



CORE MPO Board

Minutes
May 3, 2024, at 10:00am

May 3, 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		
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		
Faye DiMassimo	Chatham Area Transit Authority	X	
Karen Williams	City of Pooler		X
Jay Melder	City of Savannah	X	
Vivian Canizares	Georgia Department of Transportation		X
Jamie McCurry	Georgia Ports Authority		
Armand Turner	Citizens Advisory Committee	X	
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		
Robert Milie	Town of Thunderbolt		
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
Genesis Harrod	CORE MPO		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	
Jeff Ricketson	LCPC		X
Paul Teague	Bryan County	X	
Eric VanOtteren	Bryan County		X
Chris Benson	City Administrator – City of Pembroke	X	
Audra Miller	Community Development, Bryan County		X
Veronica Enoch	Assistant Exec. Director of Garden City		X
Dr. Estella Shabazz	City of Savannah		X

I. Approval of Agenda

Ms. Tanya Milton motioned to approve the May 3rd, 2024, CORE MPO Board meeting agenda; seconded by Mr. Nick Palumbo. The motion passed with none opposed.

II. Committee Reports (verbal)

ACAT - Ms. Asia Hernton stated the ACAT met on April 22nd but did not have a quorum, so they were unable to endorse the actions items.

CAC - Ms. Asia Hernton stated the CAC met on April 18th and all actions items were endorsed.

TCC - Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the TCC met on April 18th and endorsed the draft MOU and TIP amendments. At that time there were 3 TIP amendments, but GDOT has retracked one later, so Ms. Asia Hernton will only be presenting two TIP amendments today. All actions items were endorsed.

Executive Director - Ms. Melanie Wilson stated she wanted to thank the CORE MPO staff on the hard work for the MOU and the MPA Boundary. She looks forward to the next steps in the process.

III. Action Items

1. Approval of the February 28th, 2024, CORE MPO Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Nick Palumbo motioned to approve the February 28th, 2024, Meeting Minutes; seconded by Ms. Tanya Milton. The motion passed with none opposed.

2. Adoption of Updated MOU

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we have been talking about the MOU and MPA Boundary since last February. The Governor of Georgia has approved our MPA Boundary, and the approval letter is attached to the agenda. The MPA boundary adopted by the CORE MPO Board on February 28th and approved by the Governor is included in Exhibit A in the MOU.

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.
- Ms. Melanie Wilson's title has been updated to Executive Director and CEO.
- **MPO Organization**
 - CORE MPO Board, TCC and EDFAC - unchanged
 - ACAT and CAC – deleted.
 - TEPIAC (consolidated and restructured from CAC and ACAT)
 - 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 be assessed dues.

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

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated once the MOU is adopted by the CORE MPO Board, we will send the MOU out to the jurisdictions and modalities for signing. We hope to have the signature pages sent back to us by the end of June, so we may send the whole package to the Governor. All updates to the MOU document are highlighted in red.

Ms. Wykoda Wang has sent the matrix for Calculating the Fair Share and has not received any comments. CAT did reach out about this, and she sent the calculations to CAT yesterday. The numbers for the final fees are based on the FY 2025 UPWP which will take effect on July 1st, 2024, all based on the total local match number of about \$300,000.

Staff is asking for the CORE MPO Board's adoption of the MOU, so we can send the letters out to the participating agencies and members for execution.

Mr. Steve Scholar motioned to approve the adoption of the Updated MOU; seconded by Mr. Tim Callanan. 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. 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 second public notice was advertised on the Savannah Morning News on Tuesday, April 23, 2024 for the rescheduled public hearing date. A public hearing has been advertised – it will be held in conjunction with the rescheduled CORE MPO Board meeting on May 3rd, 2024. We have not received any public comment or input on the TIP amendments.

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. **Amendments** - Increase CST funding amount by more than \$29 million, move the CST phase to a later year and add a new fund 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.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Van Johnson motioned to open the Public Hearing; seconded by Ms. Tanya Milton. The motion passed with none opposed.

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS MADE

Mr. Michael Kaigler motioned to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Mr. Nick Palumbo. The motion passed with none opposed.

Ms. Tanya Milton motioned to approve the FY 2024 - FY2027 TIP amendments; seconded by Mr. Tom Hutchinson. The motion passed with none opposed.

IV. Other Business

V. Status Reports

4. 2050 MTP Update

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the staff has been working on the most important document for the CORE MPO which impacts the federal funding to our area - the 2050 MTP. We are at the project selection, prioritization and financial plan development stage.

We are in the process of developing the Revenue Estimates, which will tell us how much money we will receive. Then we need to know what kind of projects we will have and prioritize those projects, since we do not have unlimited revenues. Eventually we will develop the financially constrained 2050 MTP, which we will talk about in June. Our final plan adoption is by August 7th. We will provide a draft list of the financially constrained 2050 MTP in June.

Since highway projects will mostly use FHWA funds and transit projects will mostly use FTA funds, we decided to separate them out to make it easier for project selection and development.

Highway Revenues

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

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

CORE MPO Adjustments:

- Keep **Project** and **Maintenance** revenues separated.
- Use **2%** annual inflation rate for all years 2026 – 2050 for both **Project** and **Maintenance**.
- Use revenues from the adopted **FY 2024 – 2027 TIP and STIP for FY 2025, 2026 and 2027** to replace projections since these are considered committed funds.
 - **Project Revenue** – Projects' Total
 - **Maintenance Revenue** – 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

TIP and STIP Adjustments:

- The regional TIP numbers are listed at the top, 2025, 2026, 2027, etc. In February we made an amendment to the Truman Linear Park Trail Phase II-B, but that was in FY 2024, so it does not impact our FY 2050 Plan.
- Ms. Asia Hernton just spoke about the 2 TIP amendments that we made.
 - For SR 404 SPUR/US 17 Back River Bridge, we are moving the project's CST phase from 2025 to 2026. There is a cost increase, so the revenue will be deducted from 2025 and included in 2026.
 - The ROW phase for Garrad Avenue is moving from 2024 to 2025, which means revenue addition to 2025.
- We have double checked the Bryan County projects in the STIP. There are two projects, but they are not within our boundary, so they do not impact us. In the STIP, no lump sum specifics are listed for Bryan County, so we assume zero dollars.
- There are 4 projects listed in Effingham County in the STIP. One project is in FY 2024, so it would not impact the 2050 MTP. The other 3 projects do have funds listed in 2025, 2026, and 2028. We will add the revenues from these projects into the 2050 MTP revenue projections.
- Additional projects and revenues
 - The City of Savannah received a grant from the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Program for I-16 Exit IMR follow up steps. This project will be added as it must go through our MTP process before the funds can be authorized. This project comes with its own funding, and these are additional revenues we will consider.
 - GDOT notified us of another funding source for Georgia Ports Authority for \$15.3 million for EV charging stations. Those will have to go through the MTP and TIP process as well before the funds can be authorized. Since we just received the notice yesterday, we have not had time to enter the information.

When GDOT sent us the revenues, the total estimate was about \$1.4 billion. After our adjustments - annual growth rate of 2%, adjusted numbers from TIP/STIP in 2025, 2026, 2027, additional revenues from local sources and grants - the total Highway Revenue estimates at about \$1.87 billion. This is how much money we have to allocate for Highway Projects. These revenues must be allocated into 3 cost bands because of the federal Year-of-Expenditure requirements.

Revenue Allocations to Cost Bands

- Cost Band One: 2025 – 2032 (8 years; overlaps with current and next TIPs; mid-years are 2028 and 2029)
- Cost Band Two: 2033 – 2041 (9 years; mid-year is 2037)
- Cost Band Three: 2042 – 2050 (9 years; mid-year is 2046)

The 2050 MTP Highway Revenue Allocation by Cost Band and Category can be found in the table attached to the agenda. There we can see how much money will be available for specific projects – around \$418 million in Cost Band One, \$457 million in Cost Band Two, and \$548 million in Cost Band Three.

We have a lot of projects programmed in the TIP which occupy a lot of funds. After covering all the TIP and Cost Band One projects, the revenue is about \$100 million to be used by other projects for Cost Band One.

We have a lot of Operational Improvement projects that cannot compete with the Capacity projects, as they are smaller and can be done quickly. We decided to have an Operational Set Aside Revenue to accommodate these projects. This way the Operational Improvement projects will not compete with the Maintenance, Capacity projects, etc.

Revenue Allocations to Category (from 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 (for electric bus)
 - Bike/Ped/Trail Set Aside - **3%** (mode share) each year for bike/ped projects for 2028 - 2050. **Specific amounts** for bike/ped projects from TIP are for FY 2025 - 2027.
 - Specific Highway Projects – rest of the Project revenues

Transit Revenues

For Transit Revenues, since GDOT doesn't give us a revenue projection, we have to make some assumptions. We decided to use the TIP as the basis for the estimate. Charts are attached to the agenda.

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 (from 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 STIP Adjustments

1. Bryan County
2. Effingham County

For Bryan and Effingham Counties, each year they have below \$500,000 for transit improvements. Ms. Wykoda Wang reached out to the Coastal Regional Commission and GDOT Intermodal to clarify on the STIP funds for transit improvements. We asked how much we should separate out and CRC/GDOT answered that we might not have that as CRC/GDOT just provide transportation services and do not purchase buses, etc. For now, we can assume zero dollars for transit capital improvements. CRC will get back to us, so there might be a minor adjustment later.

Ms. Faye DiMassimo stated that CRC does get an allocation through the Georgia Transit Trust Fund which is flexible so it can be used for operational costs. She is sure that they use it mostly for that. They also have dollars for capital vehicle replacements, so CRC should at least be able to break down that part of it for Ms. Wykoda Wang.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that will boost our Transit Revenue a little bit.

Chairman Chester Ellis asked to clarify with CRC on the 5309 and 5311 funds.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated they don't receive 5309 funds, but they do receive 5311 funds.

Chairman Chester Ellis stated since we have added portions of Bryan and Effingham Counties into our boundary, we should check to see if the 5309 funds can come now, because Bryan and Effingham Counties are considered Rural. That is a question that would have to go to GDOT and GDOT would take it to the federal level.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she has reached out to GDOT in regard to the 5309 funds and has not received an answer yet. After we receive the information from CRC/GDOT, we will adjust the transit revenue numbers, but it probably won't be that much.

Chairperson Chester Ellis asked about the Talmadge Bridge maintenance - where does it fall in the MTP?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated that project is already included in the TIP. She adjusted in the revenue, and all the funding that goes with the Talmadge Bridge project is already included and accounted for. In June if there are any more TIP amendments, we will accommodate all the new TIP amendments. The chart shown today does not include the \$15.3 million grant received for Georgia Ports Authority, as we just received that information yesterday.

Chairman Chester Ellis asked how soon will you be notifying the board once the adjustments are completed?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we will notify the Board by June. Everything should be stable by the end of June. We will report all final adjustments in June.

Highway Projects Selection

The matrix for highway project selection is attached to the agenda.

- Project Selection - review existing plans and study recommendations.
 - Projects included in Cost Band One of 2045 MTP that have not been implemented will be considered priority projects and carried over to 2050 MTP.
 - Projects included in Cost Bands Two and Three of 2045 MTP and projects from study recommendations were placed into 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.
 - Original Selection from Matrix - 7 Tier 1 projects and 42 Tier 2 projects.
 - Grouped into Capacity Projects and Operational Improvement Projects
 - Big projects broken down to smaller segments; only segments located within CORE MPO MPA are included.
 - Capacity Projects move to the prioritization stage.
 - Projects Selected for Prioritization – Tier 1 and Tier 2 Capacity Projects + 2045 MTP Cost Bands Two and Three Projects

Chairman Chester Ellis stated when the widening of I-16 gets to the Bryan County line, it's not included because Bryan County did not want that portion included in the MPA Boundary. He wants to make sure the Board members understand. Bryan set the boundary and they excluded the portion with I-16.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the segment outside of the CORE MPO boundary is cut out. Highways Projects Selection Example can be found attached to this agenda. The matrix has projects listed and columns for categories of Coastal Empire Study, Travel Demand Model STIP Network, CORE MPO 2023 RFTP, 2024 CMP Update, CORE MPO 2045 MTP, CORE MPO 2045 Vision Plan. These six categories(columns) are regional and previously identified needs. We used those as the basis for the initial project selection.

Then added North Bryan County Transportation Study, Chatham County 2023 TSP/LOST, Belfast Keller Road Transportation Assessment, Effingham County Transportation Master Plan, SR 307 Corridor Study, SR 21 Access Management Study, US 80 Corridor Study. Those sub area studies and plans are to confirm needs - if they confirm with the 6 regional categories, the projects are good. If a project only fits in one category, then the project is not selected. The 6 categories take precedent. From these categories we have selected about 30 capacity projects and more than 20 operational improvement projects. These projects will go through the next steps of project prioritization.

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

Since Resiliency and Equity are new emphasis areas for federal fundings, instead of just going through the Needs, we wanted to add Resiliency and Equity to our screening process. We will start the screening next week. After the staff has reviewed the scores, we will call a special TCC meeting. The TCC will review the scores and the criteria to help us to ensure that everything is right, before we present them to the CORE MPO Board.

Transit Project Selection

The transit project selection is based on the Transit Asset Management Plan, Master Transit Plan, Transit Development Plan and the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP.

We have checked the 2045 MTP and with CAT. The needs seem to be pretty consistent with bus replacement for fixed routes, bus replacement for paratransit, Intelligent Transit System, etc. There might be some minor adjustments as we are working with CAT, CRC, and GDOT to see if there are any other projects that need to be added in.

Highway Financial Plan Development

After the project selection is done, the final step is to develop the financially constrained plan, which is to allocate all of our money to the projects. We will present the Financially Constrained Plan in June. Even if we used 2% for the revenue allocation, we decided to use 4% annual growth rate for the cost estimating. We learned the hard way with the Truman Linear Park Trail Phase II B. The annual inflation factor might even be more than 4%. We documented the information in the appendix for financial plan development. According to the GDOT Commissioner, some maintenance projects have had cost increase of more than 84%, and other projects were more than 120%.

Since we are looking at long term, the federal guideline is that 4% is a good assumption. We will apply a 4% annual inflation rate for projects' cost estimates. For example, for I-16 widening in Cost Band 3, we will apply the inflation factor which would be 2.28. If the project is in Cost Band Two, the inflation factor is about 1.60. Examples of how we allocate the revenues can be found attached to the agenda.

Proposed Policies for Set Asides

Operational Improvements Set Aside - An operational improvement project is considered consistent with the 2050 MTP if

1. The project is consistent with MPO's plans (2050 Vision Plan, Freight Plan, CMP, etc.).
2. The project improves functionally classified roadways.
3. The project is in the CORE MPO's MPA.
4. The project has a qualified local sponsor committing matching funds.

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

1. The project is consistent 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.

Transit Financial Plan Development

We worked with Ms. Mary Moskowitz of CAT and are still finalizing the list. The table shown on the screen is how we allocate the current revenue that is used for potential transit capital projects. The list should be relatively stable by June.

Ms. Faye DiMassimo stated this project list comes straight out of CAT's adopted Master Transit Plan, so this project list is entirely consistent with that, as well as the Transit Development Plan's Zero Emissions Bus Works. This is drawn completely from publicly adopted plans over the last year.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated in the 2050 MTP, we also have to do performance-based planning. Basically, we want to make sure the projects we are selecting meet the requirements for the Transit Asset Management and Transit Safety Plan.

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

Highway Project Prioritization

Our 3 screening tiers are Needs, Sustainability/Resiliency, and Equity. Ms. Genesis Harrod is in charge of the Needs Assessment and was unable to present today. Ms. Wykoda Wang will present a summary of her findings.

Needs Based Screening

This is still to be finalized.

Looking at the Travel Demand Model STIP network provided by GDOT (all maps and data are attached to this agenda), the red areas have higher scores and the green areas have lower scores.

- Levels of Service A, B, and C - score is 1
- Level of Service D – score is 5
- Levels of Service E and F – score is 10

Looking at the vehicle crash rates, the areas where there are a lot of crashes take precedence as improvements need to be made to those areas. We have data and mapping for bicycle crash rates as well. We will assign scores based on this data.

In summary, 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, etc. Evacuation routes will probably be considered under Resilience; Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity, and State of Good Repair will probably be considered under Equity; we are still finalizing the scoring methodology but hope to start the prioritization next week.

Chairman Chester Ellis asked if anyone has any questions about the Needs Scoring before we move on to the Resiliency and Equity portions?

Dr. Estella Shabazz (online), City of Savannah, stated she has a question about Cost Band One. She wants to be clear on all of the wonderful information and great reporting from CORE MPO Staff like always. Her statements and questions are about Project DeRene.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated Project DeRene is already in Cost Band One because Project DeRene is already in the TIP.

Dr. Estella Shabazz asked how much revenue is allocated to Project DeRene. If you can't zero in on the amount right now, could you please get back to her with the information? Another question - just like the percentage rate for estimating on the Transit side for cost estimating, CORE MPO staff are adjusting it up to 4%, while the adjusting for the inflation rate is 2%. She is wondering why the percentage rate cannot go up a little bit higher for the capital projects. The last question is in regard to Maintenance in the chart - Project DeRenne has not started, so what would the maintenance estimate be for and how does that work?

Chairman Chester Ellis stated please give Ms. Wykoda Wang a chance to answer, as he heard 3 questions.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the first question is regarding the cost estimating for Project DeRenne. We will work with GDOT and the City of Savannah on the final cost estimate. The previous cost estimate is not valid now. Even for Cost Band One projects, if the construction is not included the TIP, we need to work with GDOT and the City of Savannah to see what the final cost will be and we will include the final cost. For maintenance, we will not touch anything because maintenance is a set aside for GDOT and the local jurisdictions for resurfacing, etc. so that the maintenance projects would not compete with the capacity projects. That is why we are keeping the maintenance revenue separate. For Cost estimating, Dr. Estella Shabazz thinks the 4% is low, and the CORE MPO staff thinks 4% is low as well. We decided on 4% due to federal guidelines, since the federal requirement stated 4% is a good assumption.

Chairman Chester Ellis asked didn't we also move some lapsing funding to Project DeRenne?

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated yes, we did move some lapsing funding to Project DeRenne, and we have not talked about that yet.

Chairman Chester Ellis stated that CORE MPO staff needs to get with the City of Savannah and GDOT to go over all the aspects of Project DeRenne.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated one of the issues we have run into, after speaking with the City of Savannah in general conversations, is about the Truman Linear Trail and the costs. Some of the estimates the City of Savannah received were low and they didn't factor in enough money for the change in costs. We will get with the City of Savannah and GDOT to work on that number. Without the number, we always use the federal inflation rate, which currently is 4%. We believe the inflation rate should be at 8% to 10%, but we can't use

anything higher than the federal 4% unless we have a baseline of information from the City of Savannah for bids from the contractors.

Chairman Chester Ellis stated now that we have folks viewing this with us, it is incumbent upon us that CORE MPO staff gets with the City of Savannah and GDOT before we put anything out.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she has an MTP Fiscally Constrained Plan Example (attached to this agenda). All numbers not highlighted in yellow are TIP numbers. She feels pretty good about those numbers as they are the numbers GDOT gave us. The blue numbers are the ones Ms. Wykoda Wang feels confident about, since those are the TIP numbers and those include the Effingham County projects that have already been moved into here. All projects highlighted in yellow are the ones we need to check on. We already know all these cost estimates need to be checked.

Chairman Chester Ellis asked Dr. Estella Shabazz does that answer your questions? Dr. Estella Shabazz stated yes, thank you Chairman and everyone.

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the top 50 project list is ready for review. Please take a look at your convenience to see the selected projects that will be going through prioritization.

Resiliency Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization

Ms. Anna McQuarrie, MPC/MPO Staff, stated she will be presenting the 2050 MTP Resiliency information, specifically as it applies to the Financial Plan, the FHWA Greenhouse Gas rule update, and project prioritization.

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

Resilience to Natural & Man-Made Threats

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

Related MTP Goals & Objectives

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

How is resilience incorporated in the 2050 MTP?

- Highway Funds – Specific Projects
 - Project Prioritization – Screening for Suitability/Resiliency
 - Impacts to environmental, cultural, and social resources
 - Climate change vulnerability
 - Evacuation routes and redundancy
 - Project Cost Estimating – Resiliency Contingency Pct

- Highway Funds - Policy Statements for category projects
 - Resilience policy set aside discussed at TCC Special Meeting, in which TCC voted to not include in financial plan
 - **PROPOSING TODAY: Umbrella resilience policy to be included in all other category policies (Maintenance, Operational, Transit, Bike/Ped)**
- Transit Funds – Resiliency Integration with Transit Improvements
 - Electric Vehicle Infrastructure
 - ITS

Economic Benefits of Resilience Measures

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

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

Creating the Umbrella Resilience Set Aside Policy:

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

Case Study: Florida MPOs:

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

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

Need for Discretionary and Dedicated Resiliency Funding: Many participants indicated that a dedicated source of resiliency funds or discretionary funding sources would be hugely beneficial for conducting vulnerability assessments and resiliency corridor studies and developing plans and strategies. This funding may help reduce conflicts with other transportation system needs and dedicated resiliency funding could be used as a “carrot” to incentivize inclusion of resiliency strategies.

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

- Twenty-two States filed two lawsuits challenging FHWA's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions Final Rule.

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

Project Prioritization

Tier 2 Project Prioritization

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

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

Equity Consideration in 2050 MTP Development and Project Prioritization

Ms. Asia Hernton, CORE MPO staff, stated she will be speaking about Equity and the 2050 MTP. This is Tier 3 of our project prioritization process.

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 VII/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

Ms. Faye DiMassimo stated we often think about Equity in terms of location and geography. There is some really interesting work in regard to Equity in Design, how projects are actually designed to influence access and all those kinds of things. She would be happy to send that information to the CORE MPO staff.

Mr. Tim Callanan, Effingham County, asked when we talk about integrating the Equity Component into the project selection process, are those projects stand-alone projects, or is there scoring criteria? When you score projects generally and the project is scored high in Resilience and Equity parts, or are they projects that are targeted on their own based on the Equity merit?

Ms. Asia Hernton stated the process that the CORE MPO staff is using is looking at the individual project and its proximity to critical features, or reading the project description and seeing if it includes a median or if it is a safety project, and then giving a score based off of that.

Ms. Melanie Wilson clarified the scores are weighted for Resiliency and Equity.

Dr. Estella Shabazz wanted to thank Ms. Asia Hernton and CORE MPO staff for including areas where poverty is a component and making decisions moving forward with Equity and Equality.

5. Congestion Management Process Update

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she will give a quick overview; Draft 3.0 of the CMP report is attached to this agenda. We received the comments from FHWA yesterday and are in the process of addressing the comments now. We have been updating the CMP with new data sources.

The Congestion Management Process uses the data sources and models to find out where the congestion areas are located, then find mitigation strategies.

CMP Additions for 2024 Update

- Vehicle Delay Hours (how many hours are wasted to being stuck in traffic by commuters each year.)
- Cost of Congestion (roughly the amount of delay-hours in traffic each year multiplied by the average hourly rate of pay for that year)
- Percent of Non-single Occupant Vehicle Travel
- Total Emissions Reductions (refer to GDOT's Carbon Reduction Program)
- Type of Crash
- Pedestrian Level of Service (akin to other levels of services but for pedestrian facilities)
- Crash Density

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 CORE MPO Board 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. The red and orange areas on Travel Demand Model are the congested areas. This input will be compared with observed congestion, which is personal experience with the congestion. For example, Ms. Wykoda Wang travels on US 17 and experiences congestion there every day. This data validates her experience.

Once we find the congestion locations, we will find congestion mitigation strategies.

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.

CORE MPO staff will have to double check the projects, as some congested locations already have projects identified to address the issues, and some do not. That is where the project selection comes in. We also have operational improvements to check against the congestion locations.

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.

An example of the comments received from FWHA - you have identified these top congested locations but what specific measures do you have? The CORE MPO staff is working on the specific measures now. The Congestion Management Process feeds into the 2050 MTP in terms of project selection and project prioritization; it will be one of the supporting plans or documents for the 2050 MTP.

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, though we might have to move the adoption to a later date, due to the work needed for the MTP taking priority.

Main Updates

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

About the Scoring Methodology

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

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

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

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

Updated Cost Estimation Methodology

- Cost Estimates for the Non-motorized Transportation Plan were derived from the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) 2016 Cost Estimate Excel Tool.
- The tool was used to provide updated cost estimates for projects to compare to cost estimates comprised at the origination of the project, which were created circa 2014.
- The new cost estimates rely on an inflation rate of **2%** and have a default construction year of **2026**, as depicted in the snapshot of the main cost estimate input page to the right. All projects were researched in Google Maps.
- Any projects that could not have their costs estimated via the ARC Tool were grown linearly using a **2%** growth rate.
- The county is by default Fulton County given the ARC Tool only has the metropolitan Atlanta counties as options in the dropdown menu for selection.

- All areas were set as urban. No right of way was used in any project calculations. Total costs include preliminary engineering, construction, and contingency.

7. MPO Boundary Follow Up and Bylaws Updates

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated the reapportionment process was started last February and now we see the light at the end of the tunnel because we have adopted the MOU. The next step is adopting the Bylaws. We hope to have the Bylaws updated and adopted in June.

Before going over the Bylaws, we will address the MPA Boundary. At the February 2024 CORE MPO Board meeting, the board members asked whether the CORE MPO Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary can be revised between censuses. The response from FHWA is Yes (see the attached documentation). 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. Thus, staff strongly suggests that we should try to avoid updating the MPA boundary between censuses.

Stall will work with the committees on the Bylaws update.

Updates to the Bylaws Draft include:

- The boundary portion has been updated.
- Organizational Structure – updated to ‘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).’
- Updated the organization chart
- Membership language has been updated
- CORE MPO Board Voting Members
 - Updated to 23
 - Added
 - Municipal voting member agreed upon by Effingham County and its municipalities (rotating seat)
 - Chairman or designee, Bryan County Commission
 - Updated ‘Regional Administrator or designee, Federal Transit Administration’
 - Removed
 - Executive Director, Chatham Area Transit Authority (CAT previously had two seats)
 - Will now be the Chairman of CAT Board
 - Chairman, CORE MPO Citizens Advisory Committee
 - Chairman, CORE MPO Advisory Committee on Accessible Transportation
 - Garrison Commander, Hunter Army Airfield
- Removed - Each CORE MPO Board voting member from the local government will nominate a member to the Citizens Advisory Committee, as the CAC will no longer exist.
- An election will be held at the last CORE MPO Board meeting each calendar year for the purpose of determination of the Chairman and Vice Chairman for the next year
 - The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the CORE MPO Board shall be elected by the voting members by a simple majority vote.
 - Only elected officials are eligible for the positions of Chairman and Vice Chairman. Appointed officials or designees are not eligible.
 - The term of office for the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be one year.
- The 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.
- Updated the quorums to all say ‘1/3 of the voting members plus 1’
 - Updated the election time frames to standard end of calendar year.
 - No business may be conducted unless a quorum of the membership is present, has been changed to **No Action Item** may be conducted.

We will schedule a separate meeting for each committee to go over their portion of the Bylaws. We will also schedule a meeting for the ACAT and CAC to talk about the new combined committee and Bylaws. We are hoping to adopt the Bylaws in June. Please review the draft bylaws with the proposed updates and send in any questions. We will have a special called meeting to go over all updates.

VI. Information Reports (verbal)

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.

VII. Other Public Comments (limit to 3 minutes)

VIII. Notices

15. [TIP Administrative Modifications](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we currently have two projects that have HIP funds lapsing - one project is the Lazaretto Creek Bridge Replacement, and the other is Chatham County's I-16 at Little Neck Road. The HIP funds are lapsing on September 30, 2024. Based on the estimated GDOT and Chatham County's development schedule, it will be impossible to get the funds authorized by September 30. We don't want to lose the funds, so we have to reallocate the funds to other projects available to take them.

After checking, Project DeRenne is the only one that can take the funds, which are about \$300,000 (TIP administrative modification report attached to the agenda). For Project DeRenne's preliminary engineering phase, there was about \$1.2 million. We replaced that funding code, about \$800,000 will still be Y230 Funds, and the HIP funds at about \$300,000 has been reallocated, so the HIP funding will not lapse. The released Y230 funds will stay in our area so we can use the funds.

According to GDOT, the Atlanta Regional Commission and the CORE MPO are the only two MPOs that don't have any funds that have lapsed. We are one of the success stories, since we have projects that can use the lapsing funds.

For Lazaretto Creek Bridge and I-16, we are still in the process of identifying new funding sources. For the released Y230 funds, we will ask GDOT if we can move them to a later year, if not then we will try to find another project.

16. [GAMPO Presentations](#)

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated she and Ms. Anna McQuarrie went to the GAMPO conference. Ms. Anna McQuarrie gave an excellent presentation. While at the conference they learned about the Federal Land Access Program (FLAP) in Georgia, basically the local jurisdictions can apply for funding for road resurfacing or maintenance. This is similar to LMIG, but there is a different application cycle and different match requirement. We are going to research more and check out the inventory of Federal Lands in our area, to find out which roadways are eligible. We will report our findings. We also learned this funding source has zero competition, so the possibility of getting the funding is very high.

17. Grant Opportunities

Ms. Wykoda Wang stated we have attached the funding opportunities, so the jurisdictions can apply for these funds. One funding opportunity is ATIP Funds. We are working with GDOT and have forwarded the information to the City of Savannah. The City of Savannah is working with the Coastal Regional Commission. CRC is going to submit a big grant application on behalf of us and our region, because the federal government encourages agency cooperation. Last time the City of Savannah spoke about a Heritage Trail, which will be included in the CRC application for the ATIP grant.

18. Next CORE MPO Board Meeting June 26th, 2024, at 10:00am

Mr. Chris Benson, City Administrator for the City of Pembroke, stated he will be brief. He wanted to thank the CORE MPO Board and staff for initially making the attempt to incorporate the North Bryan County area into the MPO boundary. He understands that there may have been some reservations from Bryan County and they are not interested in joining at this go-around. He personally has a background in working with MPOs in Florida and values the process the MPO brings to small communities that may not have those resources, but also has a regional impact. He wants to thank the CORE MPO Board and staff.

Ms. Melanie Wilson stated that CORE MPO staff will get in touch with Pembroke to talk to them about the MPO process and things of that nature. With regards to dealing with the Boundary, that is a whole different ball game. When we start adjusting the Boundary, it's not just changing the perimeter, we have to deal with the population counts, and that is why this is done after a census.

If we were to try to make these adjustments in the middle between censuses, someone would have to provide the money to support the work needed for a mini census to verify the numbers for the Boundary adjustment. If they came the next month and asked to join, we might be able to make the adjustments, since we have the original data, and have not adopted the other documents that go with that boundary.

After everything is adopted, it would be very challenging, and we would bill that jurisdiction for the costs incurred. As far as participating to know what is going on and have assistance from our MPO staff, we would be glad to help Pembroke and North Bryan County. We wanted to be clear about the challenges and costs that come with the Boundary adjustment between censuses.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, the May 3rd, 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