	Description	Amendment
0017972	FHWA FBP for Dock Rehab	Add ferry dock rehab funding in FY 2025.
N/A	FHWA FBP for Ferry Replacement	Add ferry replacement funding in FY 2025.
N/A	Section 5307 Preventative Maintenance	Increase the cost estimate for funding under Preventative Maintenance for both the federal cost and local cost in FY 2025.
N/A	Section 5307 Operating Assistance	Increase the cost estimate for the local cost for Operating Assistance in FY 2025.
0015705	SR 404 SPUR/US 17 From Savannah River to Back River	Add ROW phase to FY 2025 with Y800 funds; and move CST phase from FY 2025 to FY 2026.
0017415	SR 26/US 80 @ Lazaretto Creek	Move CST phase from FY 2025 to FY 2028; and move ROW phase from FY 2024 to FY 2026 with cost increase.

We had questions on locating project ID numbers for some projects. One project in particular was the ferry boat replacement, where we couldn't locate the project ID number, but believe it needs a project ID.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz, CAT, stated since these ferries are programmed with FHWA funds, they need a PI number associated with them.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated we have a PI number for the ferry boat maintenance, but not for replacement. She is not able to locate the PI number, but she might be mistaken in where she is looking. Would anyone know more

about finding the PI number, or how PI numbers are assigned to projects? We will keep working on that and try to find that PI number.

The updated tables and funding as well as project pages are attached to this agenda. We have checked and confirmed that the projects are consistent with the 2045 MTP. The correspondence for TIP amendment requests is also attached to this agenda. We checked the status of the projects programmed in FY 2024 to ensure the programmed funds are all authorized or moved so they would not lapse. It seems that all of them are either authorized or got moved to another year. We couldn't find the status of a couple of them, for example the Ivey and Linwood sidewalks project but found out that project was cancelled. Also for the Green Island Road Trail project, the GDOT TPRO document was outdated.

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked what does that mean?

Ms. Asia Hernton stated she believes the GDOT information in the TPRO database was outdated, but the MPO's TIP page is correct. There was an amendment for this project. We will update that in the subrecipient report.

Ms. Kaniz Sathi, GDOT, stated that the GDOT Project Manager is working with engineering services to update the information in TPRO, so that the funding will be authorized in the time frame of June 2024.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated she has questions about the ferry maintenance and ferry replacement projects. Are those two totally new projects, or are they existing projects?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated they are existing projects. For the ferry maintenance, we just had additional funds added to it. The ferry replacement has multiple funding sources, so that is why we needed the update. It was an existing project in the TIP, but a new funding source had been added.

Mr. Tim Callanan motioned to endorse the FY 2024 - FY 2027 TIP Amendments; seconded by Ms. Michele Strickland. The motion passed with none opposed.

4. Approval of the DRAFT Financially Constrained 2050 MTP Project List

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we had the special called meeting in May and at that time we developed the scoring. We asked TCC members to provide feedback about the scoring but didn't receive any feedback, so it seems like everybody is OK with the project rankings. The second page of the project prioritization file shows the final scores. We decided to go with this ranking to populate our 2050 MTP. The financial plan development process is documented in the financial plan section and the appendix. The appendix has more information including the TIP amendments Ms. Asia Hernton just presented, and this includes how we derived the final revenues.

We updated all of the revenues because of the changes with the TIP amendments. Also the two projects with grant funds for the Georgia Ports Authority are not finalized yet. Ms. Wang contacted FHWA and found out that the award funds are only the federal portion. The GPA needs to provide a 20% required match and over match, so the total project cost might be \$30 million. We need to contact GPA for the additional local match but have not been able to do that yet. Whatever is included in this draft plan is 80% federal and 20% local for this project. However, it does not impact other projects.

We allocated the revenues into categories as shown in the table attached to the agenda.

- Operational Improvements Set Aside assumes 12% of total available Project revenues for 2028 - 2032. Lump Sum amounts from TIP are for FY 2025 - 2027.
- Transit Set Aside assumes \$1,300,000 each year for bus purchase and/or transit improvements.
- Non-Motorized Set Aside assumes 3% of Project revenue each year for bike/ped projects for 2028 - 2050. Specific amounts for bike/ped projects from TIP are for FY 2025 - 2027.
- Available revenues for specific highway projects are total Project revenue minus set asides.

Focusing on Specific Highway Projects, some projects come with their own revenue, so we need to identify these projects to be added in. For revenue projection, we used annual inflation rate of 2%; for cost estimating, we used annual inflation rate of 4%.

The projects in the 2045 MTP that are completed, under construction, or have construction funds authorized are not included in the 2050 MTP, including the following.

- PI# 0012757, I-16 FROM I-95 TO I-516

- PI# 0012758, I-95/I-16 Interchange Reconstruction
- PI# 0013741, SR 25/US 17 @ SAVANNAH RIVER IN PORT WENTWORTH
- PI# 0013742, SR 25/US 17 @ MIDDLE RIVER IN PORT WENTWORTH
- PI# 0015306, TRUMAN LINEAR PARK TRAIL – PHASE II-B
- PI# 0010028, CS 1097/DELESSEPS/LA ROCHE AVE FM WATERS AVE TO SKIDAWAY RD
- PI# 0013727, I-16 @ SR 307
- PI# 0006700, EFFINGHAM PKWY FM CR 156/BLUE JAY/EFFINGHAM TO SR 30/CHATHAM
- PI# 0006328, BRAMPTON ROAD CONNECTOR FM FOUNDATION DR TO SR 21/SR25/US80
- PI# 521855, SR 26 FROM I-516 TO CS 188/VICTORY DRIVE
- PI# 0010560, SR 26/US 80 @ Bull River and @ Lazaretto Creek (PE phase for the umbrella project, not including the two bridge replacement projects split from it)

The remaining projects in the 2045 MTP that are in the pipeline for implementation will be carried forward to the financially constrained 2050 MTP as shown below. Some of these projects overlap with the current FY 2024 – 2027 TIP.

- PI# 0008358, I-516 @ CS / 1503 / DeRenne Avenue (DeRenne Blvd Option)
- PI# 0008359, EAST DERENNE FROM SR 204 TO HARRY S TRUMAN PKWY (East DeRenne Avenue Improvements)
- PI# 0010236, SR 21 FROM CS 346/MILDRED STREET TO SR 204 (West DeRenne Avenue Improvements)
- PI# 0015704, SR 404 SPUR/US 17 @ BACK RIVER
- PI# 0015705, SR 404 SPUR/US 17 FM NE OF SAVANNAH HARBOR PKWY TO BACK RIVER
- PI# 0017183, SR 404 SPUR/US 17 @ SAVANNAH RIVER CROSSING (ROW phase only)
- PI# 0017411, I-95 FM FLORIDA STATE LINE TO S CAROLINA STATE LINE-ITS EXP
- PI# 0017414, SR 26/US 80 @ BULL RIVER
- PI# 0017415, SR 26/US 80 @ LAZARETTO CREEK
- PI# 0017515, I-16 @ SR 17 (I-16 Interchange at Little Neck Road)
- PI# 0018402, I-95 at Airways Avenue

The projects from Bryan County and Effingham County within the CORE MPO MPA boundary that are programmed in the FY 2024 – 2027 STIP will be included in the 2050 MTP. Bryan County does not have any projects located inside the CORE MPO MPA boundary, but Effingham County has 3 as shown below.

- PI# 0018234, STILLWELL ROAD @ EBENEZER CREEK
- PI# 0019186, CR 307/LONG BRIDGE RD @ EBENEZER CREEK 4 MI E OF SPRINGFIELD
- PI# 511250, I-95 @ SAVANNAH RIVER @ SOUTH CAROLINA LINE

The projects that received grant funding that will go through the FHWA award process will be included in the 2050 MTP as shown below.

- PI# 0011744, I-16 Exit Ramp Removal - Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Program grant award, for PE phase only. The federal award is \$1,800,000; the local match is \$450,000; and the total is \$2,250,000. The City of Savannah will use the grant funds to do the following - Equitable Redevelopment Plan, Concept Design, Environmental Studies, and Community Outreach Program.
- Voltera Electrification of American Ports (VEAP) - Reduction of Truck Emissions at Port Facilities Grant Program project award. Voltera Power, a zero-emissions refueling infrastructure provider, will receive \$7.8 million to build a large-scale charging project near the Port of Savannah. The required 20% local match is \$1,950,000. The total is \$9,750,000. The project will reduce emissions from port-related traffic by providing parking and charging services for medium- and heavy-duty electric vehicle (EV) fleets.
- Port of Savannah Renewable Fuel Project - Reduction of Truck Emissions at Port Facilities Grant Program project award. The Georgia Ports Authority will receive \$7.5 million to conduct a four-year pilot program at the Port of Savannah that will expand the use of low-emission and zero-emission equipment to carry out daily port activities and reduce port-related emissions from idling trucks. The project will replace petroleum diesel fuel used by 621 trucks with renewable, low-emission diesel fuel. The required 20% local match is \$1,875,000. The total is \$9,375,000.
- PI# 0020351, I-16 FROM W GWINNETT STREET TO CHATHAM PKWY – NEVI Charging Station. The Georgia Department of Transportation will use the NEVI funds (\$1,000,000 federal, \$250,000 other, \$1,250,000 total) to deploy charging stations on this segment of the highway.

For the long-rang projects, there is a big matrix that is developed from the Travel Demand Model, Coastal Empire Study, Freight Plan, Congestion Management Process, etc. to help project selection. From that big matrix we compiled about 180 projects. Then we decided to select the top 30 projects for prioritization, which

Ms. Wykoda Wang shared with the TCC on May 15th at the special-called meeting. For those long range projects to be included in the 2050 MTP fiscally constrained highway plan, she will plug in the project based on the priority ranking. For example, SR 21 Widening between SR 30 and McCall Road ranked 1st in the prioritization process, and the 2nd ranking project is SR 21 Widening between McCall Road to 9th St in Rincon. When she plugs in the numbers (cost estimates) for the 2050 MTP, she follows the order on the project prioritization list. Once she plugs in the numbers for the SR 21 Widening between SR 30 and McCall Road, if we still have a revenue balance in the cost band, then she moves on to the next project. That is how she did the financial plan development.

For the cost estimates, Ms. Wang referenced several plans and studies. The original project SR 21 Widening from SR 30 to 9th Street in Rincon came from the Coastal Empire Study and had a cost of about \$68 million. We are dividing the project into two segments. We assume the cost will be by percentage. For example, the segment from SR 30 to McCall Road might be 50% of the cost, so we will use \$34 million as the base cost for this segment. Ms. Genesis Harrod also used a cost estimating tool to do the project cost estimate, but it does not include ROW costs. For the first project, the estimated cost from the tool is \$19 million, which Ms. Wang does not believe will be enough. In those situations, she checks several different resources and picks the higher estimate. If the estimate is coming from the Coastal Empire Study with \$68 million, we can divide it up into different segments. We will not use the \$19 million estimate because that one doesn't include the ROW costs. That is the reasoning for how we do the cost estimating. All of this is documented in the project list sent to the TCC.

Ms. Wykoda Wang feels comfortable with the Cost Band One projects because any project with a PI# that has a construction or ROW phase in the TIP, we will use the TIP cost estimates. For the projects that don't have construction phase in the TIP, we contact project sponsors to get the most up-to-date cost estimates. For example, Project DeRenne is divided into 3 segments, and we contacted the GDOT Project Manager for the cost information. The costs for Project DeRenne's 3 segments, PI# 0008358, PI# 0010236 and PI #008359, are provided by the GDOT Project Manager. We will use these GDOT provided numbers in the 2050 MTP.

For the I-95 @ Airways Avenue project, we need information from the Airport Commission. When we included the project into the 2045 MTP, we assumed \$30 million in Cost Band One, which we have adjusted to \$36 million for 2050 MTP Cost Band One. The eventual cost depends on the final concept. Right now, the project is in the scoping phase and we are unsure of which concept we will choose from. For now, we adjusted the original \$30 million from the 2045 MTP to the \$36 million. For the 2045 MTP we were using a 3.5% annual inflation rate, but for the 2050 MTP we are using a 4% annual inflation rate. We inflated the project into 2028. For Cost Band One projects in the TIP years, there is no inflation for the cost estimates, but for later years 2028-2032 we will inflate the cost estimate into 2028. We need to check with the Airport Commission on the final concept and costs.

We also have the I-16 Exit Ramp removal project, the two GPA projects, and the NEVI project, which Ms. Wykoda Wang feels comfortable with their cost estimates.

As mentioned previously, Ms. Wykoda Wang followed the project ranking order to develop the financial plan. We will exhaust the balance in Cost Band One and then move on to allocating funds in Cost Band Two, and so on. The right column in the attached spreadsheet documents where the base costs come from.

In Cost Band Two we use 2025 as the base year and 1.6as the inflation factor, adjusting the cost estimates to Year 2037. In Cost Band Three we use 2025 as the base year and 2.8as the inflation factor, adjusting the cost estimates to Year 2046.

The other long-term projects include SR 204/Fort Argyle Rd Widening, US 80 Widening in Effingham County, Gulfstream Widening, 3 segments for the I-516 Widening, I-95 Widening (Auxiliary Lane), SR 307 Grade Rail Separation and Operational Improvements, I-95 Interchange Reconstruction. etc. The Gulfstream Road Widening project was not ranked very high in the 2045 MTP, but because we are using resiliency and equity for the 2050 MTP, this project is now ranked high.

This is the preliminary project list which was sent to the TCC on Monday. We received a response from Ms. Michelle Strickland asking why President St was not on the list. We have indicated this is just a preliminary list which is purely based on the prioritization results and does not include other considerations such as local support. For example, if I-95 Widening is not needed now, and GDOT does not want to pursue it or Chatham County does not want to support it, then we can remove that project. If Chatham County wants to proceed with President St and there is a local match and local support, then it will be a priority.

During the prioritization we have our needs screening, sustainability /resiliency screening, and equity screening, and we do have other considerations like local priority. So local priority is definitely a consideration for final project selection in the 2050 MTP. Other considerations are if the project is consistent with the 2045 MTP, alternative funding sources available, financial feasibility, and project phase or status. For example, I-95 at Airways Avenue was not ranked very high, but it was already in the pipeline and has started the PE phase.

This is just to present a preliminary project list, so we can adjust this. We will not touch any projects above the SR 21 Widening project as they are already in the pipeline or already have funding allocated. The list below has projects that are pretty consistent with the 2045 MTP. If anyone sees any projects that shouldn't be here, we can make an adjustment. Then when we present to the CORE MPO Board next week we will have a revised list. We will ask the CORE MPO Board to adopt the revised draft project list so that we can start the 30-day public comment period, during which time our members such as Pooler might have some projects they want to add in and we can trade. The thing is, we need to have local support. If we don't have local support or GDOT does not want to start a project, it will never get built. There should be additional considerations. If the TCC members see which projects make sense or don't make sense, please let us know which ones to add or remove.

Mr. Heath Maines, the Savannah Airport Commission, stated the Gulfstream Road Widening project is up in the air as to whether it is feasible or not, with some of the projects coming up in the next couple of months.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Mr. George Fielder had requested the Gulfstream Road project in the 2045 MTP, but if it is no longer feasible, we can remove it.

Another project Ms. Wang doesn't believe is feasible is the I-95 widening. Is GDOT going to do the widening? Ms. Kaniz Sathi, GDOT, stated she will reach out to upper management with GDOT and get back to Ms. Wykoda Wang. They are reviewing the tables in Section 6 and the financial constraint plan. After that GDOT will send their comments.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked about I-516 at I-16 interchange reconstruction. Part of the I-16 widening project includes improvements in that area already. Do we need this project? She does know it is higher priority and consistent with the 2045 MTP, but we are already making improvements there. Could GDOT please check the I-95 and I-516 projects and get back to us?

Ms. Wang asked "does the City of Savannah want to do the President Street project?"

Ms. Michele Strickland, City of Savannah, asked if the President Street project could be rescored. It only got a single point for high truck traffic volumes, however with the on-going corridor study of President Street, there are more than 15,000 tractor trailers on there now. The scoring does not reflect this. As for connecting to activity centers, she believes Tybee Island is an activity center. Visitors staying in downtown Savannah use President Street to go out to the islands. CAT has a route that runs on President Street and this project didn't receive any points for transit. In the corridor study meetings, they are including bike/ped connectivity. We ask if this project could be rescored in that light. She argues that when a train is present on President Street, there is a LOS of F.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will revisit the scoring of the President Street project, plus we already have a corridor study.

Ms. Michele Strickland stated if the project is rescored, considering the LOS based on the study Chatham County is doing, the freight volumes, people use President Street to get to and from Tybee Island, the CAT route, and they are including bike/ped connectivity, she believes the project score would add about 40 or 48 points, which make a huge difference in the ranking.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated we definitely have local support for the President Street project.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated even if we don't rescore and re-rank the project, there would still be local support. After the study is done, there might be a PE or scoping phase. Just because of that, we could include this project.

Ms. Michele Strickland stated she respectfully asked that President Street be rescored and put in the correct rank. She believes there is local support based on the number of complaints both the City and County receive.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked what other projects do TCC members see that need to be boosted, like the President Street project?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated to reconsider the freight for Old River Road, with the development center being located there. She believes that score was kind of low.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Old River Road is consistent with the 2045 MTP as well.

Mr. Tim Callanan, Effingham County, asked about SR 21 widening. So basically from Port Wentworth to McCall Road is first phase, and then the intersection improvement for I-95 and SR 21 would encompass the rest?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the Coastal Empire Study has one project for SR 21 widening from SR 30 all the way to 9th Street in Rincon. Normally if with a long segment the project is very costly, we wanted to break it up so it does not occupy all of the revenues. As it turns out these two projects were ranked #1 and #2, so we can convert it back into one project.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated that is not necessary. His concern is with the intersection of I-95 and SR 21. That widening of SR 21 makes complete sense, but it's just going to widen into that bottleneck again. Somewhere he saw something about SR 21 and I-95 about rebuilding that intersection.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if it is this one - "I-95 Interchange Reconstruction at SR 21/Augusta Road"?

Mr. Tim Callanan stated he assumed those projects were tied together?

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked does Mr. Tim Callanan mean that the limits of each project would match up? Like the limits of the I-95 and SR 21 reconstruction match up to the limits of the SR 21 at SR 30 project?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she believes the widening of SR 21 will be at the lower level, so it's not a grade separation. This other one interchange is a grade separation, so it's a different level as SR 21 will be underneath, and this interchange will go above.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated one concern he also has is Benton Blvd. He knows for some of these other projects like the Effingham Pkwy widening, there is no reason to move that up unless Benton Blvd is addressed. Where is Benton Blvd on this list - is it Effingham Pkwy south?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Benton Blvd wasn't in the project selection process. We used that matrix to select projects and Benton Blvd wasn't listed in that. Also there is a problem because Benton Blvd is a local road, just like Richmond Hill and Bryan County's Harris Trail Road and Port Royal Road. Those are classified as Local Roads in the federally approved Functional Classification system. We are mostly talking about federal dollars, so we want to reclassify Benton Blvd, Port Royal Road, and Harris Trail Road to be at least collectors so that they are eligible for federal dollars. We are not done with that process yet. Also she wants to mention that for Cost Bands One, Two and Three, we don't want the funding balances to be zero dollars. We want to keep some money over there just in case. For example, if Harris Trail Road or Benton Blvd gets reclassified, then we will have some money reserved for that. We are trying to do the reclassification after August; so far, we haven't received any formal written requests. Ms. Michele Strickland talked about reclassifying Benton Blvd, but we haven't received any formal request yet. Thunderbolt also wants to reclassify a road around Savannah State. We want to reclassify all these roads to be collectors, so they are eligible for federal dollars. Right now, even if we add Benton Blvd, we will have to make sure that we use local funds and not federal dollars.

Ms. Wang asked are there any other project that the TCC members see they want moved in or moved out?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated there are two SR 307 grade separation projects, one is at SR 21, the other one just references the Norfolk Southern crossing number. Where is it located?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated it is south of SR 21. There are two at-grade crossings right there. Those projects are from the SR 307 Corridor Study and also consistent with the 2045 MTP. She is not sure if it's consistent with the Coastal Empire Study, but it was selected. We can go back and check the project selections matrix to see which category it fits into. She will also revisit the cost estimates to make sure our calculations are right, so she will double check the inflation factor, etc. For now, we will move in President Street and Old River Road and move out Gulfstream Road widening.

Do we want to do the I-95 widening?

Ms. Michele Strickland stated that I-95 is only two lanes once you cross into South Carolina, which already causes a lot of crashes north bound.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that project also occupies most of the revenue. Move it out?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated yes, move it out.

Ms. Michele Strickland stated that South Carolina is working on widening their portion, but it's going to be a while.

Mr. Omar Senati-Martinez, Port Wentworth, stated until South Carolina widens their portion of I-95, it doesn't make sense to widen our portion, because we could have 5 lanes and would still have to go down to 2 lanes at the South Carolina border and still have a bottleneck.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will take I-95 widening out, and we can probably get more projects from the list added in. Can the TCC endorse the project list to the CORE MPO Board with the contingency that CORE MPO staff will double check these projects and the changes we have mentioned?

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked if anyone has any comments on the 2050 MTP projects?

Mr. Tim Callanan motioned to endorse the DRAFT Financially Constrained 2050 MTP Project List; seconded by Ms. Calia Brown. The motion passed with none opposed.

5. TCC Bylaws Update

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated before she talks about the TCC Bylaws update, she wanted to mention in the 2050 MTP financial plan we have the set asides. There are a lot of revenues in the set asides, so if we do want to start a project, for example operational improvement recommendation from the US 17 Corridor Study, make sure to amend the project into the Vision Plan so the project can be eligible for the operational set aside. For example with Effingham County smaller projects like roundabouts, make sure to pursue that funding. Make sure that you are LAP certified, as that is the requirement. This is not for bigger capacity projects; we have smaller projects that we can build. Looking at the project map, it is tilted towards the west because of the freight concentration, but we will start to see operational improvements and bike/ped improvements everywhere.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we executed the MOU in May and so far, we have only received six signatures. If you could please check and follow up for the Airport, Richmond Hill, CAT, Chatham County, City of Savannah, and Port Wentworth, we greatly appreciate it.

Mr. Omar Senati-Martinez stated that Port Wentworth will double check on that, and he knows that they had received it and forwarded it to their City manager. He will follow up on that.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for Effingham County we received three signatures. The City of Springfield does not want to join the CORE MPO.

Mr. Tim Callanan, Effingham County, stated he received the news at the same time as the CORE MPO staff. At this late in the game, he doesn't know if it's worthwhile to try and salvage this or what the process was to move on and address this after the next census.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the MPA Boundary will not change, and part of Springfield will be included in our boundary. The Boundary has already been approved by the Governor, but Springfield will not be a part of the MPO process, so the rotating seat will now be just between Guyton and Rincon.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated since Effingham County is providing the funding for these municipalities, it really shouldn't affect it at all.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, in the MOU we can just remove the Springfield signature page and remove them from the first paragraph. The rest of the TCC members please check with your boards; we probably won't

make the June 30th deadline but hopefully we will collect every signature in July. After we adopt the bylaws in June, we can forward everything to the Governor and GDOT in August.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we have talked about the TCC bylaws several times already. She has highlighted all changes since our last discussion, and they can be found attached to the agenda. Some updates are:

- Voting Members:
 - Removed from voting role - Director of Transportation Planning, Metropolitan Planning Commission
 - Moved to Non-voting advisory member - Staff Representative for Town of Vernonburg
 - Added Voting member - Staff Representative, Bryan County
 - Added Voting member - Staff Representative, Municipality within Effingham County (rotating seat)
 - Moved to Non-voting advisory member - Coastal Regional Commission
- Non-voting Advisory Members:
 - Added Chairperson, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
 - Added Chairperson, Transportation Equity and Public Involvement Advisory Committee

We talked about Ms. Calia Brown being the Chairperson for the new Bike/Ped committee (BPAC). We would like to add the new chairperson of the BPAC and the new Chairperson of the Transportation Equity and Public Involvement Advisory Committee to the Voting members for the TCC. So we will need to change this in the final bylaws.

Ms. Calia Brown asked what about adding them as chairperson or designee? That way we have ourselves covered.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that the TCC members will hear the report from the BPAC, because we are going to implement a lot of bike/ped projects. We still want the BPAC to be a TCC Voting member. She will add them back to the Voting members. Besides the membership, the other TCC changes are:

- Updated the language to - **No action items** may be conducted by the TCC unless a quorum of the membership is present. Eight (8) members (1/3 of all members +1) shall constitute a quorum.

For the new committees, Ms. Asia Hernton has already scheduled a meeting to discuss the new BPAC bylaws. We had a consolidated CAC and ACAT meeting to discuss the new TEPIAC bylaws. The TCC has not changed that much in the bylaws, just the membership and some of the language. We can make the changes and ask the TCC for their endorsement of the bylaws, because the final approval of all the bylaw changes must be approved by the CORE MPO Board. The TCC will endorse their portion of the bylaws.

Ms. Michele Strickland motioned to endorse the TCC bylaws update; seconded by Ms. Mary Moskowitz. The motion passed with none opposed.

III. Other Business

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated at the last meeting we decided we would pursue discretionary PL funding for two studies. One is the Urban Flooding Model Phase II; the second one is Bike/Ped implementation. Afterwards Mr. Tim Callanan contacted the CORE MPO staff about the US 80 Corridor Study in Effingham County. So now we will apply for discretionary PL funds for three studies. We will prepare the resolutions for the August meeting. She did send the information, asking for updates on the scope and cost estimates, so please let us know as the resolution will need to include the final cost. We have reached out to Ms. Calia Brown, Mr. Tim Callanan, and Ms. Anna McQuarrie, who are the project managers. Please send updates to Ms. Wykoda Wang. She will prepare the grant applications in July, then the resolutions will be presented in August and they will include the final costs.

IV. Status Reports

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

Ms. Asia Hernton, CORE MPO staff, stated the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan is a document that addresses the development of bike and pedestrian infrastructure in the CORE MPO planning area. 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. Because the MPO is focused on completing the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation

Plan, the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan will not be adopted in June 2024, and instead will be adopted at a later date. We will begin to refocus on the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan after the adoption of the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) in August. This is because the 2050 MTP is a required MPO document, meaning it takes precedence over the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, which is not a required plan for the MPO.

7. Congestion Management Process Update

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated FHWA wants to make sure the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and the Congestion Management Process do feed into the 2050 MTP. The reason we are not going to have the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan adopted before the 2050 MTP is because we haven't finished the prioritization process, but we have already identified more than 400 bike/ped projects. We can do the prioritization process just like for the 2050 MTP, but we do need a project sponsor to implement the project. When we have a project sponsor, it takes precedence and becomes a priority. If anyone wants to pursue a project, they can select from the project list in the NMTP, so the NMTP still feeds into the 2050 MTP.

The same goes for the CMP, and we have talked about this several times. This is the final report (attached to the agenda) that Ms. Genesis Harrod has sent us and it has incorporated the comments that FHWA sent the CORE MPO staff. We want to do the 30-day public review period for the 2050 MTP starting on July 1st, and this CMP will be part of that as well. The final resolution for 2050 MTP already considered the CMP recommendations and NMTP recommendations. This is the final report, and all the figures and everything have been corrected. If anyone is interested in this very comprehensive document, please take a look. It is basically done and needs to be adopted as part of the 2050 MTP.

8. Project Status Update - Existing Conditions SR 25/US 17 Corridor Study

Mr. Chris Marsengill and Mr. Rhodes Hunt, consultants for the Kimley-Horn Team, gave the presentation on the updates for the Existing Conditions from the SR 25/US 17 Corridor Study. The slideshow presentation can be found attached to this agenda.

Mr. Chris Marsengill stated they will cover:

- Study Goals
- Meeting Purpose
- Corridor Overview
- Initial Research
- Potential Next Steps

Study Goals:

1. Identify and prioritize improvements to SR 25/US 17
2. Plan projects through the CORE MPO's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) process
3. Program projects in the CORE MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and MTP

Key MTP Objectives:

- Improve safety, security, accessibility, mobility, and sustainability of transportation options available to people and freight
- Lower the frequency and severity of crashes for cars, trucks, pedestrians, and bicyclists
- Improve emergency response time and evacuation routes
- Reduce congestion by improving access to businesses and maximizing freight truck travel time reliability

Meeting Purpose:

1. Review existing conditions
2. Identify other problems and potential solutions

Corridor Overview (map can be found in slideshow attached to agenda.)

- Primer:
 - Where is traffic the heaviest?
 - Where are the most trucks?
 - Which are the worst-performing intersections?
 - Where are the most crashes?
 - Which area has the greatest growth potential?
 - Freight corridor or commuter corridor?

Daily Traffic:

- Segment 1: 33,300 VPD
- Segment 2: 33,900 VPD
- Segment 3: 34,500 VPD
- Segment 4: 31,500 VPD
- Segment 5: 30,800 VPD
- Segment 6: 27,000 VPD

Trucks:

- Segment 1: 6%
- Segment 2: 5%
- Segment 3: 7%
- Segment 4: 6%
- Segment 5: 6%
- Segment 6: 7%

5-Year & 10-Year Growth Rates:

- Segment 1: 3%; 2.2%
- Segment 2: 2.7%; 2.2%
- Segment 3: 4%; 3.3%
- Segment 4: 1.8%; 3.1%
- Segment 5: 1.8%; 3.1%
- Segment 6: -1.7%; -0.6%

AM Traffic (map and photos of traffic congestion can be found in slideshow attached to this agenda.)

- Fords Pointe Circle/Bradley Boulevard: LOS F
- Southwest Middle School Driveway: LOS F
- Fountain Road: LOS E
- Burton Road: LOS F
- Quacco Road: LOS E
- Kroger Driveway: LOS F
- Elk Road: LOS F
- Silk Hope Road/Derrick Inn Road: LOS F
- Tower Drive: LOS F
- Heathcote Circle: LOS F
- Mersy Way: LOS E
- Westgate Boulevard: LOS E

PM Traffic (map and photos of traffic congestion can be found in slideshow attached to this agenda.)

- Fords Pointe Circle/Bradley Boulevard: LOS F
- Bamboo Lane: LOS F
- Fountain Road: LOS F
- Burton Road: LOS F
- Quacco Road: LOS F
- Larchmont Drive: LOS F
- Elk Road: LOS F
- Silk Hope Road/Derrick Inn Road: LOS F
- Savannah Speedway: LOS F
- Mersy Way: LOS F
- Westgate Boulevard: LOS F

Land Use Summary (map can be found in slideshow attached to this agenda.)

- Data Sources
 - SAGIS
 - Current zoning/parcel information
 - Urban Footprint Analyst Data
 - Planned Urban Developments (PUDs)
- PUDs
 - Bradley Pointe South

- Pointe Grande
- Hopeton Landing
- Hopeton Landing South
- Waterford
- Lebanon Plantation

Origin-Destination (O-D) Analysis

- Passenger car trips increased 9% from 2019 to 2023 (70% out of all trips)
- Truck trips decreased approximately 6% from 2019 to 2023
- Walking, biking, or transit trips constituted less than 5% of all trips
- Nearly half of all trips had a duration between 20 and 40 minutes
- 30% of passenger car trips began or ended south of SR 204/Abercorn Street
- Construction along I-16 has not significantly impacted travel patterns on SR 25/US 17

Crashes 2018-2022 (Crash location map and bar graph can be found on the slideshow attached to this agenda.)

- 3,621 Total
- Nearly 85% PDO
- 24 Fatal
- 5 of 6 segments exceed statewide average
- Cost of \$170.1 million per year
- Clear need for safety investments

Pedestrians and Bicyclists:

- GA Bike Route 95 and East Coast Greenway
- NMTP recommends sidewalks from:
 - 1. Fords Pointe Circle/Bradley Boulevard to SR 204/Abercorn Street
 - 2. Bridgewater Drive to Quacco Road
 - 3. Berwick Boulevard to SR 307/Dean Forest Road
- NMTP recommends a shared-use path from Salt Creek Road to north of I-516/SR 21
- Variability of typical sections and latent demand
- Target improvements in network where gaps exist
- Provide greater connectivity to existing recreational and commercial facilities

Transit: (CAT route map can be found on slideshow attached to this agenda.)

- 41 stops along corridor, but most consist of only signs (i.e., no shelters)
- CAT Route 17 extends from Canebroke Road through I-516/ SR 21 and Route 25 is located between Chatham Parkway and Gamble Road
- Only 1% of existing trips use public transit
- Improvements to transit accommodations may help increase utilization

Summary:

- Capacity and safety improvements should be prioritized at key bottlenecks
- Transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities should be considered
- Access management strategies should be implemented

Potential Improvements

- Major improvements
 - Fords Pointe Circle/Bradley Boulevard
 - SR 204/Abercorn Street Interchange
 - Berwick Boulevard
 - Cottonvale Road
 - Chatham Parkway
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Access control plan to improve safety
 - Raised, grassed median
 - Driveway consolidation
 - Innovative/reduced conflict intersections
- Affordable transportation options

Next Steps:

- Preliminary Stakeholder Meetings

- Traffic Forecasting
- Alternatives/Concept Development
- Public Information Open House
- Final Stakeholder Meetings
- Final Report

Ms. Mary Moskowitz, CAT, stated the Kimley-Horn Team mentioned the fixed route system on US 17, and CAT is also doing a micro transit zone in that area. Some things to keep in mind when looking at the transit improvements is transferring, the idea with the micro transit it is supposed to enhance the first and last mile connectivity to the fixed route. Right now, CAT has designated that area as an unsafe zone for micro transit drop-offs. The micro transit vehicle is just a van, so it doesn't make sense to stop in the middle of the road to drop-off and pick-up people. If we had transit improvements that could address a safe transfer from a micro transit vehicle to a fixed route vehicle, that would help enhance the goal of that program.

9. Federal Certification Review

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated every four years the FHWA and FTA conduct a review of the metropolitan transportation planning process within each TMA to certify that MPOs conduct the comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing transportation planning process in adherence with federal statutes and regulations. The CORE MPO completed its latest federal certification review in FY 2021 and received its federal certification on March 31, 2021. The final certification report can be found on the MPC website at: <https://www.thempc.org/docs/lit/CoreMpo/Latest/2021/TMACertification.pdf>.

In FY 2025, CORE MPO will go through another round of federal certification review. Staff will prepare all required documents and coordinate with FHWA/FTA/GDOT to complete the review process. Afterwards, staff will continue to hold quarterly coordination meetings with FHWA/FTA/GDOT and will address any recommendations received during the certification process. The CORE MPO Certification Kickoff Meeting took place on May 6, 2024. FHWA, FTA, GDOT and CORE MPO staff went over the requirements and discussed the schedule for site visit and public meeting. The tentative site visit dates are October 29 - 30, 2024. The MPO staff are also working on setting up a dedicated webpage on the CORE MPO website for the certification review.

V. Information Reports (verbal)

10. GDOT Project Status Update Report

Report attached to the agenda.

11. Chatham County Project Status Update Report

Report attached to the agenda.

12. City of Savannah Project Status Update Report

Report attached to the agenda.

13. Savannah Hilton Head International Airport Project Status Update Report

Report attached to the agenda.

14. Chatham Area Transit Project Status Update Report

Report attached to the agenda.

15. LATS-SCDOT Project Status Update Report

Report attached to the agenda.

16. TIP Funding Tracking Report

Report attached to the agenda.

VI. Other Public Comments (limit to 3 minutes)

VII. Notices

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the June 20th, 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