



## CORE MPO Citizens Advisory Committee

Minutes  
April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024, at 5:30pm

### April 18, 2024, CORE MPO Citizens Advisory Committee

Voting Members	Representing	Present
Anthony (Tony) Abbott	Chatham County	X
Dr. Daniel Brantley	Chatham County	X
Vacant	Chatham County	
A'riel Johnson	Chatham Area Transit	X
Kevin Glover	Savannah	
Armand Turner	Savannah	X
Robert Pirie	Savannah	X
Vacant	Pooler	
Vacant	Garden City	
Brett Bennett	Effingham County	
Vacant	Port Wentworth	
Vacant	Richmond Hill	
Bill Grainger	Bloomingdale	
Robert Milie	Thunderbolt	
Vacant	Tybee Island	
Vacant	Vernonburg	
Others	Representing	Present
Wykoda Wang	CORE MPO	X
Asia Hernton	CORE MPO	X
Anna McQuarrie	CORE MPO/MPC	X
Kieron Coffield	CORE MPO/MPC	X
Hind Patel	MPC IT	X

#### I. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Robert Pirie motioned to approve the April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024, CAC meeting agenda; seconded by Mr. Tony Abbott. The motion passed with none opposed.

#### II. Action Items

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

Mr. Robert Pirie motioned to approve the February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024, meeting minutes; seconded by Mr. Tony Abbott. The motion passed with none opposed.

## 2. Adoption of Updated MOU

Ms. Wykoda Wang, CORE MPO, stated we have talked about the MOU at several meetings.

Summary of CORE MPO MOU Updates is listed below.

### **MOU Document**

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

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

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

- Base Amount - local governmental member's contribution base amount of \$1,000 - unchanged.
- Counties and Municipalities – population based share
  - Effingham County - Effingham County will pay 100% of the county's share of the membership dues, covering all of the Effingham municipalities located within the CORE MPO MPA boundary.
  - Bryan County - Bryan County and the City of Richmond Hill will split the county's share of the membership dues based on their respective population within the CORE MPO MPA boundary.
  - Chatham County - Chatham County and its municipalities will split the county's share of the membership dues based on their respective population within the CORE MPO MPA boundary.
- Modal Shares
  - CAT - The Chatham Area Transit Authority would contribute a fixed amount based upon the 60th percentile of the counties and municipalities contributions.
  - GPA and SAV - Georgia Ports Authority and the Savannah Airport Commission would contribute a fixed amount based upon the 70th percentile of the counties and municipalities contributions.
- Others
  - GDOT – GDOT pays 10% of the transit planning (Section 5303) local match. Thus, no additional membership dues will be assessed from GDOT.
  - MPC and Advisory Committees - not to be assessed dues.

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

The CORE MPO staff believes the MOU is ready for execution, so we will put it up for adoption at the CORE MPO Board Meeting on May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Ms. A'riel Johnson, CAT, asked if we have a proposed date for the elections for the CORE MPO Board, or is it too soon?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we are trying to adopt the MOU on May 3<sup>rd</sup>. After that we will have the MOU sent out to all the parties for their signatures, like, for example, at CAT's next Board Meeting. We hope to collect all of the signatures between May and June. Then hopefully in June we will adopt the bylaws. After we get the 2050 MTP wrapped up, we will have time to work on the bylaws. So in August at the first meeting, we hope to do the election, and the new term will start in October.

Mr. Anthony Abbott asked about Bryan County - they do not want the northern portion included?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated Bryan County does not want the northern portion included. Our new MPA boundary map can be found in Exhibit A of the MOU file attached to the agenda. At our last meeting, we presented the three scenarios that were given to Bryan County. Bryan County chose the minimum.

Mr. Anthony Abbott stated he believes that Bryan County is being short sighted. What if they come back and ask to join?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the City of Savannah and CAT reached out to the CORE MPO staff asking staff to contact Bryan County to change their minds. We reached out to GDOT and FHWA for clarification. Their response is at a minimum we must update our MPA boundary after every census and we are able to update the boundary between censuses based on the agreement. Even if this is the case, staff thinks the update will entail a lot of additional work for the MPO. Besides updating the boundary, MOU and Bylaws, we have to update/amend all of our planning documents – MTP, TIP, UPWP, Participation Plan, Title VI Plan, etc. If we don't adopt the 2050 MTP, we risk losing all of our funding from FHWA and FTA. We cannot do that. Staff strongly suggests that we should try to avoid updating the MPA boundary between censuses.

Mr. Anthony Abbott stated that Bryan County could join at the next census.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes. In their letter, Bryan County mentioned they would be open to reevaluating after the next census. CORE MPO staff's take is that we must adopt the boundary so we can move on to the revenue and the project lists to get the 2050 MTP adopted. If Bryan County asked to join in June, our answer is no.

Dr. Daniel Brantley stated CORE MPO staff was told to approach Bryan County, how is it going?

Ms. Wykoda Wang clarified that the City of Savannah and CAT wanted CORE MPO staff to reach out, to talk reason to Bryan County to persuade them not to back out. The CORE MPO Board adopted the boundary in February, so we must move on. The revenue estimates from GDOT were based on the boundary adopted in February, so we would have to recalculate everything if we change the boundary. We need to move on as we have limited capacity and need to focus on more important things.

Mr. Anthony Abbott stated he wanted to make a comment that he thinks in ten years huge amounts of development will be over and mostly everything will be already done.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated Bryan County will work directly with GDOT on those issues, as they don't go through the CORE MPO. We do have several projects that overlap into their boundary, which we cannot spend our money on, and GDOT must handle that for Bryan County.

Mr. Anthony Abbott stated since the Hyundai plant is an important project for the state, it is probably good that Bryan County works directly with GDOT.

Mr. Robert Pirie asked what Bryan County's primary reasoning for not joining?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated Bryan County sent the CORE MPO a letter stating their reasoning for not joining and that letter was attached to the February agenda. Bryan County said most development is happening in South Bryan County, and the rest of the county is rural.

Mr. Robert Pirie motioned to endorse the adoption of the updated MOU; seconded by Dr. Daniel Brantley. The motion passed with none opposed.

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

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

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

### **SR 404 SPUR/US 17 @ BACK RIVER**

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

#### **SR 26/US 80 @ LAZARETTO CREEK**

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

#### **GARRARD AVENUE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

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

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

Dr. Daniel Brantley motioned to endorse the FY 2024-2027 TIP Amendments; seconded by Mr. Tony Abbott. The motion passed with none opposed.

### **III. Status Reports**

#### 4. 2050 MTP Update

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for the 2050 MTP we are at the stage of Financial Plan Development. We are talking about Revenues, Project Selection, and Financial Balance.

#### Highway Revenues

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

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

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

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

2050 MTP Highway Revenues Estimates – TIP/STIP/MTP Adjustments and Final Revenue Estimate can be found in the presentation file attached to the agenda. The total is about \$1.87 billion for the next 25 years. We will allocate the funds into each Cost Band, as the projects have to be inflated to the Cost Band mid-year.

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

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

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

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

The 2050 MTP Highway Revenue Allocation by Cost Band and Category chart is attached to the agenda. There we can see how much money will be available for specific projects. For example, Cost Band One revenue is about \$418 million, but many of the funds have already been allocated to pipeline projects. The next step is to develop a project list and prioritize that list, so the priority projects would go into Cost Bands One, Two and Three.

### Transit Revenues

For Transit Revenues, we decided to use the TIP as the basis for the estimate.

### **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 (TCC Input on March 21, 2024):

1. Transit Revenues for Capital Projects - \$7.5 million annual transit funds
2. Inflate transit revenues to year of expenditure (YOE) with annual inflation rate of 2%
3. Adjust revenues for FY 2025 – 2027 with TIP/STIP numbers
4. Allocate transit revenues to cost bands

#### Potential Adjustments

1. Bryan County
2. Effingham County

The Bryan and Effingham Counties Transit Funds are actually allocated to the Coastal Regional Commission, just to provide transportation services and not to be used for purchasing buses or for capital projects, etc. After meeting with TCC, we agreed to assume zero dollars for transit capital improvements for these two counties.

### Project Selection and Prioritization

Transit Project Selection - project list is attached to the agenda.

- Proposed Transit Capital Projects come from the following plans and programs.
  - Transit Asset Management Plan
  - Master Transit Plan
  - Transit Development Plan
  - FY 2024 – 2027 TIP

Highway Project Selection - review existing plans and study recommendations.

- Projects included in Cost Band One of the 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 the 2045 MTP and projects from study recommendations were placed into a **matrix** and analyzed.
- Projects with the most frequent recommendations throughout the studies, denoted with 'X' marks in the matrix, were assigned to a higher tier. The goal is to have a total of 30 projects for the 2050 MTP.
  - Projects mentioned four times, with four checks, were assigned to Tier 1.
    - There are 7 Tier 1 projects.
  - Projects mentioned three times, with three checks, were assigned to Tier 2. The Tier 2 projects will have to be further analyzed to determine which projects qualify for the 2050 MTP project list selection.
    - There are 42 Tier 2 projects.
  - Projects mentioned two times, with two checks, were assigned to Tier 3.

- Projects mentioned 1 time, with one check, were assigned to Tier 4.

#### Highway Projects Prioritization

- Top Tier projects will go through further project prioritization process.
  - Highest priority – Cost Band One
  - Higher priority – Cost Band Two
  - Priority – Cost Band Three
- Project Prioritization – 3 tier screening process
  - 1st – Needs screening
  - 2nd – Sustainability/Resiliency screening
  - 3rd - Equity screening

The final phase is the 2050 MTP Financially Constrained Plan.

#### Highway Financial Plan Development

##### 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**

#### **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; and
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 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 - 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.

#### Next Steps

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

We have 50 projects already mapped out. We may have some changes, but this will be the basis that we use. Please see the map attached to the agenda. These are our identified needs; we will prioritize the list and compare



projects apples to apples. We have two different tables for capacity building projects and operational improvement projects respectively, so they will have their own scores and be allocated to the Cost Bands.

The draft project list is attached to the agenda. Some projects in TIP will automatically be carried over to Cost Band One. After including some of the TIP projects, the revenue available in Cost Band One is about \$100 million. So, we do not have much revenue for Cost Band One and the highest priority projects will go into Cost Band One. Additional projects for inclusion in the fiscally constrained plan will come from the prioritization process.

### Highway Project Prioritization Process

**Needs Based Prioritization** - implementing the 'needs' scoring criteria. There are about 50 projects to prioritize. All projects must be within the CORE MPO Boundary, so we cannot use funding on segments of projects that fall outside our boundary.

For the Needs scoring, we want to consider the level of service, truck traffic, freight connections to strategic infrastructure, crash rate, pedestrian and bicycle crash rates, bridge ratings and conditions, etc. we are still finalizing the scoring.

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

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

Mr. Anthony Abbott asked about Green Island Road multipurpose trail that was among the projects discussed earlier.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Green Island Road trail project is already in the TIP, so it is moving along and is automatically carried over to Cost Band One.

Mr. Anthony Abbott asked if CORE MPO staff knows the timeline on the project.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she believes construction will start in 2027, but it is a relatively small project. Normally, the bike/ped projects are small. It should be very soon.

### ***Resiliency Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization***

Ms. Anna McQuarrie, MPC/MPO Staff, stated she will talk about how resiliency is inserted into the various sections Ms. Wykoda Wang has already discussed.

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

#### Resilience to Natural & Man-Made Threats

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

#### Related MTP Goals & Objectives

- Goal: Safety & Security
  - Reduce the rate, frequency, and severity of crashes, injuries, and fatalities for all modes and freight and at-grade rail crossings

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

How is resilience incorporated in the 2050 MTP?

- Highway Funds – Specific Projects
  - Project Prioritization – Screening for Suitability/Resiliency
    - Impacts to environmental, cultural, and social resources
    - Climate change vulnerability
    - Evacuation routes and redundancy
  - Project Cost Estimating – Resiliency Contingency Pct
- Highway Funds - Policy Statements for category projects
  - Resilience policy set aside discussed at TCC Special Meeting, which the TCC voted not to include in the 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.

Dr. Daniel Brantley stated that Georgia is not doing resilience, but Florida is?

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated specifically for funding in MPOs for resiliency, Florida MPOs seem to have more dedicated funding within their MTPs. For funding categories, we have not seen as much of that in Georgia yet. She does know the Atlanta Regional Commission has a lot of different resiliency activities and did their vulnerability assessment 4 or 5 years ago. We do have MPOs incorporating resilience, but this specifically was looking at funding set aside for resilience.

Dr. Brantley asked about the recent bridge collapse in Baltimore, how would we prevent that in Savannah?

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated she is not a specialist on bridges but it seems like an operational failure on the ship. There are bumpers that can be put on bridges to minimize the impact.

Mr. Robert Pirie stated those bumpers are called dolphins. Basically, they large concert structures. A good example is the Sunshine Skyway in St. Pete/Tampa, FL. It was a famous bridge that was downed by a container ship and

rebuilt the bridge pilings on islands with huge dolphins surrounding them. For Baltimore, the ship just missed the dolphins and hit the bridge directly.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated she believes more attention will be given to bridges with container ship traffic, as we can see these kinds of events will cause disruption for a long time period.

Mr. Robert Pirie asked if what Ms. Anna McQuarrie is talking more about is how we would respond to something similar in our area.

Ms. Anna McQuarrie stated the resilience chapter is about identifying issues that we should consider. With project prioritization, we are thinking about the different projects, for example, is there an alternative route? If not, you are more vulnerable, so we do need to invest more money in creating solutions.

### ***Equity Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization***

Ms. Asia Hernton, MPO staff, stated she will talk about Equity and the 2050 MTP.

What is Equity?

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

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

Why Include Equity in Transportation?

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

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

It's not impossible! A great example is Hoboken, NJ. 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

Chairperson Armand Turner stated he agrees with Ms. Asia Hernton completely. He wanted to suggest that it might be beneficial for CORE MPO staff to connect with Step Up Savannah, which is currently working on an Equity Index for Chatham County. A lot of the data CORE MPO staff has gathered would support Step Up on an extremely high level. Just introducing some of the data sources to Step Up would be beneficial. He would love to connect Ms. Asia Hernton with Ms. Alicia Johnson of Step Up.

Dr. Daniel Brantley asked how Hoboken, NJ, got to where it is now and achieve zero traffic related fatalities? How expensive was it for the safety improvements and implementations?

Ms. Asia Hernton stated she does not know the exact price. She actually contacted traffic and transportation planners in New Jersey to understand how Hoboken was able to achieve zero fatalities. They didn't talk about financial details; they spoke mostly about time details and how it took decades to get to this point. It is possible, but it will take time and of course it will take money. CORE MPO is a funding body. When we get federal funding, we are happy to fund projects that do improve Equity, Safety and Connectivity. To answer Dr. Daniel Brantley's question, she does not know the exact cost.

Dr. Daniel Brantley asked if other states are doing this, besides New Jersey.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated yes, Vision Zero Plans have existed for a few years now and other cities besides Hoboken, NJ, have achieved the zero fatalities goal. Savannah has a Vision Zero Plan and other communities in the area are also creating their own Vision Zero Plans. They are responding to the stark increase in traffic related deaths and accidents over the past few years.

Mr. Robert Pirie asked based on the Hoboken example, what does Ms. Asia Hernton think is the most single effective mitigation measure Hoboken put in place? He has seen a few videos about the Hoboken Vision Zero, and it seemed like there was a lot of road re-striping and flex-cones put in place, which are very cheap compared to redesigning a sidewalk. What would Ms. Asia Hernton say was the most effective mitigation measure?

Ms. Asia Hernton stated from her research it would be addressing speed. Speed is one of the largest factors in traffic fatalities. Hoboken made very sure that within their city limits, people slowed down to a safe speed. Additionally, when speaking with the Hoboken traffic and transportation planners, they were very heavy on consistency. It took many years to get to this point. With all the years, throughout administration or any changes within the City, they made sure they were going after the same goals.

Dr. Daniel Brantley stated he believes it is important that the mindset of the people in the community be such that the Vision Zero goal is something that they are committed to as well, not just developers who want to get public money.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated that we see the mindsets changing with other cities investing in Vision Zero Plans and now all the ingredients are coming together to pursue something like this.

Chairperson Armand Turner asked if that was all for the MTP update.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated yes.

Dr. Daniel Brantley stated that he does not see reflected in the minutes the comments and questions asked by the committee. He does not believe that is turning up in the minutes.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that she believes our minutes are very detailed, as Ms. Kieron Coffield is new and sometimes types the minutes verbatim. Almost all of our committee members' questions and comments are documented. We have the audio recording available on our website for your convenience.

Dr. Daniel Brantley stated the reason he asks is because last time we talked about Bryan County and he does not see that reflected in the minutes. He gets asked why is it that Bryan County doesn't want to join CORE MPO?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the minutes are available on the CORE MPO website and will have that information on why Bryan County does not want to join. It might be who was at the last meeting, was Mr. Robert Pirie at the last meeting?

Mr. Robert Pirie stated he was at the last meeting, and after looking over the meeting minutes he felt a little embarrassed asking the same questions again about what was Bryan County's reasoning for not joining.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she reviews the meeting minutes and believes the minutes are very detailed. She remembers reading that part of the minutes and it should be documented.

Chairperson Armand Turner stated he is looking at the minutes and he does see "Dr. Daniel Brantley asked if Bryan County has time to change their mind?" with some explanation as well. He would be happy to go over the minutes with Dr. Daniel Brantley after the meeting..

## [5. Congestion Management Process Update](#)

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

Data sources used:

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

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

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

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

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

## [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.

Dr. Daniel Brantley asked what is the transportation cost burden?

Ms. Asia Hernton stated transportation cost burden is similar to house cost burden or rent cost burden. This is where a significant amount of money is going just towards a person's car payments and maintenance or just towards your transportation (bus fare, etc.).

Dr. Daniel Brantley asked if bridges and bypass are included in the transportation cost burden?

Ms. Asia Hernton clarified that transportation cost burden refers to people who own a car and the money that they put towards their car takes up a huge chunk of their income. This does not refer to bridges or specific streets, but how an individual is burdened by the cost of their vehicle.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated it typically is 30% of their income, which includes gas, car insurance, and maintenance, etc.

## 7. MPO Boundary Follow Up and Bylaws Updates

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that we have already talked about the CORE MPO boundary, so we will move on to the bylaws update. We want to have a special-called meeting for combining CAC and ACAT to talk about the bylaws portion for the Transportation Equity and Public Involvement Advisory Committee (TEPAIC). We also need to talk about the membership for TEPAIC.

All current participating members who still want to serve on the committee will be transferred to the TEPAIC, as well as several members from the ACAT. We have members like Goodwill, who never participate, so those non-participating members have been moved to non-voting advisory roles. Those members who participate will be made into regular voting members on TEPAIC, like the CAT Mobility Manager and staff representatives from Living Independence for Everyone (LIFE).

We struggle to have quorums in both CAC and ACAT. Our goal is to increase the quorum by combining the committees. We have included 6 interested citizens, since we have no more than 6 people regularly participating in the CAC. All of the CAC and ACAT members that participate will be transferred to the new combined committee. Some of our ACAT members are visually impaired and/or have ADA requirements, so it is important to have hybrid meetings where they are able to join virtually. This combined committee will have more responsibilities as previously only the participation plan was under the CAC purview. The TEPAIC will also deal with accessibility and equity.

The draft of the TEPAIC bylaws can be found attached to the agenda. Some highlighted duties include:

- Elections for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson held at the last meeting of the calendar year
- Quorum is 1/3 of the voting members + 1
  - No action items conducted unless we have a quorum
- Address ADA, participation, Title VI, Justice 40 etc.

Dr. Daniel Brantley asked if the TEPAIC will be limited to just those duties?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated those are the major duties and responsibilities for the TEPAIC. Currently the CAC is only responsible for guiding the CORE MPO staff on the Participation Plan. Now under the new TEPAIC, the responsibilities include guiding the CORE MPO staff on the Participation Plan, Title VI Plan, Limited English (Language Assistance Plan), Equity, etc. We want the consolidated committee to be more effective and solve our problems with the quorums. The CORE MPO staff has updated responsibilities from the Federal government requirements we are trying to satisfy.

Please take a look and give us your opinion on what works and what does not. We will schedule a combined meeting for CAC and ACAT in May. We still need to work on the meeting frequency, as well as the date and time of the meetings. The TEPAIC will have hybrid meetings.

Ms. A'riel Johnson asked with the TEPAIC being a hybrid meeting, will we still need to meet an in-person quorum?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated no, we do not need the voting members to be in-person for the TEPAIC hybrid meetings. We have made a special accommodation for the ACAT members' requirements. We used to have the ACAT meetings at the downtown apartments, then moved the meetings to CAT's office due to the buses. Once COVID started, we found out we got more participation with virtual meetings. The law only requires the Decision-Making Boards to vote in-person which is the CORE MPO Board. The TCC, CAC and ACAT are advisory committees, so as long as we have good participation, we can make good recommendations and do not have to meet in-person.

Dr. Daniel Brantley asked when we will have the CAC and ACAT bylaws meeting.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the CORE MPO staff is working on the 2050 MTP, which is the most important thing. Since we hope to have the bylaws adopted in June, we will have a special-called combined CAC and ACAT meeting in May. Please take a look at the draft and send us your questions or comments.

Dr. Daniel Brantley asked if the bylaws have changed since the February meeting.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the changes for the CAC would be the membership, as we tried to move the non-participating members into a non-voting advisory role. Please let us know if you see someone who should not be included. We want to focus on the voting members.

#### **IV. Agency Reports**

#### **V. Other Business**

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

#### **VII. Notices**

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

[14. TIP Funding Tracking Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

[15. Next CORE MPO CAC Meeting June 20th, 2024, at 5:30pm](#)

#### **VII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the April 18th, 2024, CAC 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.