

---

## **BATS MEETING MINUTES**

---

### **Brunswick Area Transportation Study Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting**

Monday July 12, 2021 – 4:00 p.m.

Via Teleconference  
[Join Microsoft Teams Meeting](#)

#### **AGENDA**

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks (James Gilligan)
  - a. New Citizens Advisory Committee Members
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – Action Item
  - a. Minutes from CAC meeting held on May 10, 2021.
  - b. Minutes from special called CAC meeting held on June 11, 2021.
3. BATS FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Information
4. Transit System Update – City of Brunswick
5. BATS Administrative Updates
  - a. BATS FY 2021 UPWP Administrative Modification
  - b. GAMPO Special PL Funding Applications
  - c. 5303 Transit Planning Grant Application
  - d. Special PL Funding Project (Bay Street Corridor Improvements)
  - e. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Membership Drive - 2021
6. Agency Updates
  - a. Glynn County Airport Commission
  - b. Glynn County School Board
  - c. Glynn County
  - d. City of Brunswick
  - e. GDOT District 5
  - f. Jekyll Island Authority
  - g. Transit Agencies
  - h. Other Items
  - i. Public Comment
7. Adjourn

**Brunswick Area Transportation Study**  
**Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

Monday July 12, 2021 – 4:00 P.M.  
Via Teleconference

**ATTENDEES**

Committee Members

James Gilligan (Chairperson)  
Melissa Ennis-Roughton  
Neil Ligon  
Ed Farley  
Maurice Postal  
Pastor Darren West  
Margie Harris  
Myrna Scott-Amos  
Lance Sabbe  
Dylan Lukitsch

Others

Rachel Hatcher, Senior Planner, RS&H  
Vishanya Forbes, Transportation Planner, RS&H  
Chriscilia Cox, SUMA Consulting  
Ian Newman, Transportation Planner, RS&H  
Timothy Preece, WRA  
Melissa Phillips,  
John Hunter, Director of Planning, Development, and Codes, City of Brunswick

## **1. Welcome and Introductions.**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:00 P.M. by Mr. Jim Gilligan, Chairman of the BATS Citizens Advisory Committee. Mr. Gilligan gave a brief welcome and facilitated introductions of the new CAC member for everyone on the call.

### **a. New Citizens Advisory Committee Members**

Mr. Gilligan spoke on this agenda item. He introduced himself to the committee, highlighting his background in transportation planning and his current work in transportation. Mr. Gilligan also listed his interests in transportation issues specific to Glynn County. He then went on to share some administrative pointers with the committee regarding the regularly scheduled meetings and materials distributed by staff at least one week in advance of each meeting. He encouraged the committee members to provide feedback and to read materials in advance of the meetings to be prepared to take action accordingly.

## **2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – Action Item**

### **a. Minutes from CAC meeting held on May 10, 2021.**

Mr. Gilligan spoke on this agenda item. He called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the CAC meeting held on May 6, 2021. A motion was made by Mr. Farley and seconded by Ms. Ennis-Roughton. The motion passed unanimously.

### **b. Minutes from special called CAC meeting held on June 11, 2021.**

Mr. Gilligan then called for a motion and a second to approve the meeting minutes from the special called CAC meeting held on June 11, 2021. A motion was made by Mr. Farley and seconded by Ms. Ennis-Roughton. The motion passed unanimously.

## **3. BATS FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Information (19:10)**

Ms. Forbes spoke on this agenda items he stated that the BATS UPWP for FY 2021 closed on June 30, 2021 and that BATS is now in the process of finalizing the quarter 4 package and closeout documentation for submittal to GDOT for review. Ms. Forbes continued, stating that once the annual report is finalized it will be shared with all members of the committee. Ms. Forbes then stated that highlights from the last fiscal year including the completion of the MTP with the St. Simons Island Sector Study, the completion of the Bay Street Corridor Improvement Study, and that BATS was successfully awarded funding to carry out the MLK Altama Bicycle Corridor Study.

Ms. Forbes continued the highlights from FY 2021, mentioning that BATS also updated their Transportation Improvement Program from the 2018-2021 and it is now updated through FY 2021-2024. Our committee Bylaws and Public Participation Plan was also updated to include transportation planning policies and procedures for operating virtually. Ms. Forbes highlighted that the BATS staff ensured to collaborate with both the Federal Highway administration and GDOT staff also ensured that staff brought all materials to the committee before the public to carry out a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuous planning process.

Ms. Forbes then continued to mention highlights that staff successfully carried out a Citizens Advisory Committee membership drive to fill seats from members that became inactive over the years.

Ms. Forbes then continued to discuss that the FY 2022 UPWP updates started on July 1. The planning priorities for this fiscal year include:

- Support the 2020 US Census count and all related activities within the MPO area once that data becomes available to us.
- Conduct a review of all the existing multimodal transportation studies within the region which came out of the 2045 MTP adopted in August of last year.
- Work with oversight agencies on expanding virtual outreach for members of the public who wish to continue meeting virtually once staff reintegrate into being in-person again.

Ms. Forbes continued to discuss the FY 2022 Planning Priorities as part of the UPWP, including:

- Implementation of the 2045 MTP, and the current 2021-2024 TIP, and other special PL funding projects recently completed to ensure that goals and objectives from these documents align with the UPWP.
- Continue to do our maintenance and administrative documents to stay in compliance with an annual self-certification requirement.
- Continue to support all federal, state, and local initiatives as well as performance-based planning and ensure that once those performance targets are made available to BATS in October that all committee members have a copy of them, and they are all published on the MPO's website.

Ms. Forbes then shared a schedule showing the FY 2023 UPWP which is where staff are right now between July through October will highlight the planning priorities and develop that draft UPWP before presenting it to everyone in the committee in November. Ms. Forbes stated that a feedback log has been developed for members where committee members offer their opinion and feedback on what they think staff should be focused on as an MPO and staff try our best to incorporate their feedback as best as possible when developing the draft.

Ms. Forbes ran through the process of how to fill out the feedback form and asked for any questions on this. There were no questions offered to Ms. Forbes. Mr. Gilligan stated the importance of using the existing documents on the website and thinking a few years into the future. Mr. Gilligan stated that this is a great opportunity to comment and provide feedback on the forms the committee will be receiving from the MPO staff. Ms. Forbes then gave the opportunity for Mr. Hunter to present on agenda item four of the agenda – Transit Update – City of Brunswick.

#### **4. Transit System Update – City of Brunswick**

Mr. Hunter introduced himself as the director of planning, development and codes for the City of Brunswick and thanked everyone for allowing him to speak. He stated that about a year and a half ago he was put in charge of developing a transit system within the city. In October 2020, the city partnered with the consulting firm WRA which has been helping the city of Brunswick put together some options for the transit system. Mr. Hunter then introduced Mr. Tim Preece who is a consultant with WRA. Mr. Preece will also provide an update on how they have been working on this and progressed to date. Mr. Preece introduced himself to all in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. Preece discussed that much of the work that has been performed to date has been on trying to better define transit system and the cost associated with implementing a transit system and looking at where those funds might come from. The scope of previous work did not identify the scope of local funding.

Mr. Preece stated that the direction WRA has received from Mr. Hunter and the leadership of the city of Brunswick is that a system must be made that will work for city residents and must be well utilized. The service must be sustainable and be able to function for the long-term and affordable for the long-term as well.

Mr. Preece then offered a presentation on where jobs are in the city and in the county, and how people are community to jobs. Mr. Preece stated that where people are community to jobs is one of the most critical purposes of transit. Many people who live in Brunswick commute to jobs on St. Simons Island. However, many of the jobs in the city of Brunswick are filled by people in unincorporated areas of Glynn County.

Mr. Preece then presented the first transit service option was to update/refine what came from a prior study which are three routes that are tweaked and sized the system with complimentary ADA/Paratransit service and what that would look like. Mr. Preece asked how it would operate how many days, hours, vehicles, and how much that would cost, and then presented the discoveries to these questions. He stated that the city most likely will not be able to afford the first option of City/County Fixed Bus routes of three routes that include two in Brunswick and one that goes into St. Simons Island. This is an expansion that is an option that was built upon previous discussions from the city. The city reported back to WRA mentioning that this first option would probably not be

affordable for the city. Mr. Reece then stated that the routes extend out the city, significantly. Mr. Reece stated that because of this, the costs look to be split nearly 50-50 between the city of Brunswick and Glynn County. Nevertheless, the city asked for WRA to explore alternatives due to their belief that they would not be able to afford the cost of the system.

Mr. Preece stated that they have developed three alternatives. Alternative 2 is a Microtransit, Alternative 3 is a demand taxi and Alternative 4 is a scaled-down fixed route bus that only services the city, similar to option 1 but is scaled down to only serve the city. Microtransit is essentially an on-demand vehicle that anybody can call for via an app on your smart phone or telephone number. Mr. Preece explained the process of using the Microtransit and that the vehicles may or may not be wheelchair equipped and the city has unlimited flexibility on how they subsidize the cost of the ride and cost of the system. Mr. Preece confirmed with Mr. Hunter that Valdosta, GA implemented a similar service.

The demand taxi option, which essentially uses your local existing taxi companies and subsidizing the cost of those rides largely according to whatever subsidy the city would want to put in place. Mr. Preece stated that they explored this option in other cities that do this. Mr. Preece then stated that citizens would apply with the city to become a user, receive an ID card, call the service, hypothetically assumes passengers pay a fare of \$2 maximize and the city would help subsidize the cost of the trip to \$10 per trip, and has advantages of ease-of-implementation and scalability and uses existing local businesses. It does not have the same branding though as, for example, a bus system that reads "City of Brunswick Transit" which is more identifiable and recognizable.

Mr. Preece then presented on the fourth alternative, which is a scaled down bus system of service which uses one corridor and a circulator that circulates around the downtown area which uses many fewer vehicles and much lower cost to implement and operate.

Mr. Preece then showed a table that shows the operating costs and some assumptions made in estimating the cost for the transit alternatives. An additional table then summarizes the end-of-pocket cost to the city in ranges for different options. Mr. Preece then opened the floor to questions and comments before the final slides. There were no questions or comments for Mr. Preece.

Mr. Gilligan stated it would be helpful to answer the question of why the city is leading this effort and why the county is not yet fully involved. Ms. Hatcher stated that there were previous feasibility studies conducted before the economic downturn in 2008 that were conducted collaboratively between the county government and the city of Brunswick government to identify needs and opportunities for a transit service county-wide. The recommendations were accepted but no actions were taken towards implementation. Funds from a 5307 for federal funding was submitted but not utilized. Ms. Hatcher explained that this was the case since there was no desire to move the project forward and not in the interest of the county at the time. The funding was returned due to the economic downturn.

Ms. Hatcher continued and stated that after the recovery of the economic downturn, the MPO was approached to review the recommendations of the feasibility study to determine if the recommendations were still sound and that the demand and need were still apart of the community. The area allowed to be operated in using transit funding sources had changed based on census results and excluded St. Simons Island. Sometimes St. Simons is in the line and sometimes it is not, and this is because it is an island. In the original study done in talks before the 2008 Great Recession, St. Simons was considered out to receive federal transit funds. Modifications were reflected in the final memo that showed that there was a significant amount of travel shed for employment going out to St. Simons Island.

Throughout the memo process, one of the needs was to meet with local officials and who is prepared to move this forward and the county at the time was not prepared to move forward financially. The representative on the policy had stated that there was limited demand or need for the residents, which Ms. Hatcher claimed was the resounding tone at the time.

Mr. Gilligan thanked Ms. Hatcher for providing the background. Mr. Gilligan then asked Ms. Hatcher to describe what Coastal Regional Coaches is for public transit. Ms. Hatcher agreed and explained that the Coastal Regional Coaches is administered by the regional commission which is a 10-county planning and transit provision entity. The commission offers demand responsive bus service which Ms. Hatcher explained what that is, their scope of services, their funding sources, eligibility of trip types, and the limitations on residents it faces.

At this point, Mr. Gilligan asked if there were any questions from those on the call, and Ms. Ennis-Roughton asked for confirmation if the city only routes would only service the city and not those who were employed elsewhere, such as on St. Simons Island. Mr. Hunter confirmed that the city only routes reduce the program to two routes that only service the city of Brunswick. Ms. Ennis-Roughton then asked for further clarity on the routes to which Mr. Hunter described. Mr. Hunter then explained that the primary route will be from Walmart down Altama Ave. back into the hospital (Southeast Georgia Health System) and college (College of Coastal Georgia) area and continue down Altama to MLK Blvd. into the city center. Mr. Hunter further stated that there would be an in-city circulator route that connected the college and hospital to route 17 and downtown to the Norwich Ave. area.

Ms. Ennis-Roughton then asked for Mr. Hunter to expand on the issue of those who are employed on the island, but live in Brunswick, and the considerations of this issue in the alternatives. Mr. Hunter then explained that what Ms. Ennis-Roughton stated is an existing constraint that is being considered in which the routes would work on the urbanized areas. Mr. Hunter paraphrased by mentioning the constraint is the urbanized area and where the county can work in the urbanized area, and that the participation funding lines are limited to the city of Brunswick. Therefore, there is a smaller pool of dollars, and this overall makes it harder to provide service to places in demand. Mr. Preece then stated that many of the jobs on the unurbanized areas, especially on the islands, are seven days per

week and not during regular shifts. This is one of the reasons for micro transit and demand taxis, inserted Mr. Hunter.

Ms. Ennis-Roughton then asked if she, hypothetically, would be able to call the microbus to see if she could schedule a ride to St. Simons for her place of employment if she lived in Brunswick. She then asked what assumptions were considered when creating the table of Transit Alternatives costs. Mr. Preece believes that the assumption created is that these transit alternatives would be in operation six days per week. Ms. Ennis-Roughton followed by asking if Mr. Hunter and Mr. Preece would consider talking with Uber and Lyft that are both in the county. Mr. Preece stated that both gentlemen did not talk with either company, but that the demand taxi option would be like Uber and Lyft and the city would not be involved in scheduling these trips. It would be direct rider to driver. Ms. Ennis-Roughton ceded the floor.

Ms. Hatcher inserted that the ways to use federal funds are quite prohibitive relative to services like Uber and Lyft-type operators and if programs like these are offered-then they are being paid for by local funding solely and not in the FTA funding rules. Mr. Gilligan stated that this was a great point, then asked Ms. Scott-Amos to ask her question. Ms. Scott-Amos asked what the passenger capacity is between the city/county fixed route bus (the number one alternative) and the micro transit option. Mr. Preece answered that the capacity of those is about 20 persons. Mr. Preece answered that the size of micro transit could vary but they have seen typically anything from a van to a small bus from eight passengers up to 20, and this would be tied to what the city would like as defined in their contract.

Mr. Gilligan then asked Ms. Harris to ask her question. Ms. Harris asked by looking at all four of these transportation options, what the considerations are for those people who have disabilities, and if these options would accommodate the disabled. Mr. Preece answered that with the fixed route bus service, options one or four, it would be a requirement to have overlapping ADA paratransit service. Mr. Preece then continued and stated that option three, the demand taxi, would not be wheelchair equipped since local cab companies are not required to have wheelchair equipped vehicles. Option two is at the discretion of the city to have either some or all of the vehicles to be equipped. Mr. Preece stated that Gwinnett County, GA ran a pilot program on this and that they bought 10 vehicles that were similar to small busses and got wheelchair lifts and installed them on all of them. Ms. Harris asked what type of fee people would pay for this service. Mr. Preece stated he did not have that information available. Ms. Hatcher stated that the fare for disabled passengers can be no more than double the fare it is for the fare set for an able-bodied passenger, and that this was set by federal law.

Mr. Preece then stated that there was a \$0 fare assumption for options one and four. Option three the maximum subsidy would be \$12. Ms. Harris then asked if whatever the city decides to use - whether it will come prepared with an equipped lift accessible for those in a wheelchair to which Mr. Preece responded with an affirmative.

Mr. Gilligan then told Mr. Sabbe that he has permission to ask his question. Mr. Sabbe asked a question concerning the routes along the stops, and if the routes are used as a geographical reference, since there are additional more critical services along that area, and if Mr. Preece could talk more about the stops along the routes would be. Mr. Preece stated that they have not located where every stop would be, but in other mapping they show many more important destinations but is not showing it to this meeting since those maps get too cluttered. Mr. Sabbe then asked that there is anticipation that there would be multiple stops along these routes to which Mr. Preece confirmed.

Mr. Gilligan then allowed Ms. Scott-Amos to ask her additional question. Ms. Scott-Amos was wondering if Mr. Preece was expecting or proposing growing an actual taxi type entrepreneurial service to expand. Mr. Preece responded saying that it would subsidize the cost of using a local taxi and will not start any new taxi company nor compete with any taxi company in the area. Ms. Ennis-Roughton stated that she knows of only two taxi companies, but are quite small, in the area and uses Uber and Lyft more in the area. Ms. Harris stated she is familiar with the privately owned taxi services, but that she believes it is primarily people who have turned their own private vans into taxis. Ms. Scott-Amos then stated that she would be primarily concerned about the quality of service if this is the case. Mr. Hunter shared that concern and have considered that as well.

Mr. Gilligan then gave Mr. Ligon permission to ask his question. Mr. Ligon asked, referencing Savannah and accessible cabs similar to micro transit though discontinued, in which two vehicles were bought by the city to be operated and if Mr. Hunter and Mr. Preece were familiar with the program. Mr. Preece spoke and was unaware of the program but stated that they will inquire about it.

Mr. Gilligan then gave Ms. Ennis-Roughton permission to ask her question and asked about Hinesville and their public transit and if they had one of these options, what the latest was on that. Mr. Preece stated that he believes it is new and started a fixed route which is like options one and four. Ms. Hatcher stated she was staffed on the local government when the system had started there in 2009 and stated that there was a 30-40% reduction due to the economic downturn within the first 12 months of operation. Recently went through a new procurement process and purchased smaller vans with ADA accessible lifts, provide service to local adjacent cities, provide service to Fort Stewart military installation, and the system is owned and managed by the city of Hinesville. (1:09:00)

Ms. Ennis-Roughton then asked if the first option only asks for county money only which Mr. Preece confirmed. She then asked if anyone has approached the county on this and Mr. Hunter responded saying that due to the leadership flux over the last few months – he is not sure if it has been approached by the county yet, which is why the city also wanted to have as many options on the table for themselves.

Mr. Gilligan then provided a few comments and asked if Mr. Hunter and Mr. Preece have investigated a new loop route to incorporate other businesses besides Walmart, because there are several

businesses and community needs nearby. Mr. Gilligan followed up by further asking if on the south end if Mr. Hunter and Mr. Preece have looked to extend the route for Wynn Dixie on the Causeway as this is another popular destination due to the stores in the facility. Mr. Hunter stated that both options one and four service both of those areas. The primary route is Altama which looks to utilize the Scranton connector behind Publix that incorporates other large service stores. The actual final stop locations will get much public input as well. Mr. Hunter stated that once given direction by the city commission on where to go, the city opens themselves up to much more stakeholder input. Mr. Hunter then highlighted that it is not only what are the places that people mention they want to see stops at but what is the infrastructure put in place at the places the city needs the routes to stop at. Mr. Gilligan then asked Mr. Hunter and Mr. Preece about the business community and asked if there was any conversation with the business community to advance the first option which goes into because that is where many of the jobs in the county are at. Mr. Hunter responded that that is part of their consideration in working towards Option One. If they determine that they want to make that determination that is exactly what needs to happen from a community standpoint for it to be successful since option one shows that the need is broader than just the city. Mr. Gilligan then thanked both Mr. Preece and Mr. Hunter and asked for them to complete their final slide.

Mr. Preece then shared the next steps of their plan with dates. These include the City Council Briefing (July 21, 2021) Community and Stakeholder Meetings (August - September 2021) City Council Deliberation (November – December 2021) and Service Implementation (FY 2023). The gentlemen were thanked by Mr. Gilligan, and Mr. Gilligan thanked those on the call who asked questions. Mr. Gilligan then asked Ms. Forbes to get back to the rest of the agenda for the meeting. Ms. Forbes asked Mr. Gilligan if it was okay to share the administrative updates that Ms. Forbes has, to which Mr. Gilligan agreed that it was.

## **5. BATS Administrative Updates**

### **a. BATS FY 2021 UPWP Administrative Modification**

Ms. Forbes spoke on this agenda item. She shared with the committee stated that BATS performed and administrative modification and presented the initial approved budget work program on money anticipated BATS would spend on the fiscal year. Each phase and task were allocated money based on anticipation for the Fiscal year. She then showed a modified fiscal year table and showed that we had spent more money in operations/administration this year than budgeted for and needed to reallocate money to that category. Ms. Forbes assured the committee that the amount of money did not change overall though.

### **b. GAMPO Special PL Funding Applications**

Ms. Forbes spoke on this agenda item. She stated that as a reminder, the next round of GAMPO Special PL funding is due in September 2021 and again in March 2022 and can only be used for

planning purposes and cannot be used for Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, Utility, or Construction phases of projects. The funding is always 80% Federal Government and 20% local match based on who is sponsoring the project.

Ms. Forbes further stated that these Special PL Funding Applications must be reflected in the UPWP, go through two cycles of MPO meetings, and so RS&H built in a new schedule that built in the two cycles of MPO meeting and 12-month process that meets the GAMPO projects and dates. Projects must support the BATS MTP and projects must be competitively bid through a local, state and federal RFP/RFQ process.

Ms. Forbes then presented a new timeline that showed the new GAMPO timeline which showed that if there is a project being considered for submission, now would be the time for the spring application. Ms. Forbes stated that BATS should start thinking about projects BATS would like to submit for special PL funding for the Spring.

#### **c. 5303 Transit Planning Grant Application**

Ms. Forbes stated that for FY 2023 the 5303-grant application memo is what BATS uses funding for to support, for example, the city of Brunswick to support their efforts with the transit system implementation and that there are two years of 5303 transit funding programming in the UPWP and the current year is shown in the table with line-items related to the 5303.

Ms. Forbes then presented a snippet of the typical timeline for a funding application of 5303 which is opened in September with the application being due in November and then come March there is notification of whether there was funding allocated which could then be used July 1. The estimated 5303 funding will be for FY 2023 is just over \$56,000.

#### **d. Special PL Funding Project (Bay Street Corridor Improvements)**

Ms. Forbes then stated that the Policy Committee took action to approve the Bay Street Corridor improvement study. Once Ms. Forbes receives the final product it will be downloaded on BATS website.

#### **e. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Membership Drive – 2021**

Ms. Forbes wished congratulations to all those members of the CAC on the call by being accepted by the Policy Committee. Ms. Forbes then told the committee that at the moment the CAC has 12 active members so the effort to extend the 2021 CAC membership drive to fill six remaining seats was approved by the Policy Committee on June 14, 2021. Ms. Forbes asked for those who knew people that the CAC members believed would be a good fit for the committee, to encourage these citizens

to apply. Ms. Forbes continued to mention that there will be a second new member orientation and training, date and time is still TBD, to incorporate the new members as well as members who did not attend the first new member orientation.

## **6. BATS Agency Updates**

### **a. Glynn County Airport Commission**

Agency updates from the TCC were provided earlier that morning. Mr. Vernon Bessing provided an update for the Airport Commission. He informed us that they are still finishing up the parking lot project and ongoing work with the calibration pad being carried out by Seaboard.

### **b. Glynn County School Board**

Ms. Forbes stated that Mr. Marty Simmons provided updates for the school board – working through plans for the move of Altama Elementary school to its new location further north on Altama Avenue. Ms. Forbes highlighted that Mr. Simmons also stated that there would be a temporary location of Golden Isles elementary in the old Altama elementary school building, and hopefully both schools will start the new school year in their new location August through January. The board is currently working through provisions to make plans for traffic, busses, and additional foot traffic as it relates to the schools and changes in the school zone.

### **c. Glynn County BATS Transportation Project Update**

For the county, Ms. Forbes stated that there was a county update sheet provided which is also available on the MPO website for download. Ms. Forbes reminded members of the committee that if there are any questions to please download the form on the MPO website, email it to Ms. Forbes, and Ms. Forbes will send to the appropriate person in the county and then provide everyone on the CAC with feedback accordingly.

### **d. City of Brunswick**

Ms. Forbes stated that Mr. Alberson provided the city of Brunswick update on Magnolia Park project, which is expecting to be completed later this Summer, with phase II out for bid. Ms. Forbes also stated that they are also working on the boardwalk trail along 17<sup>th</sup> and working with the consultant to get that kicked off soon.

### **e. GDOT District 5**

Ms. Forbes stated staff received a project sheet from GDOT District 5, and just like the county, one ought to look over these tables and if anyone has any questions to send the question over to Ms. Forbes so she can forward the questions to the appropriate person in the county.

### **f. Jekyll Island Authority**

Ms. Forbes told the committee members that there was no one present from the Jekyll Island Authority but that they were told that that they would not be present at the meeting.

#### **g. Transit Agencies**

Concerning transit agency updates, Ms. Forbes stated that there were none from coastal regional coaches and that staff just had a very in-depth transit update earlier in the meeting.

#### **h. Other Items**

Ms. Forbes asked Mr. Gilligan if there were any other items to be discussed. Mr. Gilligan opened the floor to the committee for discussion. Mr. Sabbe stated that there “Was a flag that went off” when thinking about the Brunswick transportation solution that staff ought to consider getting parents to schools. Mr. Sabbe was thanked by Mr. Gilligan.

Mr. Gilligan called on Ms. Ennis-Roughton. Ms. Ennis-Roughton stated that she would like to see, at the next meeting, a more-informal discussion to gather thoughts and ideas on how to help in order to see how this Brunswick transit plan can be brought to fruition from a county perspective. In other words, Ms. Ennis-Roughton wanted to know how the committee can grasp this opportunity and if the committee would like to call a special meeting. Mr. Gilligan agreed and stated how staff ought to go back to the people that staff are near: the public at large, the future riders, and the business community of the county.

Mr. Gilligan then commented that staff should not wait until the next meeting on where the CAC members should submit their comments to Ms. Forbes, in addition to mentioning that there will be time set aside during the September meeting to review the Brunswick transit plan in further detail. Mr. Gilligan asked Ms. Hatcher and Ms. Forbes whether they know if the city has spoken to the chamber of commerce directly. Ms. Forbes responded that she was not sure if they had that meeting, but she knows that they have done presentations to the commission – she just is not sure if they have met with the Chamber of Commerce but stated she will ask Mr. Hunter. Mr. Gilligan then asked Ms. Forbes if she could ask Mr. Hunter to send the maps of the proposed routes to the CAC so that members of the committee can examine these maps more closely. Ms. Forbes agreed to, but stated that, if her memory serves her correctly, that they are on the MPO website for download already, 5303 transit memo, under plans and documents, then the section for transit. Mr. Gilligan then asked for additional questions. Ms. Harris asked Ms. Hatcher if they included the city’s presentation in the committee’s packet and Ms. Forbes responded by saying that staff will request it and transfer it to the committee, and it will be detailed in the meeting minutes.

#### **i. Public Comment**

Ms. Forbes announced that at this point in the meeting we would typically have members of the public who were in attendance speak at the meeting. Ms. Forbes then announced that she believed that the members of the public left after the presentation from Mr. Preece. There were no members of the public at the meeting by this time.

### **7. Adjourn**

Mr. Gilligan asked Ms. Forbes to remind everyone regarding anything regarding the CAC for the right email to be using. Ms. Forbes stated to use the [vforbes@glynncounty.org](mailto:vforbes@glynncounty.org) email which is the email she primarily uses during the application process. Ms. Forbes then stated that if she does not respond to an email soon enough, then to forward the email to Ms. Pamela Thompson at her email [pkthompson@glynncounty.org](mailto:pkthompson@glynncounty.org). Mr. Gilligan then asked Ms. Forbes to remind the committee members of the next meeting, which is on September 13, 2021 at 4:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M. Ms. Harris stated that this is not a good time for her due to a different board conflict. Ms. Ellis-Roughton asked if the next meeting will be virtual in which Ms. Forbes confirmed it will be. Mr. Gilligan then thanked all the committee members before calling for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Gilligan called for a motion to be made to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by Ms. Harris to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Ms. Ennis-Roughton. The motion passed unanimously.

---

BATS CAC Chairman

---

Date