



## CORE MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Minutes  
May 15, 2024 at 9:30am

### May 15, 2024 Special Called TCC Meeting

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	
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	X
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
Heath Maines	Savannah Airport Commission	X
Others	Representing	
Asia Hernton	CORE MPO	X
Pamela Everett	MPC	X
Genesis Harrod	CORE MPO	X
Anna McQuarrie	CORE MPO/MPC	X
Kieron Coffield	CORE MPO	X

Hind Patel	MPC IT	X
Joe Shearouse	City of Savannah	X
Edward Hicks	GDOT	X
Joseph Longo	FHWA	X
Jonathan Martinez	GDOT	X
Shayla Grant		X
Tyrone Albright		X

**I. Approval of Agenda**

**II. Action Items**

**III. Other Business**

1. [2050 MTP Project Selection and Prioritization](#)

Chairperson Deana Brooks, Chatham County, stated good morning and thank you all for joining us to discuss the 2050 MTP Project Selection and Prioritization. That is the only item we have on the agenda. Could we please go through the call, so that we know who is participating today as this is a virtual meeting.

Vice Chairperson Caila Brown stated she is Vice Chairperson and is from Bike Walk Savannah.

Mr. Joe Long stated he is from the Federal Highway Administration.

Ms. Kaniz Sathi stated she is from GDOT.

Mr. Heath Maines stated he is from the Airport Commission.

Mr. Jonathan Martinez stated he is from the GDOT Office of Planning.

Mr. Jamie McCurry stated he is from the Georgia Ports Authority.

Ms. Michele Strickland stated she is from the City of Savannah.

Mr. Nathan Clark stated he is from the City of Richmond Hill.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated she is from Chatham Area Transit.

Mr. Steve Candler stated he is from Development Services of Effingham County.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she is from the CORE MPO.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated she is from the CORE MPO.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated she is from the CORE MPO.

Ms. Kieron Coffield stated she is from the CORE MPO.

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated she is from the CORE MPO.

Mr. Leon Davenport stated he is from Pooler.

Chairperson Deanna Brooks stated she believes that was everyone, but if there was anyone we missed, please feel free to jump in. She will turn it over to the CORE MPO staff to present the materials.

## Project Selection

Ms. Wykoda Wang, CORE MPO staff, stated before Ms. Genesis Harrod, Ms. Anna McQuarrie and Ms. Asia Hernton began their presentations on project prioritization, she wanted to mention that we did do a project selection. The project selection file is attached to the CORE MPO Board meeting agenda from May 3<sup>rd</sup>. From the worksheet, we can see how the projects are selected. The CORE MPO staff wanted to use the regional studies as the basis and the sub-area studies and plans to help us confirm needs in those areas.

We focused on the following regional plans and studies as criteria to select the projects for further analysis.

- The Coastal Empire Study
  - Covers 4 counties
- Travel Demand Model
  - Covers 3 counties
  - If the E+C and STIP model inputs show Level of Service E or F, it will be selected.
- 2023 CORE MPO Regional Freight Transportation Plan
  - Covers 3 counties
- 2024 Congestion Management Process
  - Covers 3 counties
- 2045 MTP and Vision Plan
  - Covers Chatham County and portions of Bryand and Effingham Counties

Since all of these studies and plans are regional in nature, if a project has several checks in these criteria categories, it will have a higher priority.

Then we will use the other sub-area studies to confirm the needs, including the following.

- North Bryan County Transportation Study
- Chatham County 2023 TSPLOST
- Belfast Keller Road Transportation Assessment
- Effingham County Transportation Master Plan
- SR 307 Corridor Study
- SR 21 Access Management Study
- US 80 Corridor Study

We understand that Effingham County is updating their Transportation Master Plan. Ms. Wykoda Wang has a meeting scheduled with Effingham County this Friday to go over any updates. We also understand that Chatham County is doing 3 studies - President Street Railroad Crossing Elimination Study, SR 204 Access Study, and US 17 Corridor Study. CORE MPO Staff is keeping all of that in mind. We will have the sub-area studies to confirm the project selection from the regional list.

The project selection process is to add additional projects to 2050 MTP. We already have some projects populated in Cost Band One, including the following.

- Project DeRenne
- Lazaretto Creek bridge replacement
- Bull River bridge replacement
- Back River bridge replacement
- The City of Savannah received a grant from the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Program for the I-16 ramp removal project.
  - The Preliminary Engineering phase is included in Cost Band One, as the project phase comes with its own money.
- Georgia Ports Authority received an award for the electric charging stations and electric truck fleet.
  - This project comes with its own money.

- Savannah River Crossing
  - ROW phase in 2028

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we have already populated Cost Band One with some existing projects that are in the pipeline. We have about \$100 million left in Cost Band One to allocate to additional projects. We have less than \$500 million available for specific projects in both Cost Band Two and Cost Band Three. Remember for Cost Bands Two and Three we have to apply an inflation factor.

- 1.6% inflation factor for Cost Band Two
- 2.28% inflation factor for Cost Band Three

We really cannot accommodate that many projects. The project prioritization will help us identify other projects, in addition to the projects already in the pipeline. The CORE MPO staff went through the project selection process and identified about 60 projects. Then we sorted the projects into two categories - capacity building projects and operational improvement projects.

We do have an operational set-aside for the 2050 MTP, which is about 12% of the Project revenues for each cost band. CORE MPO staff decided not to prioritize operational improvement projects. This is because operational improvement projects will not only rely on this project prioritization but also mostly rely on project sponsors to get started. If a project sponsor wants to start an operational improvement project, we can see if it is consistent with the 2050 MTP. All of the operational improvements, like signal coordination, etc. will be included in the 2050 Vision Plan. We have the set-aside for operational improvements in the 2050 MTP to accommodate these projects as long as the projects are consistent with the Vision Plan, Freight Plan, or any of the studies previously mentioned that were approved by the MPO.

We will focus on the capacity building projects. CORE MPO staff sorted through about 30 projects which are listed on the project selection worksheet. Most projects are for interstate as well as US and state highways, but some projects are smaller like Gulfstream Road, Belfast Keller Road, etc. Ms. Genesis Harrod, Ms. Asia Hernton and Ms. Anna McQuarrie were working on the prioritization of these projects. We already went over how much money we have in each Cost Band, so after we finish the prioritization process, our target is to select the top 10 or 15 projects. Then we can start to do the cost estimating and start to populate Cost Bands One, Two and Three for the remaining revenues. That is our overall approach.

Ms. Genesis Harrod will talk about the needs assessment, Ms. Anna McQuarrie will talk about the resiliency assessment and scoring, and Ms. Asia Hernton will talk about the equity assessment.

When we do the prioritization, we also considered performance-based planning. For example, with Safety we would have crash rates or crash density areas as criteria; for PM2, we would have bridge sufficiency rating and pavement conditions as criteria, etc. We did check all the projects and according to our freight plan, only two bridges have under-sufficiency ratings and those have already been addressed (SR 25 at Middle River and Savannah River). We decided not to use bridge sufficiency rating as a criterion, but we do have pavement conditions as one of the criteria for PM2.

Besides being consistent with performance-based planning, we also tried to be consistent with the Planning Emphasis Areas with Federal guidelines. One of those is resiliency and environment which fits our resiliency assessment. Another one is Complete Street and Justice 40, and that is where equity assessment comes in. We wanted to give an overall picture before diving into the specifics.

Mr. Jamie McCurry, Georgia Ports Authority, stated for the \$15 million grant for the zero emission vehicles and charging facilities, half of that does not go to the Georgia Ports Authority but to a private company. Only around \$7.5 million would go to the GPA and that would go towards fuel. Ms. Wykoda Wang stated when we include

the projects, we do not consider project sponsors. That money has to go through the FHWA process, so we have to include it in the plan. Mr. Joe Longo from FHWA might be able to correct us.

Mr. Joe Longo stated that is correct - the funds need to be in the MTP and TIP. He would like to add that this is a really great project selection and prioritization process that the CORE MPO staff has created. This is the recommended process.

### Project Prioritization – Needs Assessment (Tier 1)

Ms. Genesis Harrod, CORE MPO staff, stated she did the needs scoring, basically looking at things like level of service, freight plan, etc. She is showing some of the maps used, including a level of service map from the 2050 E+C model output. CORE MPO staff wanted to make sure that we had a weighting score that accounts for everything used for the prioritization.

Looking at the 2050 E+C Daily Level of Service map:

- LOS A, B, and C ratings = 1 point for prioritization score
- LOS D rating = 5 points for prioritization score
- LOS E or F ratings = 10 points for prioritization score

Another map we used is the Annual Average Daily Truck Traffic (AADTT). The thicker lines indicate more truck traffic.

- 1,000 or less = 1 point for prioritization score
- 1,000 - 2,000 = 5 points for prioritization score
- 2,500 - over 5,000 = 10 points for prioritization score

CORE MPO staff wants to keep the same scoring mechanism to ensure no project is weighted more than another project. Essentially 10 is the highest score, 5 is the middle, and 1 denotes less emphasis.

Using that same scoring mechanism, we also looked at other maps (all maps can be found attached to the agenda).

- Pavement Conditions - taken from the freight plan
  - Not reported - Good - 1 point for prioritization score
  - Fair - 5 points for prioritization score
  - Poor - 10 points for prioritization score
- Freight Generating Land Uses
  - SR 204 is projected for future land uses to have more freight generating land use, but for now we use the existing condition.
  - Access to Land Uses
    - Little Connection - 1 point for prioritization score
    - Medium Connection - 5 points for prioritization score
    - Most Connection - 10 points for prioritization score
- Connecting Population Centers to Activity Centers
  - Low Connectivity - 1 point for prioritization score
  - Medium Connectivity - 5 points for prioritization score
  - High Connectivity - 10 points for prioritization score
- Vehicle Crash Rates - Pulled from the Congestion Management Process
  - 0-1 - 1 point for prioritization score
  - 7-150 – 5 points for prioritization score
  - 151-771 - 10 points for prioritization score

- Freight Crash Rates
  - 0-24 - 1 point for prioritization score
  - 25-50 - 5 points for prioritization score
  - >50 - 10 points for prioritization score

Those are all the categories Ms. Genesis Harrod is scoring. There is more information about weighted scoring at the bottom of the presentation attached to the agenda. With this type of scoring mechanism, the interstates, the state roads, and the highways usually have the biggest emphasis and the highest weights.

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked if functional classification was not factored or would not be needed, as these criteria/categories are based on volume?

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated yes, the functional classification is factored, but since most of the roadways have a high functional classification, the functional classification criterion became redundant. Essentially most of the local roads are not considered except for operational improvement projects. For the needs scoring, since all the roadways are essentially a major roadway or close to a major roadway if it wasn't an interstate, then it didn't matter much and was kind of redundant.

### Project Prioritization – Resiliency Assessment (Tier 2)

Ms. Anna McQuarrie, CORE MPO staff, stated she will be talking about the resilience prioritization. She is following the FHWA framework for adaptation and assessment.

FHWA defines vulnerability as “the degree to which a system is susceptible to, or unable to cope with adverse effects of climate change or extreme weather events. In the transportation context, climate change vulnerability is a function of a transportation system’s exposure to climate effects, sensitivity to climate effects, and adaptive capacity.” Exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity as defined as:

- **Exposure** refers to whether the asset or system is located in an area experiencing direct effects of climate variables.
- **Sensitivity** refers to how the asset or system fares when exposed to a climate variable.
- **Adaptive capacity** refers to the system’s ability to adjust to or cope with existing climate variability or future climate impacts.

Using the FHWA Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Framework 3rd Edition, the CORE MPO performed a vulnerability assessment following the process outlined in FIGURE X to score the projects in the second tier of prioritization. The Framework is organized into six sections with ongoing monitoring.

1. Articulation objectives and defining study scope
2. Obtaining asset data for the vulnerability assessment
3. Obtaining climate data for the vulnerability assessment
4. Assessing vulnerability
5. Identifying, analyzing and prioritizing adaptation options
6. Incorporating assessment results in decision-making

This process took place from December 2023 to May 2024 and relied on guidance from an assessment team of MPO staff, Planners, Engineers, Emergency Management Professionals, GIS Analysts, Resilience Managers, and Community Representatives. The team consisted of representatives with varying technical expertise, covering the geographic range of Bryan County, Chatham County, Effingham County, City of Savannah, Tybee Island, and State-level entities. Organizations and institutions represented include the CORE MPO, SAGIS, FHWA, GDOT, and Harambee House (Table of Assessment team attached to this agenda).

The assessment team met once a month on the following dates:

- 12/15/2023: Kickoff meeting to set objectives, select climate stressors, and select transit assets
- 1/31/2024: Exposure indicator selection introduction
- 2/21/2024: Exposure indicators selection and scoring
- 3/20/2024: Exposure indicators scoring and sensitivity/adaptive capacity indicators introduction
- 4/17/2024: Sensitivity and adaptive capacity indicator selection and scoring
- 5/10/2024: Review results

Step 1: Objectives and Study Scope - We will only be focusing on **objective 1** today.

1. Understand and score the vulnerability of the projects listed in 2050 MTP at a macro-level to changes in temperature, precipitation, sea level rise, storm surge, and wind.
2. Investigate how the transportation system is contributing to vulnerability of transit assets and improvements that can be made.

Step 2: Obtain Asset Data. "Asset type" refers to a type of transportation asset that can be broad, along the lines of transportation modes (e.g., "Highways" and "Ports") or very specific (e.g. "docks"). Transportation assets include highway projects as identified in the Teir 1 Needs Assessment. There is a list of 30 number of projects.

Steps 3: Obtain Climate Data. A climate stressor is defined as an external change in climate that may cause damage to the transportation system. The assessment team selected five climate stressors to include in the vulnerability assessment: temperature, precipitation, sea level rise, storm surge, and wind. The Climate Mapping for Resilience and Adaptation (CMRA) Assessment Tool and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) were the two primary sources of data (Table of Climate Data Sources attached to this agenda).

Step 4: Assess Vulnerability. The vulnerability assessment was completed using the FHWA Vulnerability Assessment Scoring Tool (VAST). VAST was developed to help State DOTs, MPOs, and other organizations implement an indicator-based vulnerability screen. CORE MPO staff met with FHWA staff throughout the process to answer questions and assist with the process.

VAST was chosen because it is an FHWA tool with a replicable methodology and user guide with step-by-step instructions. The tool is formatted in a similar structure to the FHWA Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Framework and uses a macro-based excel sheet. The tool provided a baseline assessment of projects and identified knowledge gaps that can be filled between long-range plan updates.

VAST uses an indicator-based approach. Indicators are a representative data element that can be used as a proxy measurement of the overall exposure, sensitivity, or adaptive capacity of a specific asset. Indicators offer a low-cost way to score and rank transportation assets for vulnerability based on data availability and utilize quantitative data and projected climate stressors to evaluate potential vulnerabilities. Indicators should help to distinguish between assets, are based on relatively complete and consistent datasets (across assets being evaluated) and can be easily understood and interpreted.

The advantages of an indicators approach include the following. The flow chart of VAST process is attached to this agenda.

- Identify specific characteristics that can indicate if an asset is vulnerable or not
- Weighted averages of indicators drive the scoring
- Allows for many assets within a reasonable number of resources
- Identify which assets are likely to be more vulnerable, however, cannot definitely say which is more or less vulnerable

**Exposure** is the nature and degree to which an asset is exposed to significant climatic variations. The most direct way to answer this question and estimate exposure is through modeling. This assessment relied on modeling data provided by the CMRA and NOAA. As a coastal region in the Southeastern United States, the assessment team indicated that temperature, precipitation, sea level rise, storm surge, and wind were all climate stressors of concern for the CORE MPO.

The team defined the scoring scale from one, low likelihood of experiencing stressor, to four, very high likelihood of experiencing stressor. Not exposed was an option for select precipitation, sea level rise and storm surge indicators. Projected values for temperature and precipitation and historical values for wind were applied to all assets. Values that varied by geography, such as sea level rise inundation, storm surge, elevation, and 100-year flood zone, were different for each asset. TABLE X in the attached file describes each indicator and provides the rationale, data source, and scoring method. The Exposure Scoring Descriptions chart and the Exposure Indicators chart can be found attached to this agenda.

**Sensitivity** is the degree to which an asset is affected, either adversely or beneficially, by climate related stimuli. Indicators were selected based on previous experience with climate stressors, such as flooding due to precipitation, sea level rise, and storm surge, and factors that could adversely affect the asset, such as truck traffic and drainage infrastructure, and presence of overhead utilities. The team defined the scoring scale from one, exposure would not cause any damage or disruption, to four, exposure would cause severe damage and associated long-term disruption. Not exposed was not an option for any indicators. The assessment team was limited when selecting indicators based on availability of data for assets throughout the region. Many indicators relied on individual data from local Emergency Management Agencies and Stormwater Departments. TABLE X in the attached file describes each indicator and provides the rationale, data source, and scoring method. Sensitivity Indicators chart can be found attached to this agenda.

**Adaptive Capacity** is the ability of a system (or asset) to adjust to climate change to moderate potential damages, to take advantage. Indicators were selected based on factors that may be predictive of consequences if the asset were impacted by a climate stressor, such as road functional classification, evacuation routes, access to critical facilities, and average annual daily traffic (AADT). The team defined the scoring scale from one, damage or disruption to the asset would have a minimal effect on activity in the CORE MPO region, to four, damage or disruption to the asset would have a severe effect on activity in the CORE MPO region. The assessment team defined “activity” as mobility, movement, and throughput. Not exposed was not an option for any indicators. TABLE X in the attached file describes each indicator and provides the rationale, data source, and scoring method. Adaptive Capacity Scoring Descriptions chart can be found attached to this agenda.

The output of VAST is shown in a dashboard, where assets are scored for each climate stressor: temperature, precipitation, sea level rise, storm surge, and wind. These final scores are a composite of the exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity scores for each asset. The weights for each score can be changed, and the assessment team decided to weight each equally (33.3%). Sea level rise and temperature resulted in the highest vulnerability scores. The figures in the attached file show the top ten most vulnerable assets for each climate stressor. The table of the Top Ten most vulnerable assets can be found attached to this agenda. This is combination of the exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity scores, the higher the score the more vulnerable an asset is. Most vulnerable assets are to sea level rise, storm surge and wind.

Step 5: Identifying, Analyzing and Prioritizing Adaptation Options – the CORE MPO Staff has not gotten to this step yet.

Step 6: Incorporating Assessment Results in Decision-Making. VAST results in a continuous range of scores with values from 1-4. These scores needed to be converted to a 1-10 scale to be consistent with the scoring from tiers one and three. A discretization process was utilized to convert the scores, where continuous variables are



changed into discrete counterparts. The final scores for specific projects are in shown in TABLE X, attached to this agenda.

Mr. Joe Longo, FHWA, stated that he is still reviewing the draft that was sent to him. His only question was the consideration of transit assets. He is not asking the CORE MPO staff to re-run the VAST assessment of these assets but to take into consideration the impacts on operations, like flooding, bus storage, etc.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie asked Mr. Joe Longo to clarify his question.

Mr. Joe Longo stated it is not really a question; he is emphasizing the need to include multi-modal assessments. It does not necessarily need to be in the VAST tool, but this does seem very highway focused, while this is a multimodal plan.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated to clarify, this is for the MTP project selection and prioritization scoring, and not the MTP chapter itself.

Mr. Joe Longo stated his comment is more for the draft chapter.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Equity has transit connection criteria. Ms. Asia Hernton will go over the Equity scoring, as we have ranked the 30 projects and transit connection was one of the criteria.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated for more clarification today, we are just ranking the highway projects and there is a separate ranking for transit projects.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated these are the projects with funding from FHWA. The transit has its own project list, transit capital improvements which Ms. Mary Moskowitz has already provided. She believes that Mr. Joe Longo is trying to make connections, as SR 21 has a transit route and US 17 has a transit route, so he is trying to make the connection between highway and transit side.

Mr. Joe Longo thanked Ms. Wykoda Wang for the explanation. He is currently reviewing the MTP chapter, so that is why he got a little turned around.

### Project Prioritization – Equity Assessment (Tier 3)

Ms. Asia Hernton, CORE MPO Staff, stated she will be talking about the Equity scoring and prioritization.

The aim of this method is to prioritize and score projects based on their ability to improve safety, accessibility by multiple modes of transportation, and connection to critical facilities.

What measures were considered?

- Transit connection and accessibility
- Bike/Pedestrian Improvements
- Connection and Accessibility to Critical Features
- Title VI/Environmental Justice Considerations

Safety - Why these measures? There is strong evidence to support that the measures listed above improve equity. The data sets for these measures are easily accessible. Also, an analysis based on these measures was simple to do within the scope and timeframe of the overall project.

Important note: Interstate and freeway projects receive a score of 0 in this framework. This is due to the increased national and local focus on reconnecting communities and neighborhoods. Freeways and interstates

have a tendency to disconnect communities and are also inaccessible to those who do not own or are unable to operate a vehicle.

#### Process - Reading project description

Project descriptions were reviewed to find equity-improving elements. The specific elements being looked for were the inclusion of bike and pedestrian improvements and safety improvements, such as medians, roundabouts, and RCUT intersections. These elements were prioritized because according to the Federal Highway Administration, there is research to support that these improve safety. This research can be found in the Proven Safety Countermeasures on the FHWA website: <https://highways.dot.gov/safety/proven-safety-countermeasures>.

#### Process - GIS and Proximity

GIS was used to understand the project's proximity to certain features. Close proximity to these features is prioritized higher and thus receives a higher score within this system.

#### Census Tracts

Census tract data downloaded from the USDOT ETC Explorer was used to determine if a project is serving tracts with high percentages of Zero-Car Households or Poverty. If projects intersected with tracts with high percentages of Zero-Car Households or Poverty while also including bike and pedestrian improvements, those projects received a higher score.

#### Crash Points

Proximity to pedestrian crash points was also a consideration. The goal is to prioritize projects that include bike and pedestrian improvements near places that experience crashes, thus providing the infrastructure that can make road conditions safer.

#### Critical Facilities

The facilities considered were: grocery stores, hospitals, libraries, and schools.

- Grocery stores were considered critical because food access is a major equity issue. Although this does not create grocery stores within neighborhoods, it does provide connection to food. Additionally, the data was easily available.
- Hospitals were considered to improve health equity. These projects provide further access to healthcare.
- Libraries were considered because they offer vital services to the community and also provide recreational activities.
- Schools were considered to improve access to education.
- Lastly, the data for all of the above measures were easy to obtain, which was a big factor in including these factors

Scoring Tables: the scoring table shows the scoring criteria and methodology.

#### **Transit Connection and Accessibility**

Is the project:

Does the project include bike and pedestrian improvements?

Yes > Move to next transit question

No > Score of 1

Next transit question:

If yes, is the project:

Within 0.25 miles of a transit stop or route > 10 points

Within 0.5 miles of a transit stop or a transit route > 5 points

Over 1 mile or more away from a transit stop or a transit route > 1 point

### **Bike/Ped Connection and Accessibility**

Does the project include bike/ped improvements?

Yes > 10 points

No > 1 points

If yes, move on to the next question.

If no, move on to Connection and Accessibility to Critical Facilities

If yes, does the project:

Intersect with highest zero-car household tracts (Census tracts in which 50% or more households are a Zero-Car Household) > 10 points

Intersect with somewhat high zero-car household tracts (Census tracts in which 30% to 49% or more households are a Zero-Car Household) > 5 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

### **Connection and Accessibility to Critical Facilities**

Is the project:

Within 0.25 miles of a hospital > 10 points

Within 0.5 miles of a hospital > 5 points

A mile or further from a hospital > 1 point

Is the project:

Within 0.25 miles of a grocery store > 10 points

Within 0.5 miles of a grocery store > 5 points

A mile or further from a grocery store > 1 point

Is the project:

Within 0.25 miles of a library > 10 points

Within 0.5 miles of a library > 5 points

A mile or further from a library > 1 point

Is the project:

Within 0.25 miles of a school > 10 points

Within 0.5 miles of a school > 5 points

A mile or further from a school > 1 point

### **Safety**

Does the project include a median?

Yes > 10

No > 1

Does the project include a roundabout?

Yes > 10

No > 1

Does the project include an RCUT Intersection?

Yes > 10

No > 1

Does the project include pedestrian improvements?  
If yes, does the project intersect with a ped crash point?  
Yes > 10  
No > 1

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked Mr. Joe Longo if Ms. Asia Hernton answered his question.

Mr. Joe Longo stated yes, and he believes this process is great. He is just trying his best to consider FTA as they do not have the staff capacity to attend these meetings. He does not have any questions or concerns.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked Ms. Asia Hernton to pull up the spread sheet, so the TCC members can see the scores. We do need to check on President Street, as that project might get carried over to the 2050 MTP but we do need a project cost estimate.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated she has it available and will email the cost estimate for the President Street project to Ms. Wykoda Wang on Monday.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we also need to check on the I-95 at Airways Avenue project as it is in the preliminary engineering phase, and we do need a cost estimate for that as well. She had a meeting yesterday with the previous consultant who developed the concept for that project. Currently in 2045 Plan we have about \$30 million, but depending on the final concept that number will change. For US 17, SR 204, and President Street, if they have operational improvements, we will include those recommendations into our Vision Plan. If you have major capacity improvement recommendations, please let CORE MPO staff know.

Ms. Asia Hernton brought out the project scoring spreadsheet to the screen.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie asked Ms. Asia Hernton to delete the road redundancy consideration column, as we are not using that anymore.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we deleted the road redundancy, as we decided it was not a good measure after an internal meeting yesterday. Also we decided not to use Bike Crash or Pedestrian Crash, as there were only two roadway projects that have bike or pedestrian accommodations. These were not good measures for other projects. However, if we have a tie, or if we do a Call for Projects with more specific projects, we can always add those columns back. For right now, we have deleted those columns as they don't make sense for our 2050 MTP prioritization.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked to show the worksheet with total scores sorted in descending order. Ms. Asia Hernton tried to sort the worksheet and showed the project rankings from lowest to highest.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated it looks like Effingham Parkway Widening is the lowest score. Effingham Parkway is now under construction, so the widening projects are newer than that.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated the highest score is SR 21 Widening.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked the TCC members if the spreadsheet scoring makes any sense to them.

Mr. Ted Hicks asked if anyone noticed a geographic pattern here.

Ms. Michele Strickland stated it seems most of the projects are on the west side.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated because we rely on the Coastal Empire Study and the Freight Plan for project selection, which are more focused on the freight side which is mostly located in the west side. Please remember we have operational improvements and maintenance projects and those will be more spread out in the whole MPA region. We are talking about mostly new projects right now, as some projects are already in the pipeline. Those pipeline projects are more centrally located like Project DeRenne, Back River bridge, Lazaretto Creek Bridge, etc. She does agree this list is more geographically in the west. Does the TCC feel comfortable to go from this prioritization list, or does the TCC want to revisit the list to see which one makes sense and which doesn't?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated if there's no additional discussion, she feels that the information presented for the scoring criteria and this project list make sense to her. Did any of the other members have any comments about this list as it is presented? Hearing no comments, it seems that the TCC feels comfortable proceeding with this list as it is presented to us.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we also have additional consideration, such as if the project is already consistent with the 2045 MTP, or if the project has additional funding sources. If the project comes with its own money, it will be a higher priority. We also want to check the project status - if the project is already in the pipeline with scoping or preliminary engineering already programmed, it will be considered in the 2050 MTP. An example would be the I-95 at Airways Avenue project - it is at the PE phase, so it probably will be included. The President Street project is already in the 2045 MTP, so it might be carried forward as well. We want to make sure we have all the additional considerations that staff will have to review. If all the projects are on the west side, that's where the developments are. Does the TCC feel comfortable with CORE MPO staff starting with the top 10 projects so that we can do cost estimating to see which cost band the projects can fit into?

Mr. Steve Candler, Effingham County, stated he is good with that.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated CORE MPO staff will proceed as directed. She then asked Chairperson Deana Brooks if we need another special-called meeting after the staff has populated the 2050 Financial Plan. Does Chairperson Deana Brooks want to have the special-called meeting to go over that draft of the fiscally constrained financial plan? Or will the June TCC meeting be sufficient?? We can just email that out to all the TCC members for comments, or they can review it on our website as all information is online. Please send CORE MPO staff any additional comments you may have.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated the June TCC meeting will be sufficient. Please try to get that document out for TCC members to review and make comments.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked the TCC members to please review the attached information for this meeting, including the project selection file on the May 3 CORE MPO Board agenda. Please have your comments to CORE MPO staff by next Tuesday.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated that sounds good. TCC members will have our comments submitted by next Tuesday May 21<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for next steps, CORE MPO staff will do the cost estimating for the top fifteen projects to see how they fit into the fiscally constrained plan. We will present that list once completed and email to TCC members at the beginning of June to have a more robust discussion at our June TCC meeting.

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked if CORE MPO staff can update the file that was presented on the MPO website, as she believes it still includes the file with the road redundancy.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, CORE MPO staff will clean it up and update the MPO website. We will go ahead with this plan and thank you to everyone who attended the meeting.

**IV. Status Reports**

**V. Information Reports (verbal)**

**VI. Other Public Comments (limit to 3 minutes)**

**VII. Notices**

**VIII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the May 15th, 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.