



CORE MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Minutes
 Special Called TCC meeting March 21, 2024 at 10 am
 2050 MTP Financial Plan Development

SPECIAL CALLED CORE MPO 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 |
| Aaron Higgins | City of Pooler | X |
| Kaniz Sathi | GDOT – Planning | X |
| Jim 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 | |
| Wykoda Wang | CORE MPO | X |
| Stephen Henry | City of Savannah | |
| Tim Callanan | Effingham County | X |
| Robert Milie | Town of Thunderbolt | |
| Vacant | Town of Vernonburg | |
| Voting Alternate | Representing | |
| Michele Strickland | City of Savannah | X |
| Heath Maines | Savannah Airport Commission | X |
| Others | Representing | |
| Asia Hernton | CORE MPO | X |
| Pamela Everett | MPC | X |
| Anna McQuarrie | CORE MPO/MPC | X |

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---|
| Sally Helm | CORE MPO/MPC | |
| Kieron Coffield | CORE MPO | X |
| Genesis Harrod | CORE MPO | X |
| Hind Patel | MPC IT | X |
| Edward Hicks | GDOT | X |
| Kiarra Fields | City of Savannah | X |
| Katie Dunnigan | | X |
| Leon Davenport | | X |

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Action Items

III. Other Business

1. [2050 MTP Financial Plan Development](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang, CORE MPO Director, stated the purpose of this meeting is to get TCC input and direction on developing the methodology for Fiscally Constrained 2050 MTP. In order to talk about our financial plan development, we must make sure we have all the revenues to cover the costs. The project costs cannot be more than the revenues. We will focus on:

- Revenues
 - Highway Revenues
 - Transit Revenues
- Project Selection and Prioritization
 - Highway Projects
 - Transit Projects
- Financially Constrained 2050 MTP
 - Highway
 - Transit

Federal requirements mean that the MTP must be fiscally constrained in each Cost Band. We have divided the 2050 MTP into 3 different Cost Bands. All of the projects and costs must be inflated into the Year of Expenditure. Like previous MTPs, we are separating the Highway plans from the Transit plans to make it easier for Staff to develop the plans. We will focus on the revenue estimates first, starting with the Highway Revenues Estimates.

Highway Revenues

GDOT provided the 2025-2050 revenue forecasts on 2/29/2024 which are based on census population and the state's obligation authority without considering project-based forecasts.

- 2% inflation rate for IJA years and 1% after 2026
 - Table is available on slide show attached to agenda.
- Projects and Maintenance revenues separated
 - LIMG funds are Not included in Maintenance Revenue as those are for local roads.
- Revenue projections are matched (estimated Federal OA + match)
 - The estimates provided by GDOT are matched funds, which means they include the federal portion (80%) plus the 20% state or local match.

This is not our final revenue; we would like to make adjustments. One adjustment would be using the funding amounts from the TIP. The TIP funds are considered committed funds and will be available. Compared to the first three years of the GDOT Revenue Estimates - 2025, 2026, 2027, the TIP funds vary by year because they are tied to projects. Each year is different based on the project development schedule, so we cannot say that we can push a project into two years later when it is developing now. The TIP revenues are divided into revenues for specific projects and revenues for lump sum projects (Bridge Maintenance, Road Maintenance, etc.). We can correspond the TIP revenue for specific projects to Project estimate (on the table provided by GDOT) and the Lump Sum revenue to the Maintenance estimate for these three years.

CORE MPO Adjustments:

- Keep Project and Maintenance revenues separated.
- Use 2% annual inflation rate (TCC decision as of October 2023) for all years 2026 – 2050 for both Project and Maintenance.
- Use revenues from the adopted FY 2024 – 2027 TIP for FY 2025, 2026 and 2027 to replace state obligation-based revenue projections since these are considered committed funds.
 - Project – TIP Projects' Total
 - Maintenance – TIP Lump Sum Total
 - Effingham and Bryan Projects are in STIP and will move from STIP to TIP eventually if they are located within the CORE MPO MPA. Staff will check the STIP information.
- 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% (*2045 MTP assumed \$2.5 million). We are assuming 3 million because we have to come up with more than a 20% match, most likely from TSPLOST, etc.,
 - Assume no other funding sources (grants, discretionary funds, PPP, etc.).
 - Maintenance
 - Assume no LIMG funds (staff is uncertain of what is the pct of LIMG funds for eligible maintenance projects.)

Based on these assumptions, we have recalculated the highway revenue projections. The estimated total for Highway Projects is approximately \$1.6 billion and Maintenance is approximately \$135 million, and the total is approximately \$1.8 billion.

Would these assumptions be okay with the TCC members?

- Do we want to use TIP committed funds to replace the state obligation-based revenue estimates for 2025, 2026 and 2027?
- Do we want to use the 2% to boost revenue, or keep the GDOT 1%?
- Are the assumptions for additional funds reasonable?

Mr. Leon Davenport, Consultant for Thunderbolt, stated he would prefer to go with the conservative approach of 1%. Hopefully our TIP will be rolling as revenues actually come in. Those shorter windows are more accurate with regards to what revenue will be. He prefers to use the GDOT estimate of 1%.

Mr. Tim Callanan, Effingham County, stated he doesn't believe we are carving this in stone by going with the conservative estimate of 1%.

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked Ms. Wykoda Wang what contributed to choosing the 2% back in the October meeting?

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated the MPOs across the state of Georgia all have used 2% or 2.5%. We are basically asking if we would rather go with all the Georgia MPOs or with GDOT?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for the 2045 MTP we did use 1%. We documented that ARC was using 2.2%, Augusta was using 1%, and another MPO 2.5%. We listed several examples.

Ms. Asia Hernton asked if there are pros and cons of the 1% vs. the 2%?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the revenue estimates and cost estimates are all based on assumptions. If we can justify 2%, as long as we can balance the MTP, it is more important than pros and cons. What is the TCC decision? Would Chairperson Brooks want to have a vote?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated she is not sure how many people favor the 1% or 2%.

Mr. Leon Davenport stated he does not believe it needs to be put to a vote. If we want to keep the projections the way they are, he agrees to that. He was just voicing his preference. He believes a 1% difference over 20 years makes a considerable difference when you start looking at year 2050 to program those long-range projects. He is fine with whatever way we want to go. If other MPOs are comfortable with it, and we want to follow that, then he is fine with it. GDOT has given their projection, and he believes that is the best and most conservative way to go.

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked can we call a vote to stay at the 2% annual growth rate?

Mr. Nathan Clark, City of Richmond Hill, motioned to vote to stay at the 2% annual growth rate; seconded by Ms. Calia Brown, Bike Walk Savannah. The vote passed with none opposed. We will stay at the 2% annual growth rate.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the next question is does TCC want to replace the state obligation authority-based estimates with the committed funds from the TIP? Also use the lump sum in the TIP as the base estimate for the Maintenance revenues? Cost Band One overlaps with the TIP, so when we include actual projects into the TIP, we have actual cost estimates for those projects in Cost Band One. Those cost estimates use the TIP numbers. If we use the state obligation authority-based estimates, the revenue probably will not even cover those project costs.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated if those are the most accurate numbers, she doesn't see why we wouldn't use that, instead of the projections.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated so for the top 3 years, we want to use the actual committed funds from the TIP?
Chairperson Deana Brooks stated she thinks so, yes.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked what about additional revenues? Should we assume additional HB 170 funds? Grant funds are not reliable. One grant fund she might add in, the City of Savannah received the Reconnecting Communities Grant, which we are processing an amendment into the TIP portion. For grants we either get it or we don't, so we are currently assuming no grants or HB 170 funds.

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated since we did not put in HB 170 funds and we went with the 2% instead of 1% annual growth rate, that puts us in the middle which is a little bit more conservative. So that will satisfy those members who want to be conservative. It is her opinion to assume zero dollars.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz, CAT, stated if we do receive a grant, then we would do a TIP amendment to receive the grant. She believes for planning purposes it is better to assume zero dollars since the grants are not a guaranteed revenue source.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked what about the LMIG funds? What are the percentages of LMIG funds that we are committing not to local roads but to principal arterial, minor arterial? Do you commit any of the LMIG funds for the maintenance on the major roadways? This is a question for all the jurisdictions.

Mr. Leon Davenport stated on behalf of Pooler and Garden City both, they are using their LMIG funds on their own local roads, for paving, resurfacing and that kind of stuff. They are not using the LMIG funds for arterial or collectors.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated then it is good to assume zero dollars.

Chairperson Deanna Brooks stated for Chatham County she knows they have Montgomery Cross, Little Neck Road coming up. We do use some, but she does not have a set percentage to give.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked is it a good assumption to use zero dollars from LMIG for this?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated yes.

Mr. Leon Davenport said he would think so.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked what about the local contributions? We have to come up with additional funds to cover project costs. Previously we were only counting on Chatham County's SPLOST. Now we know that Effingham and Bryan Counties have TSPLOST, so she boosted the number from \$2.5 to \$3 million dollars. Is that reasonable?

Mr. Leon Davenport stated he does not want to over inflate it, but he does not want to make it less either. He believes we should keep it at \$3 million.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated Effingham County will be using those funds as well.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked so \$3 million is a good estimate?

Mr. Tim Callanan stated yes.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated then we will use the \$3 million estimate.

Ms. Wang asked do we have additional funding source that we need to consider? If not, we will make the assumptions of 2% annual growth rate, revenue adjustment using the TIP committed funds to replace the estimates (she will get the Bryan and Effingham County projects and re-calculate), and for additional revenues we will assume \$3 million for the additional match. The total Highway Revenue will be around \$1.8 billion. As mentioned previously, we have to account for the Year of Expenditure, which means both the revenues and the project cost estimates have to be inflated into each Cost Band. We want to divide the revenues and projects into 3 Cost Bands.

- We are proposing for Cost Band One to be 8 years. In the previous 2040 Plan, we had 5 years for Cost Band One, it overlapped with the TIP and caused headaches for Staff when we had to amend the TIP. For the 2045 MTP, we did 8 years for Cost Band One, so we can do two continuous TIPs and that would still correspond to Cost Band One. That is why we are suggesting keeping 8 years in Cost Band One.
- The reasoning for 9 years for Cost Band Two is because of the mid-year, for all the project costs must be inflated to the mid-year. If we have two mid-years, then we don't know which year to inflate the cost to, so that is why we suggest 9 years to have the mid-year at 2037. So we will inflate the cost to 2037 for Cost Band Two projects.
- For Cost Band Three, the mid-year will be 2046.

Is this a good approach? The revenue allocations for Cost Band One, Two and Three are listed on a table attached to the agenda. The revenues for projects and maintenance are still separated. Any different ideas on the Cost Bands?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated that we don't seem to have any different ideas for the Cost Bands. She thinks the explanation for the mid-year choice is sound.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated these are draft numbers listed under each Cost Band (on table attached to agenda). Under each Cost Band, these revenues will cover Project and Maintenance. For the 2045 MTP, we allocated the revenues for different projects. One big chunk is for specific highway projects, but we did have some set aside, like operational set aside, transit set aside, and bike/ped/trail set aside.

- Operational set aside is for smaller projects, which would be roundabouts, intersection improvements or signal coordination. In the 2045 MTP, we used the lump sum as the basis. At that time, about 9.5% of the total projection revenue was set aside for Operational improvements. She calculated from this TIP and the lump sum is about 12%, so we might boost it up. Not only because the lump sum category is larger than 12%, but also because a lot of the projects, signal coordination, etc. contribute to maintaining existing roadways. That is the top response from our 2050 MTP survey. People want to maintain existing roadways, and Operational set aside will contribute to that. Also if the traffic is moving more smoothly, that also contributes to Greenhouse Gas reduction which is a Federal emphasis now. We are proposing this 12% based on good assumptions. We want to ask for the TCC members' input. Are you okay with this approach?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated yes, she thinks the 12% makes sense.

- Ms. Wykoda Wang stated if there are no other questions she will move on to the Transit set aside. We are going to talk about the Transit revenues estimates based on the FTA funds later. She is now talking about the FHWA funds that can be used for transit projects. Every time we do a Call for Projects, CAT applies; when they get the funding award, we flex the funds from the FHWA to the FTA side. This is the FHWA side of the funding. For the 2045 MTP, we assumed \$700,000 for the replacement of one bus. We thought of boosting it up for the transit improvements. After attending a CAT public meeting, Ms. Mary Moskowitz told Ms. Wykoda Wang that even if CAT wants to replace one bus, the electric bus is more expensive at \$1.3 million opposed to the \$1 million for a regular bus. Transit Improvements was a big response from the 2050 MTP survey - people want good public transportation. We can help CAT to make improvements with bus stops, charging stations, etc. If we support public transportation, it also reduces greenhouse gas emissions. So, do the TCC members want to use \$1 million, \$1.3 million, or \$700,000 for Transit set aside?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated that CAT's latest estimate for an electric bus is a little over \$1.3 million. Generally with the FHWA grants they provide an 80% match, so \$1 million would not even cover the 80% match. She would certainly want a little more to move forward with the best replacement plan. We are looking at improving some of the transit stops, which is considered a high need in our MTP.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked what is the number Ms. Mary Moskowitz wants to propose?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated she would propose the \$1.3 million.

Mr. Leon Davenport stated he is good with the \$1.3 million as well.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated okay, we want to give CAT \$1.3 million.

Chairperson Deana Brooks asked with the set aside, is CAT still eligible for other funding sources? Is that \$1.3 million just specific to CAT?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, CAT will probably receive around \$7 million of FTA funds. So if we gave them the \$1.3 million, this is additional funding from the FHWA side. When we do a Call for Projects, if CAT applies for and get those funds, then the \$1.3 million will be transferred from FHWA to FTA.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated FHWA sets aside funding for transit, but we have to ask to flex/transfer the funds from FHWA to FTA. The money CAT receives from FTA is not enough to cover all of their transit replacement needs. Yes, CAT does receive other funding sources, but this is allocated in CAT's budget as a funding source.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if the TCC members are good with the \$1.3 million for CAT each year?

Mr. Leon Davenport stated yes.

- Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for bike/ped/trail set aside, previously we were using the Y301 funds in the TIP as the basis. We got about \$500,000 each year for Y301 funds. For the current TIP, the average is about \$1.36 million a year for matched funds. We can use the \$1.36 million or we can use the mode share. Bike/ped/trail projects was one of the top responses from our 2050 MTP survey - people want good bike/ped/trail facilities. Currently we have Chevis Road project, Garrad Ave project, and Truman Linear Park Trail Phase II-B. Based on our cost estimates, it is more than \$1.36 million; but in terms of the financial plan we have to make assumptions. If we just use the Y301 funds as the basis, the average is about \$1.36 million.

Another option is looking at the mode share as the basis for bike/ped/trail set aside. Bryan County's bike/walk mode share is about 1.2%, Chatham County's is about 3%, and Effingham County's is about 0.7%. Looking at the census information, it says 'workers 16 years and older'. Children under the age of 16 are the dominant users of the biking and walking mode share. Actually 3% is a minimum. When we compare the bike/ped/trail set aside for using \$1.36 million a year vs. using 3% Mode Share as the basis (assuming we are not using the TIP numbers), the difference is around \$4 million for Cost Band One, more than \$4 million for Cost Band Two, and around \$7 million for Cost Band Three. It does make a difference if you use the mode share as the basis because it is adjusted with the growth rate. What would the TCC members like to use for the bike/ped/trail set aside?

Mr. Tim Callanan asked what are Ms. Wykoda Wang's recommendations?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated currently the \$1.36 million she is using for each year is based on the Y301 funds in the TIP. Every time we do a Call for Projects, some of our projects, like bike/ped/trail projects, also receive Carbon Reduction Program funds and Y230 funds. Basically, what they get is more than \$1.36 million each year. We need to have a good basis to use this assumption if we want to use the mode share at 3% as the basis. The TCC members need to decide.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated that is a big difference going from the \$1.36 million to what? Asked if he is reading this correctly?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated \$1.36 million is less than 3% of the mode share. 3% is based on each year's revenue and adjusted for inflation.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated using the table on the slide, the 3% over the eight-year period would mean \$14 million over the period of Cost Band One.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated we should use the 3%.

Mr. Mary Moskowitz stated she agrees, we should use 3%.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the mode share is more than what the statistics show, because the statistics only account for works over 16 years old. What about the children under 16? They would use bike/ped/trails more.

It is confirmed we will use the 3%.

- Ms. Wang asked since resiliency is an emphasis area for FHWA, do we want to add a resiliency set aside? Right now, it is hard to define what specific resiliency projects to talk about. Bike/ped/trail projects are pretty easy to see, as there is a bike lane or sidewalk; transit projects would be a bus or bus stops; and operational projects would be traffic signals or roundabouts. For resiliency, what kind of projects would be considered resiliency? This is just a thought or idea thrown out. If we don't want to do resiliency set aside, maybe the TCC members would want to add a resiliency cost to each specific project? Do the TCC members want to consider a resiliency set aside or resiliency cost contingency for specific projects?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz asked if we know what other MPOs are doing. In her experience she would say all projects need to have some sort of resiliency component, rather than saying this one special project needs resiliency while others don't.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked Ms. Mary Moskowitz to clarify that she doesn't think we need a set aside for resiliency?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated all projects should have a resiliency component included in their plans, so no, we don't need a resiliency set aside.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated she has been researching on what other MPOs are doing. Right now, it seems that Florida DOT has some cost feasibility plan guidance for their MPOs. FHWA has general guidance on how to address resiliency, a lot of it more of a life-cycle analysis, thinking of potential costs if we don't do anything, etc. There are federal regulations coming out for states to develop a risk-based asset management plan and consider financial life-cycle cost. She has some preliminary research but nothing definite. Florida is trying quite a bit to get their MPOs on board to include resiliency costs. Chairperson Deanna Brooks stated it sounds like at this time we really don't have a solid definition of which projects would qualify. She understands having an effect on the life-cycle of the projects, but we can't identify specific projects that would fit in this resiliency allocation, so she does not believe we are ready for a resiliency set aside at this time.

Mr. Leon Davenport stated he agrees with Chairperson Deanna Brooks. He thinks what we could do to emphasize the resiliency aspect in our Call for Projects is to include it in our prioritization criteria, to give it a boost if it has resiliency planned.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated okay, we will not have a resiliency set aside.

Ms. Wang showed an example for the three set asides - operational, transit, and non-motorized in the slides attached to agenda. The rest of the project revenue will be used for specific projects. These numbers will be updated after incorporating the decisions from today's meeting. Are the TCC members good with these three set asides? Chairperson Deana Brooks stated we are good with the three set asides.

Transit Revenues

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for the Transit Revenue Estimates, besides the \$1.3 million from FHWA we just talked about, we are focusing on the FTA side of it. Looking at the current TIP, each year the transit revenue is different because each year CAT or CRC might get some grants. For FY 2024, we have \$7 million of flexed funds from previous years. FY 2025, we have grant funding from THUD at \$14 million. FY 2027 is the only year we don't see any grants. The total revenue is about \$10 or \$9 million. The MTP is more related to the capital improvements, so we are not considering operations. When checking FY 2027, out of the \$9 million about \$3 million is for operating costs. We can assume \$7 million will be used for transit capital improvements. We are using the \$7 million as the basis and we can do some adjustments, assuming we receive grant funds. In the 2045 MTP, we assumed \$7.5 million which is pretty consistent with what we are trying to do over here. Our estimate is about \$7 million for capital improvements, but with a little bit of an additional grant. She is assuming we will use the same 2045 MTP assumption at \$7.5 million with the 2% annual inflation rate for the transit revenue for 2050

MTP. Are the TCC members okay with the \$7.5 million and 2%? If we are using 2% for the Highway, we should use 2% as well for the Transit, but what about the \$7.5 million for capital improvements?

Ms. Mary Moskowitz stated she thinks that is a good estimate, and Ms. Wykoda Wang is correct that it ebbs and flows depending on if we have a major capital investment. That is a good starting point.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if Chairperson Deana Brooks wants to go with the CAT suggested \$7.5 million?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated yes, she thinks \$7.5 million works well.

MS. Wykoda Wang stated so that is settled for the transit revenues.

Highway Project Selection and Prioritization

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that most of the Cost Band One projects are already in the pipeline. Currently in the 2045 MTP, most of those projects have been completed, under construction, or in the pipeline. We want to carry the 2045 MTP Cost Band One pipeline projects over to 2050 MTP as priority projects. For Cost Band Two and Three projects, we want them to go through the project selection and prioritization process. Genesis will share what she has been doing.

Ms. Genesis Harrod, CORE MPO Staff, stated that 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. For Cost Band Two and Three we wanted to do some more analysis, so we made a matrix of the different study recommendations. When the MPO or our consultants do studies, we come up with recommendations on what projects need to be put forward to mitigate any of the problems that the study found. We had a list of those, and the only thing missing is the Travel Demand Model, which GDOT is working on now. Once we get those projects, we will be able to complete the list. We selected the projects with the most frequent recommendations throughout the studies. We put an X mark in the matrix to assign those projects to a higher tier. When she went through all those, the projects were mentioned 4, 3, 2 and 1 times which correspond to the tiers in the matrix with tier one being the projects that were mentioned the most. There are 7 Tier One projects and 42 Tier Two projects. The Tier One projects automatically go into the 2050 MTP. The Tier Two projects have to be whittled down a bit more because we also have more projects that might be included once the Travel Demand Model comes in. We wanted to ensure that we had a robust and thorough analysis. These are given across the entire MPA, including everybody's analysis and recommendations as we wanted to be as inclusive as possible. Everything else is waiting on the Travel Demand Model results.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the first selection is based on region wide analysis. The Travel Demand Model is 3 counties, Freight Plan is 3 counties, Congestion Management Process is 3 counties, the Coastal Empire Study is 4 counties and the 2045 MTP is regional as well. Those would be the major considerations. After those, we have to consider sub-area studies like US 80 Corridor Study, SR 307 Corridor Study, etc. Those are specific corridor studies. If SR 204 Corridor Study is not done yet, you cannot say no improvements will be made on SR 204. We want to focus on regionwide studies first. If our projects are already consistent with those four or five regional analyses, additional studies will confirm the needs. For example, improvement recommendation at US 80 @ SR 307 was confirmed by the US 80 Corridor Study and the SR 307 Corridor Study, but it was confirmed previously by the Travel Demand Model, Congestion Management Process, and Coastal Empire Study. In short, we want to focus on regionwide studies first, and then the corridor-based studies will be additionally confirming. That is how we want to select the projects first. Then as Ms. Genesis Harrod mentioned, the Tier Two and Tier Three projects would go through project prioritization. This is what we are proposing, are the TCC members okay with this approach?

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated she thinks it sounds good. Her initial reservation is because she knows we are expanding the boundaries, but it sounds like most of these studies that we are basing this off of include Effingham and Bryan Counties. It seems like a good basis for doing the project selection.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we do have projects coming from Bryan and Effingham Counties in the Freight Plan, the Coastal Empire Study, and the Travel Demand Model. The Travel Demand Model results for Network 4 are supposed to come in tomorrow, so we will check what that looks like. Those projects regionwide would be the first choice. After we do the project selection through this process, we will have 40-50 projects. How do we narrow that down into the financially constrained plan? We have to do cost estimating and project prioritization. The highest priority projects will be in Cost Band One, higher priority in Cost Band Two, and the rest will be in Cost Band Three.

If we have 50 projects, they would go through the Needs screening, then Sustainability/Resiliency screening, then Equity screening. The Equity screening is highlighted in red, because the Needs screening and Sustainability screening were carried over from the 2045 MTP. We were using a two-screening process for the 2045 MTP, but for the 2050 MTP we want to add Equity screening.

The factors and goals are listed on the slide show attached to agenda. Some factors are level of service, truck traffic, freight connections to strategic infrastructure, crash rates, designated evacuation route, connecting population to employment, etc. Projects will be given scores based on these factors. All the performance measures listed in black are carried over from the 2045 MTP. We do want to include new measures under these criteria for the 2050 MTP and the new measures are highlighted in red. For example, under Safety and Security, we want to add pedestrian/bike injuries and crash density as some of the measures. Also, for Resiliency and Environment, new measures are highlighted in red. Equity is what we are proposing for the third screening, and that is why all Equity measures are highlighted in red. These are the criteria we are proposing. Now let us focus on the factors - we will work on finding the data sources for the prioritization, are the TCC members okay with these measures? Like level of service, truck traffic, freight connections, etc.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated that she doesn't have any standouts from the measures listed here.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that she had posted the draft presentation file to the agenda online, and she made more changes before this meeting. She will post the updated version after today's meeting. If the members have any questions, please email her so that we can start to do the project prioritization.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated yes, the TCC members can do that. Ms. Wykoda Wang stated our next meeting will focus on the results of the prioritization. Please look at everything after the meeting and send feedback as soon as possible.

Transit Projection Selection

Ms. Wykoda Wang indicated that we would try to use the Transit Asset Management Plan, Master Transit Plan, Transit Development Plan, and the FY 2024 - 2027 TIP as the basis for transit project selection. Transit projects would not be that specific; instead, it would be a category, like vehicle replacement for Fixed Route, Paratransit, ITS, etc. Ms. Mary Moskowitz had another project that is not included, so we will rely on CAT to take a look at the proposed Transit Projects.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz clarified for the group that the project is the Para and Mirco Transit Maintenance Facility.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked the TCC members to take a look at the proposed Transit Projects and send her feedback so that she may incorporate the input.

Development of the Fiscally Constrained 2050 MTP

The third step is the development of the Financially Constrained Plan. We have the revenues, we have the prioritized projects, now we have to develop the cost estimates for those projects and balance it out in the Financially Constrained Plan. For the TIP projects, we will use the project costs in the TIP. The recommendations for the studies or plans also have project costs. Ms. Genesis Harrod did acquire the cost estimating tool, and she is using the tool to calculate the project costs. We will do a comparison to see which one makes sense from

the recommended plan or from the cost estimating tool. The result will be the base cost. We would assume that base year 2025 would be the first year. The cost estimate would have to be inflated into the Year of Expenditure dollars. So we have the base cost estimate and apply the inflation factors based on the annual inflation rate. GDOT has some statistics, as well as the County, CAT, and City of Savannah. The statistics show that projects' costs actually increased dramatically over the past several years. If we are looking long term, what is the inflation factor we want to use? Our 2045 MTP used the 3.5% annual increase rate based on the Consumer Price Index. The FHWA recommendation is to use the local inflation rate; if we don't have that available, FHWA says 4% would be a good estimate. Based on how crazy inflation is currently, we would say 4% might be a better indicator. Based on the 4% annual increase, we have the inflation factors. Cost Band One projects are inflated into year 2028 dollars; the inflation factor is 1.125. Cost Band Two will be using the mid-year 2037, and the inflation factor would be 1.6. Cost Band Three will be using the mid-year 2046, and based on the 4% annual growth rate, the inflation factor would be 2.28. Are the TCC members okay with the 4% annual growth rate, or would you like to use something higher or lower?

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated that she wanted to point out with economy, please remember that although inflation has cooled, the prices are high and are not going to go back down. The future inflation is on top of the prices we already have. We want to make sure we are remembering that prices have already gone up, for the vast majority of companies the prices will not go back down when looking at the cost of concrete, cost of wood, etc. Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the GDOT numbers were included in the financial plan documentation. Some of the cost increase was at 81% for the past two years for maintenance or operational improvement projects, so it was more than 100%. We are looking long-term all the way to 2050. We are asking TCC members whether 4% is a good assumption.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated that she doesn't have anything against the 4%. She did have a question with the cost estimating tool. Have you looked at it against projects that we have better cost numbers for to see the accuracy of the cost estimating tool? Is the MPO staff trying to get all projects to use the cost estimating tool so that they are all starting with a similar base cost? Or it is the cost estimates that came from the studies more preferred? Curious about the base of the cost estimates.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she is certain about projects in FY 2025 - 2027 because those are TIP based. She has not done the studies from the cost estimating tool as Ms. Genesis Harrod was doing that work.

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated she compared the two. Generally, it is a bit of both; this is because you want to make sure that the cost makes sense for what everything should cost now. The projects that we have previously for the 2045 MTP, the cost estimates were done in 2019. Now we want to make sure that costs are in line with what the prices are today. From the ones she has done thus far, for the project selections they seem to be on par with how much it would cost in today's dollars. That is what you want to make sure of because the 2050 MTP is for 2024, so we have to have today's dollars. That is what we are looking at when doing these cost estimates. The base costs are assumed from 2016, and that is when the cost estimating tool was created. You can go into the cost estimating tool and change the date, which includes inflation factor and growth rate factor of your choosing. She has put those numbers in there and everything is on par with what it should cost today. Chairperson Deana Brooks stated because we are looking so long-term, that she wanted to make sure everything had a consistent base cost for the projections into the future.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated actually in the 2045 MTP, for example, Project DeRenne has the construction cost at \$30 million. She doesn't think that makes sense and it will have to be adjusted and boosted up. Even the Right-of-Way cost is more than \$26 million.

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated for the 2050 MTP, she did not put in Right-of-Way costs. For instance, a signal has not gone up exceptionally in price. There are certain things that will stay around the same but other things will go up depending on the materials included in the cost of construction.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated another thing she wants to ask, since Ms. Mary Moskowitz asked previously that every project should have resiliency incorporated. Do we want to boost the rating more by adding a resiliency

contingency? Ms. Anna McQuarrie has done research on what other MPOs and DOTs are doing for their resiliency. Do we need to adjust to 5% resiliency or 10%, 6%, etc.? Do we want to adjust for resiliency for the cost estimating tool for the base year estimate?

Ms. Genesis Harrod asked if that is practiced across the state, or do we want to be the pioneers in doing that?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that we might be one of the pioneers if we start doing this.

Ms. Genesis Harrod stated she thinks we might need more guidance from GDOT.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if Kaniz Sathi from GDOT was online?

Ms. Kaniz Sathi stated she believes we can discuss this with Mr. Habte Kassa of GDOT because there are documented federal regulations about the project requirements and all these things. It would be good to get in contact with FHWA and Mr. Habte Kassa and have that information included in this highway project cost estimating approach.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will do more research on this, possibly we will add some kind of resiliency especially for projects in a vulnerable area.

Ms. Kaniz Sathi said something, but her statement was unintelligible due to the virtual meeting connections.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that she believes what Ms. Kaniz Sathi is saying is that we can send her the questions and Ms. Kaniz Sathi will send the questions to Mr. Habte Kassa who will provide an answer.

Chairperson Deana Brooks stated it sounds like we still need to do some research on the resiliency contingency adjustment. Were there any thoughts on the 4% annual growth rate?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will assume the 4% for now to see what the results look like.

She moved on and showed some examples of cost estimates that Ms. Genesis Harrod did using the cost estimating tool. Ms. Genesis Harrod did some cost estimating with selected projects and made adjustments, and these are just examples. Our next meeting will be dedicated to this.

In the Financially Constrained Plan, we have Set Asides for operational improvements, transit, etc. For those kinds of projects, we will have a policy, so we want to continue the proposed policies for Set Asides from the 2045 MTP, because the 2045 MTP made good policies.

- Operational Improvements Set Aside Policy - an operational improvement project is considered consistent with the 2050 MTP if 1. The project is consistent with MPO's plans (2050 Vision Plan, Freight Plan, CMP, etc.); 2. The project improves functionally classified roadways; 3. The project is in the CORE MPO's MPA; and 4. The project has a qualified local sponsor committing matching funds. Every time we do a Call for Projects, if you submit a project, we will check whether it is listed in the specific project category, or it is consistent with the proposed set aside.
- Transit Set Aside Policy - A transit improvement project is considered consistent with the 2050 MTP if 1. The project is consistent with the needs identified in the cost feasible transit plan of the 2050 MTP, or 2. The project is approved by the CORE MPO Board for inclusion in the TIP, and 3. The project has a qualified local sponsor committing matching funds.
- Non-Motorized Set Aside Policy - A bicycle, sidewalk, crosswalk or trail improvement project is considered consistent with the 2050 MTP if 1. The project is consistent with the CORE MPO Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, and 2. The project has a qualified local sponsor committing matching funds.

These would be some of the Set Aside policies carried over from the 2045 MTP, but if any TCC members have different opinions please let us know. We will also post this for the TCC members' consideration, if you don't agree with the language, please let us know.

For the 2050 MTP Financially Constrained Transit Plan, we will have to get together with Ms. Mary Moskowitz to map out things. For example, if CAT is doing 50 bus stop improvements, then we need to know how much money is needed for each year. We will allocate the funds and do cost estimating. We will work with CAT to develop the financially constrained transit plan.

Next Steps

The next steps would be finalizing the revenue estimates based on what we talked about, assumptions, set asides, etc. We will complete project selection and prioritization. Please send us your input on the project prioritization methodology, so after we have the projects, we will start the project prioritization. Then we will develop cost estimates for those selected projects. Finally, we will have the Financially Constrained 2050 Plan both Highway and Transit developed and will show the results. That is when we will see specific projects, what is the project and the cost estimate.

Our next meeting is on April 18th, but before that we might need a special-called TCC meeting to focus on the project selection and prioritization and cost estimating.

These are the next steps, any questions on this? We budgeted for one hour and are 18 minutes over. We will try to schedule another special-called TCC meeting in early April, then we will have a project list and cost estimates. Chairperson Deana Brooks asked that Ms. Wykoda Wang said she will post this presentation and if any TCC members have any additional feedback, please send it to Ms. Wykoda Wang, is that correct?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that is correct, especially the prioritization methodology and criteria. She will delete the Resiliency Set Aside in the slide presentation. She will finalize the presentation file and repost it to our website.

Chairperson Deana Brooks thanked everyone for joining us today and having this conversation. We will let you know when the next special-called meeting is.

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 March 21, 2024 Special Called 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.