



CORE MPO Board

Minutes
June 26th, 2024, at 10:00am

June 26, 2024, CORE MPO BOARD

Voting Members	Representing	Present	On-Line
Asia Hernton	Advisory Committee on Accessible Transportation	X	
Steve Scholar	City of Richmond Hill	X	
Tim Callanan	Effingham County Commission	X	
Nick Palumbo	City of Savannah	X	
Karen Jarrett	Metropolitan Planning Commission	X	
Bruce Campbell	City of Garden City	X	
Jim Aiello	Savannah Airport Commission		
Deidrick Cody	Chatham Area Transit Board of Directors	X	
Brian West	City of Tybee Island		
Dana Williams	Town of Thunderbolt		
Laura Lawton	Town of Vernonberg		
Karen Williams	City of Pooler		
Jay Melder	City of Savannah	X	
Vivian Canizares	Georgia Department of Transportation		
Jamie McCurry	Georgia Ports Authority		
Armand Turner	Citizens Advisory Committee		
Gary Norton	City of Port Wentworth		
Dennis Baxter	City of Bloomingdale		
Chester Ellis	Chatham County Commission (Chairman)	X	
Michael Kaigler	Chatham County	X	
Chairperson	Economic Development & Freight Advisory Committee		
Tanya Milton	Chatham County	X	
Voting Alternates	Representing		
Matt Walker	Town of Thunderbolt	X	
Ted Hicks	Georgia Department of Transportation	X	
Heath Maines	Savannah Airport Commission	X	
Tom Hutchinson	City of Pooler	X	
Others	Representing		
Katie Proctor	GDOT District 5		X
Kaniz Sathi	GDOT		X
Joseph Longo	FHWA		X
Wykoda Wang	CORE MPO	X	
Kieron Coffield	CORE MPO/MPC	X	
Pamela Everett	MPC		X
Melanie Wilson	MPC	X	
Anna McQuarrie	MPC – Special Projects	X	
Hind Patel	MPC/IT	X	
Joseph Shearouse	City of Savannah	X	
Mary Moskowitz	Chatham Area Transit	X	

Deanna Brooks	Chatham County	X	
Ashley Goodrich	Thunderbolt – consultant	X	
Leon Davenport	Pooler – consultant		X
Paul Teague	Bryan County		X
Beverly Dumas	Chatham Area Transit		X
Rhodes Hunt	Kimley-Horn Consultant	X	
Chris Marsengill	Kimley-Horn Consultant	X	
Veronica Enoch	Assistant Exec. Director of Garden City	X	
Faye DiMassimo	City of Savannah	X	
Dr. Estella Shabazz	City of Savannah		X

I. Approval of Agenda

Ms. Tanya Milton motioned to approve the June 26th, 2024, CORE MPO Board meeting agenda; seconded by Mr. Nick Palumbo. The motion passed with none opposed.

II. Committee Reports (verbal)

CAC - Ms. Asia Hernton, CORE MPO staff, stated the CAC met on June 20th and did not have a quorum, so they could not move forward on the action items.

ACAT - Ms. Asia Hernton stated the ACAT met on June 24th and did not have a quorum, so they could not move forward on the action items.

TCC - Ms. Deanna Brooks, Chatham County, stated the TCC met on June 20th and all actions items were endorsed. There was some discussion around the project list and offering local support and recommending different projects.

Executive Director - Ms. Melanie Wilson, Executive Director of MPC, stated we are launching a public outreach plan for the 2050 MTP. We will be doing a press release next week. Please let everyone in your communities know about the public outreach. She would like to thank the CORE MPO staff as they have been working diligently. We also have started the Federal Certification Review with FHWA, and we will be talking about that with the CORE MPO Board over the next few months.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked if we have the dates available for the public outreach for the 2050 MTP.

Ms. Wykoda Wang, CORE MPO staff, stated we are going to send our draft document out, having the 30-day public review period for the 2050 MTP from July 1st to July 30th. We are still scheduling the different public outreach venues. We have at least August 7th when we will have a public hearing at the CORE MPO Board meeting. We will do one virtual meeting and one in-person meeting, both TBA. We will also go to Forsyth Park Farmer's Market, TBA. We have reached out to Effingham County and CAT, and thank you both for letting the CORE MPO staff present at your July meetings. If anyone has a spot in their meetings where the CORE MPO staff could present, please let us know. We will also research other events to tag-along with, for example the Title VI workshop because we are addressing equity in our plan, and the Coastal Georgia Indicators Coalition meeting. We are also reaching out to the neighborhoods to see if they will accommodate us, because normally when we host meetings no one comes, so we are trying to go to the people.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked all CORE MPO Board members if they have websites, to please let the CORE MPO staff share their 2050 MTP public outreach information link on the website.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated when CORE MPO staff does the press release, we will send it to everyone. Please help us advertise for this.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated if anyone has space in their community they could offer up, please let us know.

III. Action Items

1. Approval of the May 3rd, 2024, CORE MPO Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Steve Scholar motioned to approve the May 3rd, 2024, Meeting Minutes; seconded by Mr. Deidrick Cody. The motion passed with none opposed.

2. FY 2024 - FY 2027 TIP Amendments June 2024

Ms. Asia Hernton gave the presentation on TIP amendments. In April and May of 2024, Chatham Area Transit (CAT) requested multiple TIP amendments be made. In May 2024, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) requested amendments be made to two highway projects.

In terms of the Public Participation Process, the comment period started on June 12, 2024, and closes on June 26, 2024. A public hearing has been advertised to be held in conjunction with the CORE MPO Board meeting on June 26, 2024. So far, we have not received any public comments.

There are a total of six TIP amendments, due to the fiscal year 2024 ending soon.

- FHWA FBP for Dock Rehab
 - Amendment - To amend flex funds into construction phase in FY 2025
 - Federal Flex Funds = \$363,292, Local Match = \$90,823, Total cost of project is more than \$450,000.
- FHWA FBP for Ferry Replacement
 - Amendment - To amend multiple different federal flex, state and local funds into FY2025
 - Flex Funds/THUD / GDOT Transit Trust Match (Flex Funds)/ GDOT Transit Trust Match (THUD)/ GDOT Transit Trust Fund Additional Match/ Additional Local Match
 - Total cost of project is \$6 million, with multiple local matches
 - Federal Flex Funds almost \$300,000, THUD funds are around \$450,000
- CAT Section 5307 Funding Change for Preventative Maintenance
 - Amendment - To change funding amounts in section 5307 funds in FY 2025 for preventative maintenance.
 - To amend the federal cost from \$1,200,000 to \$1,830,915, and the local costs amended from \$240,000 to \$457,729.
- CAT Section 5307 Funding Change for Operating Assistance
 - Amendment - To amend the funding amounts for section 5307 in FY 2025 under Operating Assistance.
 - The local cost would be amended from \$0 to \$2,770,030.
- SR 404 SPUR/US 17 FM NE OF SAVANNAH HARBOR PKWY TO BACK RIVER
 - Amendment - GDOT requested to add the ROW phase in FY 2025 with Y800 funds of \$500,000
 - Amendment - GDOT also requested to move the CST phase from FY 2025 to FY 2026
- SR 26/US 80 @ LAZARETTO CREEK
 - Amendment - Move the CST phase with Y800 funds from FY 2025 to FY 2028
 - deleting the phase from the current FY 2024-2027 TIP
 - Also to move the ROW phase from FY 2024 to FY 2026

The appendix has the updated tables with the new funding numbers and updated TIP project pages (can be found attached to the agenda). We have double checked that all projects are consistent with Mobility 2045. We also double checked to ensure that other projects that had funding programmed in FY 2024 are good to go and not at risk of funds lapsing. All projects are good to go and not at risk of funds lapsing. We also received comments from FHWA and Ms. Mary Moskowitz will provide clarification on that.

Ms. Mary Moskowitz, CAT, stated FHWA had asked if the dock projects were capital improvements, so she wanted to reiterate that the dock projects are for capital improvements to the two existing docks CAT currently has.

Mr. Nick Palumbo motioned to open the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Tim Callanan. The motion passed with none opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING – no comments

Mr. Nick Palumbo motioned to close the public hearing; seconded by Ms. Tanya Milton. The motion passed with none opposed.

Mr. Nick Palumbo motioned to approve the FY 2024 - F Y2027 TIP amendments and resolution; seconded by Mr. Tom Hutchinson. The motion passed with none opposed.

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

Ms. Wykoda Wang gave the presentation on the DRAFT Financially Constrained 2050 MTP Project List. We have been talking about the 2050 MTP for over two years. We started our first round of public involvement in September of 2022 and went to about 40 events. The second round we had at least ten meetings to give status updates. The third round we will probably have at least ten meetings and will be focusing on the project list. She did talk about how we got the revenues at the last meeting and will briefly go over Chapter 6 of the 2050 MTP.

CORE MPO staff received the original revenues from GDOT and have made adjustments which were presented to the CORE MPO Board. The adjustments are from the TIP, the grants, and cost estimates.

For each cost band the revenues will be divided into Projects and Maintenance.

- Cost Band One Revenues
 - Projects - \$545,981,125
 - Maintenance - \$55,518,434
 - Total - \$601,499,559
- Cost Band Two Revenues
 - Projects - \$551,319,529
 - Maintenance - \$36,047,908
 - Total - \$587,367,437
- Cost Band Three Revenues
 - Projects - \$658,877,872
 - Maintenance - \$43,080,587
 - Total - \$701,958,459
- Total Revenues for all Cost Bands - \$1,890,825,456
 - Total for all projects - \$1,756,178,527
 - Total for all maintenance - \$134,646,929

We also divided the Project revenues into different categories:

- Specific Highway Projects
- Operational Improvements Projects Set Aside
- Non-Motorized Projects Set Aside
- Transit Projects Set Aside

We are talking about the Highway portion, so even if you see the transit projects set aside listed, they will have FHWA money flexed to help CAT with transit projects. We also have a maintenance project list which is its own category.

Revenues For Specific Highway Projects

- Cost Band One - \$424,073,416
- Cost Band Two - \$456,921,600
- Cost Band Three - \$548,346,192
- Total - \$1,429,341,208

How do we select the projects to be included in the 2050 MTP? Those projects already in the pipeline from the 2045 MTP but have not been implemented will be carried over to the 2050 MTP. Then the highest priority projects will be included in the list. Then we have to do the financial balance, which includes the cost estimating for the projects. We did have a special called TCC meeting to go over the project prioritization for new additional projects. We showed the CORE MPO Board the matrix for project selection. We have more than 200 projects coming from the Congestion Management Process, Travel Demand Model, Coastal Empire Study, Regional Freight Plan, and other corridor and sub-area studies. The projects listed are the top 30 capacity projects that were selected to go through further prioritization. These projects have the potential to be included in the final project list. We used the performance-based planning criteria, the Federal Planning Emphasis area, and the Goals and Objectives of the 2050 MTP as our basis for project prioritization.

The top 30 projects went through three screens:

- Needs Screen
 - Facility LOS E or F

- High Truck Volumes
- Freight Crashes
- High Crash Density
- Bad Pavement Conditions
- Bridge Sufficiency less than 50 or poor conditions
- Connects Population Centers to Activity Centers
- Does the project connect major freight generators with infrastructure
- Sustainability/Resiliency Screen – used the federal tool for vulnerability scoring (VAST)
 - Temperature Changes
 - Precipitation Changes
 - Sea Level Rise
 - Storm Surge
 - Wind
- Equity Screen – a federal area of emphasis (Quality of life, Title VI, and Environmental Justice)
 - Transit Connection and Accessibility
 - Bike/Ped Connection and Accessibility
 - Connection and Accessibility to Critical Features
 - Title VI Environmental Justice Consideration
 - Safety Features
 - High Pedestrian Crash Rate

The total scores are the first step to select projects, and there are also additional considerations:

- Local Priority
- Consistent with the 2045 Constrained Plan
- Alternate Funding Source Available
- Financial Feasibility
- Project Status (PE, ROW)

CORE MPO presented the prioritization list to the TCC in May and did not receive much input. When we started to develop the project list, we realized that President Street was ranked low. When we do our scoring, some of the projects coming from the plans and studies such as the Coastal Empire study have project descriptions, so we read the project description to know what the concept is like, but some of the projects don't have the concept.

For President Street we know the study is on-going right now, but we don't have the final recommendation yet. We just have to assume the project is making improvements only to the ramps and not getting high scores for the transit connections or bike/ped connection, so that is why it is ranked low. Another project we had a problem with is I-95 at Airways Avenue. In the original study there were so many options, so the different options have different costs.

This is not the final scoring; this is just the scoring to help us select the projects, to assist us. Unless we have the full concept for the project, we will not be able to revise this scoring sheet. The President Street Railroad Elimination study is on-going, and they will come up with recommendations. So based on that study we will probably re-rank this and the different recommendations will have different cost estimates. What we are using right now is based off what Chatham County sent, which is the cost figure from the TSPOLST. When we eventually get the recommendations, we will have the actual numbers to replace those. This is a big worksheet with the screening process listed, and the next page shows the total scores for the projects.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked Ms. Wykoda Wang to go back to the President Street Railroad Elimination Study.

Mr. Nick Palumbo, City of Savannah, asked looking at this list, can Ms. Wykoda Wang explain about how CORE MPO staff prepares the scoring rubric?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated Ms. Genesis Harrod did the Needs scoring, Ms. Anna McQuarrie did the Resiliency scoring, and Ms. Asia Hernton did the Equity scoring. So, for example with the facility LOS E or F, we were using the Travel Model Demand output (the STIP model), which we presented at the last meeting. If the facility gets an LOS E or F, then the score is 10 points. For High Truck Volumes, we have scoring that shows how much will be 10 points, 5 points, or 1 point. For Freight Crashes, we have a crash map. For Bad Pavement Conditions, we also have data from the Freight Plan. We do have specific numbers that we go by.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he noted that these are very broad numbers, on a scale of 1 to 10. It doesn't give us that insight that we have as a necessity to prioritize these projects. Particularly when it comes to the President Street Overpass and the connections there, he noticed the CORE MPO staff scoring for Level of Service, they have everybody scoring a 10, but President Street scores a 1. Can Ms. Wykoda Wang help the CORE MPO Board members understand why it scored so low?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we can go back to the STIP model.

Ms. Deana Brooks, Chairperson for TCC, stated with the President Street, while the Level of Service decreases greatly when the train is blocking the crossing, it is not a consistent problem for the Level of Service of the roadway to consistently be an E or F. That is why it is kind of hard to justify that metric as it is not consistent all the time for people at this intersection.

Mr. Nick Palumbo asked for our Needs assessment, are we measuring the needs or current conditions?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we have to use certain criteria. She will go back to the last meeting's agenda.

Mr. Nick Palumbo wanted to give a quick example while Ms. Wang was pulling the information up. Let's say there is a dangerous intersection for pedestrians, but if we are measuring the number of pedestrians that are there, how are we able to measure that dangerous intersection if it's so dangerous that pedestrians cannot cross. He knows based on his evidence and being there at the intersection, that it is an extremely dangerous intersection for pedestrians to cross. You have major truck traffic crossing east and west, you have rail traffic that's out there, and if he's pedestrian or cyclist trying to get to his destination, work or home, he is not able to do that. So how do we ensure that it is measured in this rubric?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that we need to have some kind of measurement. She is bringing up the Level of Service map, on which President Street probably does not show as LOS E or F. We need to have measurable metrics for the prioritization process.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated one of the things is we have to be consistent with the data that we use. If Mr. Nick Palumbo has additional evidence, he would like to share that with the Technical Coordination Committee, because that is the group that prioritized this and CORE MPO staff did not do it on their own. Members of the TCC include all the jurisdictions, GDOT, and other folks, so we didn't do it ourselves or come up with this rubric on our own. It has to be based on proven data and it has to be consistent. We got a lot of data from the updates with the freight plan and other planning documents, and we need to have a starting base line. At the time this was put together, that train crossing did not show up at a LOS E or F. That does not mean that that we cannot make adjustments as we move forward with getting comments, and that is why we have a public comment period. So we can, as the TCC, revisit that project and move it higher based on additional information. This was graded based on the facts we have now, and she hopes that will help the CORE MPO Board understand it. There is the opportunity to revisit the scoring, which the TCC will do once the public comment period is over.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the scoring will go through public review process as well, because this is part of the 2050 MTP. We cannot give you just one exception project and not use all the criteria that the other projects went through. Every project has to be evaluated equally based on all the criteria.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that please help him understand this. We are saying this is a professionally scored rubric based on data, and that data generates this. However, he is also hearing that it is eligible to be rescored based on public input.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she previously showed the prioritization matrix that helped us select and prioritize projects. Travel Demand Model was one of the criteria. Normally when we have a Travel Demand Model, we have to present that model and do the validation. Who does the validation? The people who use the roadways and the technical people who evaluate the roadways. They see whether the model is valid or not. Besides the scores based on technical analysis, there will be other considerations. So that is why we have the categories for Local Priority, Consistency with the 2045 MTP, Alternative Funding Source Available, Financial Feasibility, etc. These are the considerations in addition to the three-tiered scores. Normally the TCC members see this score and let us know whether or not it makes sense. We presented this scoring sheet to the TCC on May 15th and did not receive any comments, until we started to develop the project list based on this scoring.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that he understands.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated part of the process is that we deal with baseline and get the technical information, then the TCC reviews that, which includes all the members including members of the City of Savannah staff. Then once this is presented, we get feedback from the public because that is part of this whole process. If the feedback from the public has enough input to give some sway, then the TCC will go and look at the project. If we make a change based on the comments that Mr. Nick Palumbo made, we would have to rescore all the projects. We are trying to be consistent and make sure we are treating everyone fairly.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that he understands it is a big lift, but he also understands how valuable we are at this place and time as we move forward. We need to know if the scoring rubric has changed, as he knows this project has been a priority project multiple successive times in the MTP 2050. He also knows this particular item was a topic of debate at the TCC meeting, that they disagreed with the scoring and recommended for the project to be rescored. Can we please share with the rest of the CORE MPO Board as well?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will re-score the project, as we have said the scoring will go through the public review process and this scoring is not final. This is just to help us in initial project selection. The projects to be included in the 2050 MTP when the CORE MPO Board adopts it on the August 7th meeting might be different than what you see today.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated that this young woman, Ms. Deana Brooks, is the Chairperson for the TCC. She would be the better person to respond to your question with regards for the scoring and any discussion that took place there. As you know this has been something that has been an issue, nobody is saying that it is not, however there is the opportunity for the projects to be re-scored and looked at.

Ms. Deana Brooks stated she has explained the Level of Service is not consistent throughout the day, so that is how that scoring happened. The other point that we touched on was about pedestrian access. That scoring happened because the concept currently doesn't show any sidewalks and there are not any sidewalks there now, so there is a need for it, but this is based on connectivity. So it was looking at that one section without looking at how it ties into other places, and that is why it scored low. We did look at it, but it was based on the data and information currently present. We addressed the needs for the project, and those things are being addressed as Chatham County is currently doing a study on President Street. In that study, Chatham County is definitely making recommendations to include sidewalks and non-motorized transportation. That information will be available in that study to make recommendations, but the study won't be completed until February.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he wants to understand why the last time this project was presented to the CORE MPO Board, it was scored as a 10 and is now a 1. What changed?

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if Mr. Nick Palumbo was talking about the 2045 MTP?

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated correct.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the 2045 MTP has different scoring criteria.

Mr. Nick Palumbo asked if Ms. Wykoda Wang understands how confusing it might be to this governing body?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated some of the criteria from the 2045 MTP were carried forward. We also added equity and resiliency.

Mr. Nick Palumbo asked if we are adding equity and resiliency, why are they all scored zero? Are we measuring them correctly today or not? This report, to him, is very clearly underprepared and we are not prepared to move this ahead today because he does not believe that we have accurate information or a clear picture. He knows that this is a dangerous intersection and he would not try to attempt to cross it as a pedestrian or a cyclist if he didn't have to, but other people do. That is where we have a moral imperative and responsibility to them. So we need to determine whether or not we are measuring the intersection as it is, or as a potential project in the future. We need to be consistent across the board.

Ms. Asia Hernton stated she can answer Mr. Nick Palumbo's question about the equity scoring, as she did the equity scoring. She would also like to reiterate that these scores are not final as we are still receiving input on them, so thank you for your input on them. On to the equity scoring, for the President Street Interchange Bridge and Ramp reconstruction, the reason it scored low on equity is because doing reconstruction on a ramp freeway or interchange doesn't improve access to sidewalks or bike lanes or transit. Any type of construction on a freeway is not necessarily equitable because it is next to an existing sidewalk or next to a designated bike lane. So freeway and interstate projects received an equity score of zero if those improvements happened on the

interstate or freeway because that only serves access to one form of travel which is driving. She would also like to add that our full methodology is posted on the TCC webpage, so you can review the details for what our methodology was for scoring these projects.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated the way that these are put together, right now we are working on the 2050 MTP, before that it was 2045 MTP. We have a new administration and the feds have a new set of criteria, so it changes every time we do the review. That is part of the process. Equity is a really big part of what is important to FHWA. We would be glad to make sure that we spend some time to go over the criteria that was used previously and the rationale with the 2045 MTP. We can go into more detail. As she has said, the City of Savannah had staff present at all of these meetings and they participated in this process and a vote was taken. Does it mean that this is totally done? No, because it is going through a process. It is not a final document.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the 30 projects listed are selected from over 200 projects, so these 30 projects are all priority projects. The important thing is to add the project to the 2050 MTP Financially Constrained List, and the President Street project is on the list.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated another thing to take into consideration is a study that will be completed in February. The results from that could have a significant impact and that was the other thing that was discussed at the TCC meeting.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he understands we are in flux and it's constantly in motion. He finds extraordinary value especially in the equity component. He wants to make sure for this governing body, because it is their names on the dais, that we are approving something that has actually been scored. It cannot be done with a promise that it is going to be scored incorrectly or inaccurately.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated this project is included. This is the proposed project list for the 2050 MTP Financially Constrained plan, and the President Street project is included.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he understands the project is in the list, but he does not think it is in the right cost band. He believes it should be in Cost Band One, as he believes it is a higher priority. When it comes to the scoring, that if the scoring changes, we need to understand how the scoring changed. Why are some projects getting a 10 while others are getting 1. It is not just the CORE MPO Board saying this; he knows at the TCC meeting the TCC recommended endorsement with the condition that President Street project be rescored. He believes we need to heed that recommendation.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that the CORE MPO staff are not saying that we will not rescore or reevaluate the scores. The scoring takes several weeks, so between the TCC meeting and now there is no way for us to rescore all of these projects, as we cannot just rescore this one project; we have to rescore all of them.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that he apologizes for putting Ms. Wang in this position, but he believes as a governing body they need to be accurate in all that they do. He understands that the rescoring takes a long time, but if the grading is faulty from the beginning, the product that we produce and approve in the end will be faulty as well. We have to operate at the right cadence and do everything above board.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will rescore during the public comment period when we have the draft out. What she is showing is not final; it is just to give a preliminary project list. The costs of the projects and the cost bands have to be reevaluated during the public comment period. For example, if we go to Richmond Hill and they don't see Harris Trail Road on the project list, they might have problems and ask about it. That is why we are going to the public and during that time we will reevaluate all of the information to make sure it is valid. Between the TCC meeting and now, we did not have time to rescore all of the projects.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that he wants to make sure that we get off on the right foot. He wants to make sure that we are operating all above board and we are scoring them equitably and fairly across the board. He also does not want to put the onus on the public to correct our mistakes.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the public input is part of the process.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated what he is hearing is 'approve this today and the public will fix it later.'

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that is not correct.

Ms. Karen Jarrett stated she believes part of the problem is we are looking at a pedestrian crossing as opposed to the interchange ramp rebuild. The interchange ramp rebuild is not going to address the pedestrian problem, as that is a completely separate problem. Perhaps another item needs to be added to address the pedestrian problem and that is probably why the score does not show up high.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated he has two problems. Number One: for the 2045 MTP we scored it one way and now with the 2050 MTP we scored it another way. What changed in those five years? He understands that administration changed. Before we adopted the 2045 MTP, this administration was in and we have put more monies into transportation. He understands GDOT and what GDOT does is move freight, as their concern is freight. Our job is to move people. Chatham County sought out and got \$300,000 for the study on President Street. That study is on-going and not finished yet. That study should include moving the people and the freight. The train is freight, and pedestrians and bicyclist are people. His personal opinion is that we don't need to adopt this until we have all of the facts and figures into place. We are talking about President Street, but we are also talking about Pooler Pkwy and Airways Avenue and I-95. Those are the ones that scored high last time and scored low the next time. Let's not make decisions based on non-facts; he would rather wait until we get the facts in and then do the rescoring.

Mr. Michael Kaigler, Chatham County, stated that there is clearly some unreadiness amongst members of this board. He thinks some clarity needs to be made on the scoring criteria from the 2045 MTP and the 2050 MTP. He would make a recommendation to table this to the next meeting. Then there would be an opportunity to meet with members of this board who really want to look at that and make sure they understand before we take a vote.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated one other thing that we will make sure the CORE MP Board gets is a chronology of who was in office at the time because 2045 MTP was based off of who was in office ten years ago and not who is in office now. That is the criteria based on at that time. We will make sure you have all of that. Basically, the criteria change every couple years, and that is why we do this update. Some projects get moved higher and some get moved lower based on whether there is funding or a study. In this case there is a study that is on-going for President Street, but the study won't be completed until February. It's ranked at 85 because the study isn't done yet, but knowing that we have the opportunity to do some moving around once we have the completed study and more detailed information.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the 2045 MTP was based on the Travel Demand Model output. So at that time it might show Level of Service F, but with this newer Travel Demand Model output, it gave President Street a Level of Service score of C. She will have to double check what the 2045 MTP score looked like. As of now, the GDOT Travel Demand Model output does not show Level of Service E or F.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he agrees with Mr. Michael Kaigler's recommendation that this governing body deserves to have a little bit more background input. He makes a motion to continue item #3 until the next meeting.

Mr. Jay Melder, City of Savannah, seconded the motion.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated if we table this item, we will not be able to do the 30 day public review period and we are not going to adopt the 2050 MTP in August, then we will all lose federal funding. Can we afford to do that?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated he doesn't think it is that drastic.

Mr. Joseph Longo, Federal Highway Administration, wants to jump in and remind everyone that if the MTP does lapse, then TIP projects cannot be authorized. He wanted to make sure everyone was clear on that, as that is the point of what Ms. Wykoda Wang is getting to.

Ms. Wykoda Wang thanked Mr. Longo for the clarification. If we are not going to adopt the 2050 MTP on August 7th, no one will be able to get any TIP projects done. That is the risk.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated his understanding is August 7th is the deadline?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, August 7th is the deadline. So you want to table it until the August 7th meeting which means we would not adopt the 2050 MTP until October or December. That means during that time no TIP projects will get done.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated we have the ability to call special meetings. We are looking for a happy medium, where we can meet everybody, whether talking about Federal or State or Local monies. The happy medium is that we get the information that is not in here, that Mr. Nick Palumbo and Mr. Michale Kaigler are talking about. Mr. Kaigler and Chatham County need to meet to get those facts and figures from their engineering department, also from the City of Savannah and whoever else is working on the flyover for Pooler Pkwy, Airways Avenue and I-95. We need to get those facts and have those things in place by the deadline. One of the things he has said from the beginning is that we are not letting anything lapse or send no money back.

Mr. Michael Kaigler asked Ms. Melanie Wilson if she could get them a schedule, knowing that we have deadlines to meet and other information that several of the board members want to revisit. Could you get together a timeline when we need to meet again to fulfill all the requirements that we have.

Ms. Melanie Wilson thanked Mr. Michael Kaigler and stated she was going to suggest that as well. She wanted to do a quick count of time. What Ms. Wykoda Wang and Mr. Joseph Longo of FHWA were trying to say is that we have to have something by August 7th. It does not mean we have to wait to have the meeting that long. For example, if we say we want to meet on July 17th, that should give the us some time to get the document in place. We will work on that while you continue the meeting and come back with an exact date. We will also send out the criteria requested and go from there.

Ms. Tanya Milton, Chatham County, asked how it will take to get the information that is missing?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated that will be determined by the CORE MPO staff, the counties, and municipalities that are involved. The current on-going President Street study does not stop us from doing what we need to do for the 2050 MTP. What the study does is to give us directions as to where we say we want to go and what is the need for the public. Sure we need to get over the train, but we also need pedestrian lanes, bike lanes, and not just for this particular project. There are other projects on here, for example the Bryan County projects.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated there are three projects listed for the Bryan County and Richmond Hill area. Two of those projects, Harris Trail and Port Royal Road, are local roads, so they are not eligible for federal dollars. However, for geographic equity we added in the Belfast Keller Road widening.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated to all board members when dealing within your jurisdiction, you need to make sure that you get the questions that need to be answered so that the CORE MPO Board can make an intelligent decision about how to move forward. To him, what we have to do as a board is make ourselves available, so if we need to meet again, we need to meet again to get the information in. All staff members need to be a part of getting the data that we need so we can make an intelligent decision.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if we are still targeting the August 7th adoption date, or are we going to be delayed?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated that we don't have a choice in that matter. Everyone heard what the gentleman from the FHWA said -we've got to have something in place by August 7th.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated we are looking at the master calendar. We have to make sure we have time for public advertising. We can announce today if we are going to have a special-called meeting. We can also try to get a meeting for the TCC and others together, so that we can look at and revisit things that were mentioned. We have to make sure we include everybody in this process. She suggests a special called meeting on July 17th.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated to clarify, the 2050 MTP needs to have a 30-day public comment period.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked how long the public comment period has to be?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated the public comment period for the 2050 MTP has to be 30 days. Advertising is not the issue, but the public comment period is.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the public comment period has to be 30 days and we have to have at least three working days in addition to that. So basically, you have 35 days.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he has a possible alternative or a compromise, as we may be out of time. He asks the CORE MPO staff to never put us in this position again, if possible, please. We are left with diminishing returns at this point. Would it be possible to approve this item with the condition that the projects be rescored?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, that was what we are planning to do.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated we act incredulous, but we need to be able to present that information and that we are very clear that we can approve a list today with the condition that it will be rescored.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the Cost Band, cost estimate, and priority scoring will all be reevaluated.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that he needs an admission from the CORE MPO staff that this is a faulty report the board is approving. You can understand that we are lay men up here on the dais. We are elected by our peers and we are trying to understand how you put a list in front of us but you are also encouraging us to re-score the list that has been presented.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we were not aware of the rescoring requirement until we presented our results at the TCC meeting last Thursday. We presented the scoring results to the TCC on May 15th and asked for input, but we didn't receive any input until we presented the project list at the TCC meeting on June 20th. Then the President Street project was not included and suddenly the scoring criteria became a problem. We did ask for input from the TCC after the May 15th meeting. What we are presenting to the CORE MPO Board today is to approve this draft project list. As for costs, even with this President Street project, right now she is using the TSPOLST as the basis for cost estimating, but that might be false because the new recommendations from the on-going study might give us more specific costs. So, a lot of assumptions have been made on these based on the concepts provided to the CORE MPO staff.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated that we have said moving forward through this process does not mean that we will not look at doing a rescore as we get more information and feedback from the public. The report is sound because we use the same methodology that we use, and anybody uses for a report like this. We have to use what we've got and this has been out since May 15th. Actually, before May 15th as we sent the list out to ensure that we got participation for the TCC special-called meeting. She can assure Mr. Nick Palumbo that if the board moves forward so that we can get public input, please keep in mind this is not the final report, as the final report will be in August, and we will make sure rescoring is a priority.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that the Draft 2050 MTP report that will go through the 30-day public review period includes all chapters. That means every word in the Draft 2050 MTP is subject to public input. The CORE MPO Board is part of public input. You want the CORE MPO staff to revise the scoring, and that is public input, and the staff has to address all of that. Public input not only comes from the general public, but it also comes from the elected officials, appointed officials or their designees. Every comment we receive about the document needs to be addressed. For example, she contacted Mr. Steve Henry from the City of Savannah about the traffic cameras because she thought there was more than 500 cameras, but Mr. Steve Henry said that it is around 300. Even that number has to be corrected in the report. This includes the scoring, the project list and final cost estimate, everything needs to be updated. Ms. Asia Hernton, Ms. Anna McQuarrie, and Ms. Genesis Harrod have all been working for the last few months to compile this big document. We have such a small staff, but we are not allowed to use consultants for the MTP update. For example, the Gainesville MPO has 5 full-time employees and they are still allowed to use consultants. We are the only MPO, besides ARC which has 20 MPO employees, in Georgia that works on the MTP in house.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that he understands that Ms. Wykoda Wang has a very hard job, but CORE MPO staff has a duty to inform this board when staff is up against the wall. Send up the alarm and tell us! He understands that CORE MPO staff has been working with the City of Savannah staff, but CORE MPO staff have to work with the board members as well. That is our duty to this board to make an informed decision for the good of the people. Because right now where his thinking is, is he going to move forward on something that he knows is a dangerous intersection. Is somebody going to die because he moved forward with something today and he didn't have a choice. That is his decision tree right now.

Ms. Karen Jarrett stated that ramp improvements to President Street won't improve the pedestrian access.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he needs a point of order, Mr. Chairperson, that Ms. Karen Jarrett needs to be recognized by the chair. This opportunity here, he doesn't want to get in a trainwreck literally when we are not going to get it approved. He needs as a condition, if the condition is set in stone and made part of the motion to re-score the entire rubric and matrix.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we already told the board that is part of our plan. CORE MPO staff would re-score and address this during the public comment period.

Dr. Estella Shabazz stated she has been listening to all of this and wanted to say something before the board takes a vote. She appreciates the conversation on President Street, but she must put in her comments to a few of the other items on this list. First of all, she wants to thank the CORE MPO staff, who have done the work thus far. Including what we are discussing, the top 30 projects that came out of the 200-300 original project list on the 2050 MTP. She appreciated the work thus far and the conversation, but she must bring your attention back to Project DeRenne, as it is her duty to keep it on the top of everyone's mind. There are three of the items on this list in reference to Lynes Pkwy, which are the I-516/Lynes Pkwy widening from I-16 to Veterans Pkwy, I-516/Lynes Pkwy interchange reconstruction at I-16, and I-516/Lynes Pkwy widening from Mildred Street to Veterans Pkwy. She has some questions on those, as she cannot see the scoring of those projects. Can the CORE MPO staff tell the public where the scores are? She appreciates the President Street conservation, but she needs to know if Project DeRenne was scored properly.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Project DeRenne is already in the pipeline, so it does not go through the scoring process. It is automatically carried over to the 2050 MTP because it is already in the pipeline. In terms of I-516, the total score for the I-516/Lynes Pkwy widening from I-16 to Veterans Pkwy is 91 points, I-516/Lynes Pkwy interchange reconstruction at I-16 is 88.5 points, and I-516/Lynes Pkwy widening from Mildred Street to Veterans Pkwy is 88.5 points.

Dr. Estella Shabazz stated alright, fantastic. She wanted to make sure and with every opportunity to keep in the minds of this almost 20-to-25-year long project. Thank you all so much for the information.

Mr. Jay Melder, City Manager of Savannah, stated he would like to echo the amendment, to make an amendment to the motion and the vote that happened earlier, if that is in order, to approve the Draft 2050 MTP project list with the condition that all projects are rescored and specifically the President Street with particular focus.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked does that get the board where we need to be? He is seeing all these bowing heads. He believes that is a motion.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he seconds.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if the board wants to go through the project list?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated what CORE MPO staff will do now, is provide the board with the information.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated the CORE MPO staff will provide the board with the information that was used. We will go back historically to find out what was used for the criteria before in the 2045 MTP. We will give the board a list and timetable of the data used to get the information. It is on the website but we will make sure to put it in one file so that the board has it electronically. We will be sure to send that out.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked if we could still schedule a workshop for the 17th of July?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated that is up to you, Mr. Chairperson.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated that he is trying to make sure that we can open the public comment period to cover the 35 days required. What day is that going to start?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated since the board approved the motion that Mr. Jay Melder just made, that gives the CORE MPO staff the opportunity to get the board's feedback. If the board would like to meet, we could use that as a public meeting to get input from the board, and that doesn't have anything to do with that time frame. We just needed to have some feedback and support to get this process started. We would be fine to meet on July 17th if needed.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked when the public comment period will start?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated the public comment period was set up to start on July 1st and end on August 7th.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated he believes it is incumbent upon everyone in their jurisdictions that on their websites to let folks know the public comment period is going on. Not everyone reads the MPC website, but the communities will read their own jurisdiction's website. Please urge the public to take part in the public comment time.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated please take a look at this list, since the CORE MPO Board did not want to go through the project list presentation today. She encourages everyone to take a look at this list to see if it makes any sense. If anyone has questions, please let CORE MPO staff know as soon as possible. This is a preliminary draft so that the CORE MPO staff can go to the public and have something available for their input, but it is not final.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated that CORE MPO staff could come to the Chatham County Commission meeting or the City of Savannah City Council meeting to give an overview of this process and let people participate as well. That would be a good way to get people to participate.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated that if CORE MPO staff shows up on Friday at the Chatham County Commission meeting during the information section, we can do that.

Dr. Estella Shabazz stated there was a term that CORE MPO staff used doing the evaluations on this list. They are going off information coming from the TSPOLST list. The cost came from a TSPOLST list. She needs an explanation on what the TSPOLST list we are talking about.

Chairperson Ellis stated remember when we had the TSPOLST on the ballot two years ago? This project was on that list, and it had a cost estimate on there. Then TSPLOST didn't pass, but Chatham County had already applied for federal funding to do the study on President Street. The federal funding came through for the study. What the CORE MPO staff used was the suggested cost estimate from two years ago. That is what CORE MPO staff had to work with, because they didn't have any other estimates to work with, as the study is on-going. So, CORE MPO staff took what information they did have, the estimate available from two years ago, which is old information. Everyone in here must be realistic. The thinking two years ago is a wash, as everything in Chatham County is changing because of the growth and the migration. For example, John Carter Road and Little Neck Road were not a priority until Hyundai showed up, and now it is a priority. There are a whole lot of changes happening here. We must do what we have to do to meet the needs of our constituents. We should not be afraid of changes, but we need to have the data and information to make intelligent decisions.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she does have the cost estimating; she does have a comment section indicating where the cost estimate information came from. This is subject to everyone's review as well. If the GDOT project managers provide the cost to her or if the numbers come from the TIP, she feels more comfortable. For all the others, she has to have the numbers come from somewhere. We do have a cost estimating tool, but that does not include the ROW costs. So if she has two estimates, she uses the higher number, as she does not trust the lower numbers. If the board wants to review the information, please review the information about where the cost estimate came from as well. Make sure that it makes sense, if not, then we have to revise the cost estimate and we have to revise the cost band as well.

Mr. Tim Callanan, Effingham County, stated if we cannot do a workshop on this, at the very least have an agenda item at the next meeting prior to this vote. Basically, if we take President Street and break it down to determine how the scoring took place. He agrees and he believes it is pretty obvious that when a score goes from a 10 to a 1, just saying the administration changed doesn't carry enough water for him to make the determination that is the reasoning for the scoring change. He understands it will be a new score by the next meeting. So, they have a better understanding on what has to be done to that particular project to get the score up.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the CORE MPO staff could have two example projects including President Street, so we can see how the projects are ranked. Even for the 2045 MTP we will see what their Travel Demand Model output was, to see if President Street was scored as a LOS E or F for the 2045 MTP. Now, for the Travel Demand Model for the 2050 MTP, President Street is ranked at a LOS of C. It is not like the CORE MPO staff made up the numbers. We will have two examples to show at the next meeting.

Dr. Estella Shabazz stated she would like to say, because she was in front of and moving along with Chairperson Chester Ellis, two years ago, during the TSPOLST. Getting public comments, you all are talking about public comment and how the reach should continue and to look at new ways. There was a template and a model that was used during the time of TSPOLST for getting the public comment, the public awareness. Chairperson Chester Ellis led the effort to put that model in front of whoever it needs to be in front of, so that we can get the cost estimates using TSPOLST, so that we can get the input from the public like we did with TSPOLST. She just wanted to put that on the table for the items we were talking about earlier, in reference to public input, public meetings, and public comment.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated he has that template available for whoever wants it.

Mr. Jay Melder motioned to approve the DRAFT Financially Constrained 2050 MTP Project List; seconded by Mr. Nick Palumbo. The motion passed with none opposed.

4. CORE MPO Bylaws Update

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated before she moves on to the Bylaws, she wanted to mention to the jurisdictions and agencies that have not executed the MOU, to please try to send the signature page as soon as possible. We still need signatures from CAT, Richmond Hill, Chatham County, City of Savannah and GPA. The City of Savannah hasn't executed it yet, so what is the City of Savannah's status on the MOU?

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated the City of Savannah has a couple of clarifying questions they would like to address. They agree with the vast majority of the changes and welcome their participation. They noticed that the chairperson roles each year. Is that an established best practice or how does it compare to our peers? As far as electing the chairperson, every year seems like a very short runway.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the chairperson elections every year is the norm.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated they also noticed an amendment of the title change from Executive Director to Executive Director and CEO. Can they get some clarity on that?

Mr. Michael Kaigler stated that was the MPC board who made that change.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked if Ms. Melanie Wilson is the Executive Director for the MPC, but does that make her the Executive Director for the MPO?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated yes.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated we are moving over to CEO now, is that right?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated it is still both Executive Director and CEO. It is very similar to the way CAT is set up and other entities. The only reason that this has changed is that it is now consistent with the title that was in the previous reports.

Mr. Nick Palumbo asked so our MPC Director is now not an Executive Director but a CEO?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated to clarify it is both Executive Director and CEO.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we did talk about the Bylaws update several times. It is a draft, attached to the agenda, because we are still working on it. She will go over the updates:

Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary – Language updated to:

- The CORE MPO's Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary, as shown in Figure 1, was adopted by the CORE MPO Board in February 2024 and approved by the Governor of Georgia. It encompasses all of Chatham County and its municipalities, the portion of Effingham County south of SR 119 - Indigo Road - Bethany Road, Richmond Hill, the portions of the 2020 census defined Savannah Urban Area that fall within unincorporated Bryan County, and the minimal areas that are connecting Richmond Hill and the Savannah Urban Area in Bryan County.
- Updated Boundary map included in the bylaws.

Organizational Structure – Language updated to:

- As shown in Figure 2, the organization of the CORE MPO shall consist of the CORE MPO Board and four (4) advisory committees: (1) the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), (2) the Economic Development and Freight Advisory Committee (EDFAC), (3) the Transportation Equity and Public Involvement Advisory Committee (TEPIAC), and (4) the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).

CORE MPO Board

- Voting Members (total 23)
 - Language updated to Chairperson
 - Language updated to Mayor (Commissioner, Councilperson, etc.) or designee.
 - Effingham County has one rotating seat which will be divided between Rincon and Guyton, because Springfield did not want to join.

- Bryan County has a voting seat.
 - Richmond Hill has a voting seat.
 - Removed Executive Director from Chatham Area Transit. We have 3 modal representatives from Savannah Airport Commission, Georgia Ports Authority, and CAT. Currently GPA and the Airport only have one voting seat while CAT has two. We decided to have the CAT Board Chairperson as the voting member for CAT, because the CORE MPO Board is mostly elected officials.
 - Removed the CAC and ACAT Chairperson, as those committees have been consolidated.
- Non-Voting Advisory Members
 - Language updated to Administrator (Director, Commander, etc.) or designee.

Duties and Responsibilities

- Removed the language “Each CORE MPO Board voting member from the local government will nominate a member to the Citizens Advisory Committee.” because there is no longer a CAC.

Officers and Organization

- Language updated to Chairperson
- Language updated to “An election will be held at the last CORE MPO Board meeting each calendar year for the purpose of determination of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for the next year.”
 - Removed “The Chairman of the Board shall be the Chairman of the Chatham County Commission.”
- Language updated to “The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the CORE MPO Board shall be elected by the voting members by a simple majority vote.”
 - Removed “The Vice Chairman of the Board shall be the Mayor of the City of Savannah.”
- Added “Only elected officials are eligible for the positions of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson. Appointed officials or designees are not eligible.”
- Added “The term of office for the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be one year.”
- Added “Should the seat of the Chairperson become vacant in mid-term, the Vice Chairperson shall become Chairperson, and a new Vice Chairperson shall be elected. Should the Vice Chairperson be unable to serve as Chairperson, election shall be held for both Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.”
- Language updated to “The Executive Director and CEO of the Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission or his/her designated representative shall act as Secretary of the CORE MPO Board.”

Duties of the Officers

- Language updated to Chairperson

Meetings

- Language updated to Chairperson
- Language updated to – “No ~~business~~ action items may be conducted by the CORE MPO Board unless a quorum of the membership is present. 1/3 of all members + 1 (9) shall constitute a quorum.”
- Language updated to – “The ~~Chairman~~ Secretary shall cause a notice to be sent to all members of the CORE MPO Board and the general public at least seven (7) calendar days in advance of the meeting date giving the time and place of the meeting and the preliminary agenda.”
- Language updated to – Any regularly - scheduled meeting may be cancelled either by the Chairperson with at least seven (7) calendar days of advanced notice or by a majority vote of the members taken during a regularly - scheduled meeting.
- Language updated to – “The meetings of the CORE MPO Board shall follow all requirements as defined by the Georgia Open Meetings Law. The meetings shall be open to the general public and members of the public are given an opportunity during the meetings to submit brief comments. The meetings will also be recorded ~~by the Government Channels~~ for airing.”

Technical Coordination Committee

- Voting Members (total 19)
 - Removed from voting role - Director of Transportation Planning, Metropolitan Planning Commission
 - Added Voting member - Staff Representative, Bryan County
 - Added Voting member - Staff Representative, Municipality within Effingham County (rotating seat)
 - Moved to Non-voting advisory member - Staff Representative for Town of Vernonburg
 - Moved to Non-voting advisory member - Coastal Regional Commission
- Non-voting Advisory Members:
 - Added Chairperson, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

- Added Chairperson, Transportation Equity and Public Involvement Advisory Committee
- Language updated to Chairperson
- Language updated to – “No ~~business~~ action items may be conducted by the TCC unless a quorum of the membership is present. 1/3 of all members + 1 (8) shall constitute a quorum.”

Mr. Jay Melder asked if it would be possible to amend the language to City of Savannah Staff Representative, to be similar with the other municipalities.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, we can do that. Does Chatham County also want to do the same thing?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated that Staff Representative is fine.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated for TCC we updated the language, but not that many changes to TCC.

Economic Development and Freight Advisory Committee (EDFAC)

- Voting Members (total 15)
 - Language updated to City/County Manager (Director, Representative, etc.) or designee.
 - Added in westside municipalities, which are impacted by freight traffic:
 - Port Wentworth
 - Garden City
 - Pooler
 - Moved people who have not attended the meetings to non-voting advisory members for consultation.
- Non-Voting Advisory Members
 - GDOT Freight Planner
 - FHWA Freight Planner
 - Representative, CSX Transportation Railroad Industry
 - Representative, Norfolk Southern/Railroad Industry
 - Representative, Trucking Industry
 - Representative, Environmental Group
 - Representative, Emergency Management Agency
 - Representative, Law Enforcement
 - Representative, School Board
- Duties and Responsibilities
 - The EDFAC shall provide guidance on the CORE MPO's Regional Freight Transportation Plan development and update.
- Officers and Organization
 - An election will be held at the last EDFAC meeting each calendar year for the purpose of determination of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for the next year.

We have a new committee, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. We had a meeting with the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan Update steering committee, and they reviewed the Bylaws for the BPAC. The voting and non-voting membership has been reviewed and vetted by the steering committee. Their responsibilities are to do the bike/ped/trail project selection, prioritization, implementation, and coordination. For the smaller municipalities that don't have the staff member capacity, like Thunderbolt, Bloomingdale, etc., BPAC will coordinate because the local project sponsors have to be LAP certified to receive federal funding. Some smaller municipalities may not have the capabilities, so BPAC will coordinate with the bigger municipalities to get a project sponsor and project manager to get the bike/ped projects implemented. BPAC will also track the project implementation.

Mr. Tim Callanan asked to go back to the list of members for the BPAC. Staff Representative for Bike Effingham, shouldn't that just be Effingham County?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that Bike Effingham County is an actual organization.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated Bike Effingham doesn't have a staff. Could we change it to an Effingham County Appointee? His fear is that there might be only one or two people in the Bike Effingham group and if they move out of the county, that organization may dissolve. If it is just Effingham County appointing a representative from a biking organization, that might be more stable.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we can change it to Staff Representative, Effingham County.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated yes, and Effingham County can appoint someone from Bike Effingham.

Ms. Wykoda Wang asked if Bryan County or Richmond Hill would like to do the same thing? When we had the meeting with the steering committee, we identified who the staff representatives are. We are in need of specific people. For example, the LIFE group our representative is Mr. Shannon Ginn, for Bike Walk Savannah our representative is Ms. Calia Brown.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated that Staff Representative for Chatham County Engineering department, change that to just Staff Representative from Chatham County, take the Engineering part out.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she will do that. She will revise the language to be general and make the changes. We have tried to standardize all the Bylaws for all the committees, quorums, officers and duties. The BPAC Bylaws are attached to the agenda for review.

We have removed CAC and ACAT because the new TEPIAC takes the responsibilities of both the CAC and ACAT. They have joint missions. The TEPIAC will provide oversight to the Title VI Plan, Participation Plan, Language Assistance Plan, Environmental Justice report for the CORE MPO. Previously ACAT provided oversight of the paratransit handbook from CAT, so now TEPIAC will continue to provide that service to the CAT board as well. The TEPIAC will also address other transportation equity issues.

Previously CAC had 15 members with only 6 seats filled, even with the quorum being 3 we still struggled to meet the quorum. ACAT had 26 members, but Ms. Wykoda Wang has been working at the MPC for over 20 years and has never seen 15 members, as they never came. We decided for the TEPIAC to encourage the CAC and ACAT members who do attend the meetings to participate. We reduced the voting members to 16 and moved the agencies who never showed up to non-voting advisory members. If we need consultation, we will reach out to the agencies. The duties and responsibilities we have already mentioned. The officers and organizations are listed, and the quorum will be 7 (1/3 of the members plus 1). We also had a joint CAC and ACAT meeting, with the members giving comments and vetting the Bylaws.

Another thing we added to the Bylaws, which was a recommendation from an ACAT member, "The CORE MPO staff can make typographical and grammatical changes to the bylaws without requiring formal amendments." For example, changing chairman to chairperson.

For any other changes to the Bylaws, for example the TCC can approve their portion of the TCC Bylaws, but the final approval must come from the CORE MPO Board. Even if TCC endorses their portion, the final adoption will be done by the CORE MPO Board.

We have "Two-thirds of the CORE MPO Board must vote affirmatively to modify, change, or repeal these Bylaws.". This is an amendment from 2021. Do the CORE MPO Board members still want to keep the two-thirds or change to majority of people present can make the change?

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated that he believes two-thirds is fair, as a change to the Bylaws is a major change, there should be two-thirds.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated even if the Board votes today, we will have to reach out to the people who are not here, to make sure they are okay with the Bylaws? Before it takes effect?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated that making it two-thirds is consistent with Roberts Rules of Order.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that we do not have two-thirds of the voting members here today, so we will reach out to the members who are not present to make sure they are okay with the language, before the Bylaws take effect.

Mr. Tim Callanan stated to clarify, he believes the CORE MPO Board needs two-thirds once the Bylaws have been enacted, but not now.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated so it does not impact us now. CORE MPO staff are requesting that you adopt the proposed Bylaws subject to the changes mentioned previously.

Mr. Jay Melder asked to go back to the membership for the CORE MPO Board.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked can we adopt this at the August meeting, or do we have to adopt this today?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we have not received all the signatures for the MOU. We are going to forward the executed MOU and the updated Bylaws to GDOT in August. So August would be fine.

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated then let's wait until August, when we have all the MOU signatures. Does anyone agree to tabling it?

Mr. Tim Callanan asked if the new CORE MPO Board takes effect in December or January?

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated that the new seats will take effect in January.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked why do we have elections every year, why can't it be two years? Since FHWA isn't requesting every year, could we do elections every two years for consistency and stability.

Mr. Nick Palumbo stated he supports the Chairperson's point; he knows the Atlanta MPO Chairperson serves two years.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated since we want to change the CORE MPO Board elections to every two years, do we want to change the sub-committees as well?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated yes, we need to be consistent throughout the whole document. He believes having an election every year will give instability.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated we originally had two years, but going through the review process it was changed to one year. We are fine with every two years; we think two years gives more stability as well.

Mr. Jay Melder asked Chairperson Chester Ellis with the change of elections to every two years, would you be comfortable with voting on the Bylaws today?

Chairperson Chester Ellis stated sure.

Mr. Jay Melder motioned to approve the CORE MPO Bylaws Update with the added changes from today's meeting; seconded by Mr. Nick Palumbo. The motion passed with none opposed.

IV. Other Business

V. Status Reports

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

Ms. Asia Hernton, CORE MPO staff, stated the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan is a document that addresses the development of bike and pedestrian infrastructure in the CORE MPO planning area. The goal of this plan update is to identify new projects, assess the needs of the community, and set new goals for bike and pedestrian infrastructure. Because the MPO is focused on completing the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan will not be adopted in June 2024, and instead will be adopted at a later date. We will begin to refocus on the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan after the adoption of the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update in August. This is because the 2050 MTP is a required MPO document, meaning it takes precedence over the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, which is not a required plan for the MPO.

[6. Congestion Management Process Update](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated FHWA wants to make sure the Congestion Management Process feeds into the 2050 MTP. This is the final report (attached to the agenda) that Ms. Genesis Harrod has sent us, and it has incorporated the comments that FHWA sent to the CORE MPO staff. We will add a cover page and post it to our website. It will probably be adopted by the 2050 MTP. Congestion Management identifies where the congestion areas are and identifies the strategies to fix congestion.

[7. Federal Certification Review](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated every four years the FHWA and FTA conduct a review of the metropolitan transportation planning process within each TMA to certify that MPOs conduct the comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing transportation planning process in adherence with federal statutes and regulations. The CORE MPO completed its

latest federal certification review in FY 2021 and received its federal certification on March 31, 2021. The final certification report can be found on the MPC website at:

<https://www.thempc.org/docs/lit/CoreMpo/Latest/2021/TMACertification.pdf>.

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

There are two requirements before our area can receive federal dollars from FHWA and FTA.

1. The MPO must be federally certified.
2. The MTP must be adopted.

We will make sure that we get certified by compiling all the documents to make sure we meet all the federal requirements and then we will adopt the plan. We will advertise this later as well. Please come to our certification review public meeting to see that we are deserving of federal recertification, otherwise we are not going to have any money. This is an update, as FHWA wants the CORE MPO staff to keep the federal recertification on our Agenda until we are certified.

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

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

Mr. Chris Marsengill stated they will cover:

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

Study Goals:

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

Key MTP Objectives:

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

Meeting Purpose:

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

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

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

Daily Traffic:

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

Ms. Tanya Milton, Chatham County, asked what is segment 6?

Mr. Rhodes Hunt, Kimley-Horn, stated segment 6 goes from Chatham Parkway north to the I-516 interchange. The corridor starts in the south at the Bryan/Chatham County boarder at the Ogeechee River, and the segments are broken into 1-2 miles increments up the 10-mile path. We did that because the characteristics change every few miles.

Ms. Tany Milton asked how recent is this study?

Mr. Rhodes Hunt stated the data is very recent. We used historical data from GDOT, as well as count data that Kimely-Horn collected in January.

Trucks:

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

5-Year & 10-Year Growth Rates:

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

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

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

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

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

- Mersy Way: LOS F
- Westgate Boulevard: LOS F

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

- Data Sources
 - SAGIS
 - Current zoning/parcel information
 - Urban Footprint Analyst Data
 - Planned Urban Developments (PUDs)
- PUDs
 - Bradley Pointe South
 - Pointe Grande
 - Hopeton Landing
 - Hopeton Landing South
 - Waterford
 - Lebanon Plantation

Origin-Destination (O-D) Analysis

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

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

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

Pedestrians and Bicyclists:

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

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

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

Summary:

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

Potential Improvements

- Major improvements
 - Fords Pointe Circle/Bradley Boulevard
 - SR 204/Abercorn Street Interchange
 - Berwick Boulevard

- Cottonvale Road
 - Chatham Parkway
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Access control plan to improve safety
 - Raised, grassed median
 - Driveway consolidation
 - Innovative/reduced conflict intersections
- Affordable transportation options

Next Steps:

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

VI. Information Reports (verbal)

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

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

Report attached to the agenda.

[15. TIP Funding Tracking Report](#)

Report attached to the agenda.

VII. Other Public Comments (limit to 3 minutes)

VIII. Notices

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, the June 26th, 2024, CORE MPO Board 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.