



CORE MPO Advisory Committee on Accessible Transportation

Minutes
April 22nd, 2024, at 1:00pm

April 22, 2024, ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACCESSIBLE TRANSPORTATION

Voting Members	Representing	Present
Ben Lewis	Chatham County	X
Vacant	Savannah Council of the Blind	
Wayne Dawson	Savannah - Chatham County Fair Housing Council	
Brenda Pollen	Housing Authority of Savannah	X
Paula Valdez	Savannah Center for the Blind and Low Vision	X
Carol Hunt	NAACP - Savannah Branch	
Jackie Immel	Georgia Infirmary Day Care Center for Rehabilitation	
Shannon Ginn	Living Independence for Everyone (LIFE), Inc.	X
Patti Lyons	Senior Citizens Savannah - Chatham County, Inc.	
Representative	Savannah – Chatham Council on Disability Issues (SCCDI)	
Tyrone Palmer	National Federation of the Blind, Local Chapter	X
President & CEO	Goodwill Industries of the Coastal Empire	
Representative	Effingham County	
Representative	GDOT District Five	
Representative	Richmond Hill	
Asia Hernton	CORE MPO	X
Clealice Timmons	Coastal Center for Development Services	
Terry Tolbert	Economic Opportunity Authority	X
Tia Baker	Chatham Area Transit	
Vacant	GVRA/Chatham County Coastal Chapter-GA Association of the Deaf	
Voting Alternates	Representing	Present
Others	Representing	Present
Anna McQuarrie	CORE MPO/MPC	X
Kieron Coffield	CORE MPO	X
Wykoda Wang	CORE MPO	X

There was not a quorum at the beginning of the meeting, so we went over the status reports and agency reports. A quorum was reached later at the meeting, but we were not aware of it, so no action items were presented and acted on at this meeting.

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Action Items

1. [Approval of the February 26th, 2024, CORE MPO ACAT Meeting Minutes](#)
2. [Adoption of Updated MOU](#)
3. [FY 2024 - FY 2027 TIP Amendments April 2024](#)

III. Status Reports

4. [2050 MTP Update](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang, CORE MPO Staff, stated we are at the project selection and prioritization stage for the 2050 MTP update. We are going to divide the 2050 MTP into a Highway section and a Transit section.

Highway Revenues

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

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

CORE MPO made some adjustments.

- Keep **Project** and **Maintenance** revenues separated.
- Use **2%** annual inflation rate for all years 2026 – 2050 for both Project and Maintenance.
- Use revenues from the adopted **FY 2024 – 2027 TIP and STIP for FY 2025, 2026 and 2027** to replace projections since these are considered committed funds. Depending on June amendments, we might have to make more adjustments if the projects cannot make it to 2024 and will be moved to 2025 or 2026.
 - Project – Projects' Total
 - Maintenance – Lump Sum Total
- Add **state and local** funds for eligible roadways (collectors and above within CORE MPO MPA)
 - **Project**
 - Assume **no** available HB 170 funds

- Assume **\$3 million** annual local funds (SPLOST, TSPLOST, general funds) and adjust with annual inflation rate of **2%**
- Assume **no** other funding sources (grants, discretionary funds, PPP, etc.)
- **Maintenance**
 - Assume **no** LIMG funds

The total estimated Highway Revenues for 2050 MTP are about \$1.87 billion.

Revenue Allocations to Cost Bands:

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

For Project Revenues, we want to have several categories.

Revenue Allocations to Categories

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

Transit Revenues

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

2050 MTP Transit Revenue Estimates:

TIP Information for Reference

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

Assumptions:

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

Potential Adjustments – After checking the STIP, it is our understanding that the transit capital funds are allocated to the Coastal Region Commission. The money does not go to capital improvements, but to purchases services. We decided not to have additional funds for Bryan County and Effingham County.

Highway Projects Selection

- We developed a matrix using the Travel Demand Model, Regional Freight Plan, Congestion Management Process, Coastal Empire Study, the 2045 MTP, and some corridor studies like US 80, Effingham and Bryan Counties' MTP.
- Project Selection - review existing plans and study recommendations.
 - Projects included in Cost Band One of 2045 MTP that have not been implemented will be considered priority projects and carried over to 2050 MTP.
 - Projects included in Cost Bands Two and Three of 2045 MTP and projects from study recommendations were placed into the matrix and analyzed.
 - Projects with the **most frequent** recommendations throughout the studies, denoted with 'X' marks in the matrix, were assigned to a higher tier.
 - Original Selection from Matrix - 7 Tier 1 projects and 42 Tier 2 projects.
 - Grouped into Capacity Projects and Operational Improvement Projects
 - Big projects are broken down to smaller segments; only segments located within CORE MPO MPA are included.
 - Capacity Projects move to the prioritization stage.
 - Projects Selected for Prioritization – Tier 1 and Tier 2 Capacity Projects + 2045 MTP Cost Bands Two and Three Projects

We will use the regional studies first, such as the Coastal Empire Study, Regional Freight Plan, Travel Demand Model, Congestion Management Process, and the 2045 MTP. Those five categories would be the basis. If the project is consistent with those categories, it will be a higher priority. The sub-area studies will confirm the needs.

After checking over our list, we found out some of the projects are not included within the MPA Boundary, so those projects will be kicked out. In addition, the bigger projects such as I-95 auxiliary lane that goes all the way from SR 21 to US 17 will have to be divided into smaller segments. We are in this process.

We have selected 50 projects for further analysis. These projects will go through the project prioritization process.

Project Prioritization – 3 tier screening process

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

Transit Project Selection and Financial Plan Development

The transit project selection is based on the Transit Asset Management Plan, Master Transit Plan, Transit Development Plan and the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP. CAT will prioritize the projects. We will continue to work with CAT to allocate the revenue sources to these projects in Cost Bands One, Two and Three.

Highway Financial Plan Development

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

Base Year Cost Estimating

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

Year of Expenditure (YOE) Inflation Factors

- Annual Growth Rate – **4%**
- Inflation Factors
 - Cost Band One
 - FY 2025 – 2027 – Use **1** (no inflation factor as TIP project costs are already inflated)
 - FY 2028 – 2032 – Use **1.125** (Base Year 2025, Inflation Year 2028)
 - Cost Band Two: 2033 – 2041 (9 years; mid-year is 2037) – **1.60**
 - Cost Band Three: 2042 – 2050 (9 years; mid-year is 2046) – **2.28**

After we select the projects, we will do the cost estimating and revenue allocation. One project might have preliminary engineering in Cost Band One,

ROW in Cost Band Two, and Construction in Cost Band Three, all depending on the revenue balance at that point.

Proposed Policies for Set Asides

Operational Improvements Set Aside- 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
4. The project has a qualified local sponsor committing matching funds

Transit Set Aside - A transit improvement project is considered consistent with the 2050 MTP if

1. The project is consistent the needs identified in the cost feasible transit plan of the 2050 MTP, or
2. The 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 - 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
2. AND The project has a qualified local sponsor committing matching funds.

Resiliency Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization - Ms. Anna McQuarrie gave the presentation for Resiliency information for the MTP.

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

Resilience to Natural & Man-Made Threats

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

- Hazardous materials

Related MTP Goals & Objectives

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

How is resilience incorporated in the 2050 MTP?

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

Economic Benefits of Resilience Measures

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

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

Creating the Umbrella Resilience Set Aside Policy:

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

Case Study: Florida MPOs:

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

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

Need for Discretionary and Dedicated Resiliency Funding: Many participants indicated that a dedicated source of resiliency funds or discretionary funding sources would be hugely beneficial for conducting vulnerability assessments and resiliency corridor studies and developing plans and strategies. This funding may help reduce

conflicts with other transportation system needs and dedicated resiliency funding could be used as a “carrot” to incentivize inclusion of resiliency strategies.

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

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

Project Prioritization

Tier 2 Project Prioritization

1. Vulnerability Score: Utilizing the FHWA Vulnerability Assessment Scoring Tool (VAST) for composite score
 - Considers exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity •
 - Assessment team determining inputs
2. Evacuation Route: Yes/No
 - Example:
 - i. I-95 Auxiliary Lanes: No
 - ii. I-95 at SR 204/Gateway Interchange: Yes
3. Road Redundancy: Alternative routes available
 - Example
 - i. I-95 Auxiliary Lanes: Yes (Highway 17)
 - ii. I-95 at SR 204/Gateway Interchange: n/a

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

Equity Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization - Ms. Asia Hernton, MPO Staff, talked about Equity and the 2050 MTP.

What is Equity?

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

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

Why Include Equity in Transportation?

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

A transportation system is only equitable if it is safe, useful, and offers connection for all people.

It's not impossible! A great example is Hoboken, NJ. Also want to acknowledge the City of Savannah's study of the I-16 exit ramp removal, that will help reunite the community. We are getting the ball rolling on equity with planning and funding.

How is Equity being Incorporated into the 2050 MTP?

- Goals and Objectives
 - Safety and Security
 - Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity

- Needs Assessment
 - Non-Motorized Transportation Plan
 - Public Involvement (survey, etc.)
- Project Selection and Prioritization •
 - Equity Measures for 2050 MTP Highway Projects - **Prioritizing projects that improve equity*****
 - Equity Measures for Non-Motorized Transportation Plan
- Investments – 2050 MTP Fiscally Constrained Plan
 - Devoting highway funds to support transit development - transit set aside
 - Devoting more highway funds for bike, pedestrian, and trail projects – bike/ped set aside based on higher mode share
 - Transit investments to create transit/bike/ped connections (bus stop improvements, etc.)

Highway Project Prioritization and Equity

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

Transit Connection and Accessibility:

Does the project include bike and pedestrian improvements?

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

If yes, is the project:

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

Justification

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

Bike/Ped Connection and Accessibility

Does the project include bike/ped improvements?

- Yes > 5 points
- No > 0 points

If yes, is the project:

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

If yes, is the project:

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

If yes, does the project:

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

Justification

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

Connection and Accessibility to Critical Facilities

Is the project:

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

Is the project:

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

Is the project:

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

- Over 1 mile from a library > 0 points

Is the project:

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

Justification

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

Other Thoughts

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

Title VI/Environmental Justice Consideration

Does the project have bike and pedestrian improvements?

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

Justification •

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

Safety

Does the project include a median?

- Yes > 5
- No > 0

Justification

- Data is easily available

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

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

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

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

Additional Methods to Incorporate Equity in the Planning Process

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

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

Equity Data Sources

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

Mr. Shannon Ginn, LIFE, asked if this was everything that had come up from the last Non-Motorized Transportation meeting?

Ms. Asia Hernton stated at the previous meeting we devoted about half of the meeting to talking about the 2050 MTP and trying to brainstorm measures that would be important to the process. She took that input and checked if we had data available based on this input. Any of the input that was easy to find data for, that is what we went with in terms of what Equity scoring system we used.

5. Congestion Management Process Update

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the Congestion Management Process is where we do an evaluation of where the roadways are congested and find the specific mitigation measures.

Data sources used:

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

Looking at the STIP Network map, the red is where the congestion is very serious and we need to do something. The solutions may be road widening, signal improvements, ITS responses, etc. We will focus on the red congested areas. We identified a list of the top 20 most congested locations. Some of the congestion problems are already being addressed. We are double checking to make sure there are projects identified. If there are no projects identified, those projects will be considered in the 2050 MTP if they are on the priority list. We have different mitigation measures for different types of facilities, examples are listed. The 3rd draft of the CMP is attached to this agenda. We are asking ACAT members to please look at sections 9 and 10 and provide input, as there is more specific information.

6. Non-Motorized Transportation Plan Status Report

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

About the Plan:

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

- We are aiming to adopt the plan in June 2024.

Main Updates

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

About the Scoring Methodology

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

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

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

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

Updated Cost Estimation Methodology

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

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

7. MPO Boundary Follow Up and Bylaws Updates

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will talk about the Bylaws update. We have tried to schedule a combined meeting between the ACAT and CAC but have not been able to. We did adopt a new boundary at our CORE MPO Board February meeting, and the boundary map in the Bylaws has been updated.

Updates to the consolidated committees:

- ACAT and CAC original Bylaws were deleted.
However, the language used was consolidated into the Transportation Equity and Public Involvement Advisory Committee (TEPIAC) Bylaws.
- TEPIAC will take over for both the ACAT and CAC. This is mainly due to the struggle to get a quorum for both committees.
 - We have moved members who did not previously participate into non-voting roles.
 - Regular attendees are kept as voting members.
 - Combined committee will be about 15 voting members.
 - Quorum is $1/3$ of members + 1 = 6
- Duties and responsibilities
 - Will take on previous ACAT and CAC duties and responsibilities
 - Provide advice to CORE MPO Board on:
 - Public Involvement
 - Equity
 - ADA
 - Accessible Transportation
 - Guide the Staff on CORE MPO projects under purview:
 - Participation Plan
 - Title VI Plan
 - Limited English Proficiency Plan (Language Assistance Plan)
 - CAT Plans related to mobility management

Mr. Shannon Ginn asked if we are still trying to have this combined committee at the beginning of August.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will try to adopt this in June. Right now, we are working on the 2050 MTP project selection and prioritization, which we hope to complete in May. After that is done, we will be able to focus more on the Bylaws update. We are also going to adopt the MOU, we could not act on that today, because we didn't have quorum, but we will adopt the MOU eventually. The Transportation Equity and Public Involvement Advisory Committee (TEPIAC) is listed in the MOU, so the committee's responsibilities would be equity and public involvement.

We need to have a combined meeting with ACAT and CAC, so we can finalize the voting members, non-voting members, duties and responsibilities, etc. We can go through each line to make sure that we are all okay with this. Since the TEPIAC will have hybrid meetings (virtual and in-person), we will need to specify that in the Bylaws. It is important to have virtual attendance for our members with visual impairments and ADA accessibility needs, as it is difficult to arrange transportation to meet in-person.

Mr. Shannon Ginn wanted to clarify whether virtual attendance will always be an option, that being in-person is not a requirement.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, virtual attendance will always be an option. If you want to attend in-person, that is fine too. We want to specify the hybrid meetings for TEPIAC. With the other committee meetings, we don't specify that it has to be a hybrid meeting. We also need to decide on the TEPIAC meetings schedule. Did ACAT member still want to meet on Mondays at 1pm, or create a new schedule?

Mr. Shannon Ginn stated he is fine with the Monday at 1pm meeting time but is also open to other members' suggestions.

Ms. Paula Valdez stated she likes the Monday at 1pm meeting time but is also open to changing if needed.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated we will add that to our discussion when we have the combined ACAT and CAC meeting, to see what works for everyone.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the proposed language is in the MOU, which is a combination of the previous ACAT and CAC language. We will still have elections, chairperson, vice-chairperson, they will be elected at the last calendar meeting of the year. Please take a look and review this MOU, if you see anything you do not agree with, please let us know.

IV. Agency Reports (verbal)

Mr. Shannon Ginn, LIFE, stated last Friday was their annual Students for LIFE conference, which went really well. Other than that, LIFE doesn't have too much going on at the moment.

Ms. Paula Valdez, Savannah Center for the Blind and Low Vision, stated they have been doing a lot of getting back out in the community and getting their faces out there. COVID kind of knocked them down for a while. Also, they have incorporated peer and student relations meetings once a month. It just started last month and is going really well. It gives them the chance to know each other, not just people from the Savannah Center for the Blind and Low Vision. Anyone can come to these meetings. It's a great way to get together, to do things together, and get to know each other. Anika Fudge from the event center has been the leader and it really turned out good. The meeting is every fourth Friday from 10am to 2pm at the Center. It's a lot of fun and a good way to interact with people with disabilities and ask questions. They also go on trips and go out and do things as well. They also had a golf tournament recently. The Savannah Center for the Blind and Low Vision has really been reaching out.

Ms. Asia Hernton asked if anyone else would like to speak? Hearing none, this meeting is adjourned.

V. Other Business

VI. Public Participation Opportunities

VII. Notices

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

Report attached to agenda.

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

Report attached to agenda.

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

Report attached to agenda.

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

Report attached to agenda.

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

Report attached to agenda.

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

Report attached to agenda.

14. TIP Funding Tracking Report

Report attached to agenda.

15. Next CORE MPO ACAT Meeting June 24th, 2024, at 1:00pm

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the April 22nd, 2024, ACAT 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