

# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

## DRAFT FINAL REPORT

PREPARED FOR | SOUTHERN GEORGIA REGIONAL COMMISSION  
PREPARED BY | METRO ANALYTICS, LLC  
IN ASSOCIATION WITH | POND & COMPANY, CROY, AND MPH & ASSOCIATES



DRAFT REPORT

AUGUST 2025





Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO)

## 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)

### Final Report

Prepared for the



Prepared by



In association with



August 2025



## ACRONYMS

<b>ACS</b> - American Community Survey	<b>IIJA</b> - Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act
<b>ADA</b> - Americans with Disabilities Act	<b>IRI</b> - International Roughness Index
<b>AoPP</b> - Area of Persistent Poverty	<b>ITS</b> - Intelligent Technology System
<b>ASU</b> - Albany State University	<b>LEHD</b> - Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics
<b>ATIIP</b> - Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program	<b>LMIG</b> - Local Maintenance & Improvement Grant
<b>ATTAIN</b> - Advanced Transportation Technology and Innovation Program	<b>LOTTR</b> - Level of Travel Time Reliability
<b>BIL</b> - Bipartisan Infrastructure Law	<b>MPA</b> - Metropolitan Planning Area
<b>CMAQ</b> - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality	<b>MPO</b> - Metropolitan Planning Organization
<b>CMV</b> - Commercial Motor Vehicle	<b>MPP</b> - Metropolitan Planning Program
<b>CRFC</b> - Critical Rural Freight Corridors	<b>MSA</b> - Metropolitan Statistical Area
<b>CRISI</b> - Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvement Grants	<b>MTP</b> - Metropolitan Transportation Plan
<b>CUFC</b> - Critical Urban Freight Corridors	<b>NBI</b> - National Bridge Inventory
<b>CFI</b> - Charging and Fuel Infrastructure Grant Program	<b>NEVI</b> - National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program
<b>CVSP</b> - Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan	<b>NHS</b> - National Highway System
<b>EJ</b> - Environmental Justice	<b>NHFN</b> - National Highway Freight Network
<b>EPA</b> - Environmental Protection Agency	<b>NHPP</b> - National Highway Performance Program
<b>FAST</b> - Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act	<b>NOx</b> - Nitrous Oxides
<b>FHWA</b> - Federal Highway Administration	<b>NMFN</b> - National Multimodal Freight Network
<b>FRA</b> - Federal Railway Administration	<b>PEHD</b> - Peak Hour Excessive Delay
<b>FTA</b> - Federal Transit Administration	<b>PHFS</b> - Primary Highway Freight System
<b>GDOT</b> - Georgia Department of Transportation	<b>PM</b> - Performance Metric
<b>GTIB</b> - Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank	<b>PMI</b> - Project Management Institute
<b>HDC</b> - Historically Disadvantaged Community	<b>PMBOK</b> - Project Management Body of Knowledge
<b>HP-CMV</b> - High Priority Commercial Motor Vehicle Grants	<b>POP</b> - Operations Plan
<b>HSIP</b> - Highway Safety Improvement Program	<b>PPP</b> - Public Participation Process
<b>HUB</b> - Historically Underutilized Business	<b>RCE</b> - Railway Crossing Elimination Grant
	<b>RCP</b> - Reconnecting Communities Pilot Grant Program
	<b>SGRC</b> – Southern Georgia Regional Commission



**SHSP** - Strategic Highway Safety Plan

**SMART** - Strengthening Mobility and  
Revolutionizing Transportation Program

**SOGR** - State of Good Repair

**SOV** - Single occupancy vehicle

**SPLOST** - Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax

**SS4A** - Safe Streets and Roads for All

**SSTP** - Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan

**STBG** - Surface Transportation Block Grant Program

**STRACNET** - Strategic Rail Corridor Network

**STRAHNET** - Strategic Highway Network

**STP** - Surface Transportation Program

**SWTP** - Statewide Transportation Plan

**SWOT** - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities,  
Threats Analysis

**TADA** - Traffic Analysis and Data Application

**TAMP** - Transportation Asset Management Plan

**TA** - Transportation Alternatives

**TAZ** - Traffic Analysis Zone

**TDM** - Travel demand model

**TDP** - Transit Development Plan

**TIA** - Transportation Investment Act of 2010

**TIP** - Transportation Improvement Plan

**TMA** - Transportation management area

**T-SPLOST** - Transportation Special Purpose Local  
Option Sales Tax

**TSM** - Transportation System Management

**TTTR** - Truck Travel Time Reliability

**URP** - Urban Redevelopment Plan

**USDOT** - United States Department of  
Transportation

**V2I** - Vehicle-to-Infrastructure

**V2V** - Vehicle-to-Vehicle

**VLMPO** – Valdosta-Lowndes MPO

**VMT** - Vehicle Miles Traveled

**VOC** - Volatile Organic Compounds

**VRU** - Vulnerable Roadway User



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms .....	i
Table of Contents .....	iii
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables .....	xi
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Overview of the VLMPO Study Area.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the MTP .....	1
1.3 MTP Process .....	4
1.4 Report Organization.....	6
<b>2 Review of Relevant Studies .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Federal Policies .....	7
2.1.1 BIL Overview.....	7
2.1.2 MTP Requirements.....	7
2.2 State Plans and Policies .....	8
2.2.1 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan (SSTP)/2050 Statewide Transportation Plan (SWTP) 8	
2.2.2 Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan.....	8
2.2.3 GDOT Transportation Asset Management Plan.....	9
2.2.4 Georgia State Rail Plan 2021 .....	9
2.2.5 2022-2024 Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan .....	9
2.3 Regional Plans and Policies.....	9
2.3.1 Vision2045: Valdosta-Lowndes County Metropolitan Transportation Plan .....	9
2.3.2 2009 Freight Movement Study.....	10
2.3.3 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) .....	10
2.3.4 Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning.....	10
2.3.5 Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines.....	10
2.3.6 Hahira Area Traffic Studies .....	10
2.3.7 2045 Transportation Plan Socioeconomic Data Study .....	10
2.3.8 SGRC Transit Development Plan (TDP) Update .....	11
2.4 Local Plans and Studies.....	11



2.4.1	Comprehensive Plan.....	11
<b>3</b>	<b>Performance Based Planning.....</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.....	12
3.2	National Transportation Performance Measures & GDOT Targets.....	14
3.3	Existing System Performance.....	18
3.3.1	Safety and System Reliability.....	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Existing Transportation Asset Profile .....</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1	Roadway System.....	25
4.2	Transit Operations .....	30
4.3	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities .....	32
4.4	Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Technology .....	38
4.5	Emerging Transportation Technology .....	41
4.6	Railroads (Freight) .....	43
4.7	Ancillary Truck Facilities.....	46
4.8	Aviation Facilities .....	46
<b>5</b>	<b>Existing System Conditions and Performance.....</b>	<b>47</b>
5.1	Safety and System Reliability .....	47
5.2	Infrastructure Conditions.....	53
5.3	Congestion Reduction/Mobility.....	57
5.4	Freight Movement and Economic Vitality .....	59
5.5	Environmental Justice, Equity, and Sustainability.....	61
5.6	Project Delivery .....	71
5.7	Assessment of Bicycle and Pedestrian Demand .....	72
5.8	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) .....	73
<b>6</b>	<b>Stakeholder and Public Involvement .....</b>	<b>75</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	75
6.2	Public Participation Structure .....	75
6.2.1	MPO Committees .....	75
6.2.2	Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) .....	75
6.2.3	Public Open Houses.....	76
6.3	Stakeholder and Public Involvement Tools.....	76
6.3.1	Stakeholder and Public Involvement Plan .....	76



6.3.2	Webpage .....	77
6.3.3	Fact Sheet .....	77
6.3.4	Online Citizen Survey.....	77
6.3.5	HEAL and ArcGIS StoryMaps .....	78
6.3.6	Press Releases .....	78
6.4	MTP Document Notification, Review, and Documentation Procedures.....	79
6.5	Evaluation of Public Involvement Tools .....	79
<b>7</b>	<b>Land Use and Development .....</b>	<b>81</b>
7.1	Inventory of Existing Land Uses .....	81
7.1.1	Activity Centers .....	81
7.2	Areas of Persistent Poverty.....	86
<b>8</b>	<b>SocioEconomic Profile.....</b>	<b>90</b>
8.1	Base Year 2020 Demographic Profile.....	91
8.1.1	Population and Households .....	93
8.1.2	Employment .....	96
8.1.3	K-12 and University Enrollment.....	98
8.2	Horizon Year 2050 Demographic Profile.....	98
8.2.1	Year 2050 Population and Households.....	100
8.2.2	Employment .....	101
8.2.3	K-12 and University Enrollment.....	105
<b>9</b>	<b>Needs Assessment .....</b>	<b>108</b>
9.1	Future Year 2050 Travel Demand Forecasts .....	108
9.2	Future Roadway Needs.....	114
9.3	Future Active Transportation Needs.....	121
9.3.1	Pedestrian Focused Projects .....	121
9.3.2	Bicycle Focused Projects .....	121
9.3.3	Pedestrian Intersection Safety Projects.....	121
9.3.4	Multi-Use Paths and Recreational Trails.....	121
9.4	Future Transit Needs.....	127
9.4.1	Fixed Route Transit Service.....	127
9.4.2	On-Demand Transit Services .....	130
9.4.3	Transit Hubs and Mobility Hubs .....	130



9.4.4	Connectivity and Sidewalk Infrastructure .....	131
9.4.5	Mixed-Use Development.....	131
9.4.6	Public Transit Infrastructure .....	131
9.5	Future Needs for Other Transportation Modes.....	131
9.5.1	ITS and Signalization.....	131
9.5.2	Electric Vehicles.....	135
9.5.3	Rail Freight.....	138
9.5.4	Aviation Access.....	138
<b>10</b>	<b>Alternatives Analysis and Testing.....</b>	<b>139</b>
10.1	Safety and System Reliability .....	139
10.2	Infrastructure Condition .....	140
10.2.1	Anticipated Bridge Conditions .....	140
10.2.2	Anticipated Pavement Conditions.....	141
10.3	Congestion Reduction.....	141
10.4	Freight Movement and Economic Vitality .....	144
10.5	Environmental Sustainability and Equity.....	144
10.5.1	Potential Stormwater Impacts and Mitigation.....	144
10.5.2	Potential Air Quality Impacts and Mitigation.....	145
10.5.3	Potential Equity Impacts and Mitigation.....	147
10.6	Reduced Project Delivery Delays .....	148
<b>11</b>	<b>Transportation Revenues and Cost Assumptions .....</b>	<b>149</b>
11.1	Funding Sources.....	149
11.1.1	Federal Funding Sources .....	149
11.1.2	State Funding Sources.....	151
11.1.3	Local Funding Sources.....	152
11.2	Revenue Projections .....	152
11.3	Project Cost Assumptions .....	155
<b>12</b>	<b>Performance-based Project Prioritization.....</b>	<b>157</b>
12.1	Scoring Criteria and Metrics .....	157
12.1.1	Safety .....	157
12.1.2	Freight Movement and Economic Vitality.....	157
12.1.3	Infrastructure Condition .....	158



12.1.4	System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction .....	158
12.1.5	Equity and Environmental Sustainability .....	158
12.1.6	Project Delivery .....	158
12.2	Criteria Weights .....	158
<b>13</b>	<b>MTP Work Program.....</b>	<b>162</b>
13.1	Project Rankings .....	162
13.2	Cost Feasible Projects .....	166
13.3	Aspirational Projects.....	178
<b>Appendix A: Historical Equity Action Lens (HEAL) Support Materials.....</b>		<b>179</b>
<b>Appendix B: Stakeholder Advisory Committee Membership .....</b>		<b>180</b>
<b>Appendix C: Stakeholder Advisory Committee and Public Open House Meeting Notes .....</b>		<b>182</b>
<b>Appendix D: Online Citizen Survey Summary .....</b>		<b>183</b>
<b>Appendix E: Growth Scenario Analysis Technical Memorandum .....</b>		<b>184</b>
<b>Appendix F: Revenue Projections and Project Costs Technical Memorandum .....</b>		<b>185</b>
<b>Appendix G: Project Prioritization Technical Memorandum .....</b>		<b>186</b>
<b>Appendix H: FHWA Compliance Checklist.....</b>		<b>187</b>



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: VLMPO Planning Area .....	2
Figure 1-2: VLMPO Urban Core .....	3
Figure 1-3: Key Milestones and Project Flow .....	5
Figure 3-1: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide .....	21
Figure 3-2: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core .....	22
Figure 3-3: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide .....	23
Figure 3-4: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core .....	24
Figure 4-1: Roadway Functional Classifications .....	26
Figure 4-2: Roadway Lane Configurations .....	27
Figure 4-3: Year 2022 GDOT Traffic Counts .....	28
Figure 4-4: Year 2022 GDOT Percentage of Trucks .....	29
Figure 4-5: Existing VLMPO Transit Systems .....	31
Figure 4-6: Existing VLMPO Trail System .....	33
Figure 4-7: Existing VLMPO Sidewalk Network .....	34
Figure 4-8: Existing VLMPO Crosswalk Locations .....	35
Figure 4-9: Existing VLMPO Pedestrian Signal Locations .....	36
Figure 4-10: Existing VLMPO Bicycle Lanes .....	37
Figure 4-11: Existing Regional ITS Infrastructure .....	39
Figure 4-12: Existing ITS Signal Locations .....	40
Figure 4-13: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations .....	42
Figure 4-14: Railroads and Rail Yards .....	44
Figure 4-15: Railroad Crossings .....	45
Figure 5-1: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide .....	49
Figure 5-2: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core .....	50
Figure 5-3: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide .....	51
Figure 5-4: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core .....	52
Figure 5-5: Valdosta Area Bridge Conditions .....	54
Figure 5-6: GDOT Highway Pavement Conditions in Valdosta Area <sup>1</sup> .....	55
Figure 5-7: City of Valdosta Roadway Pavement Conditions .....	56
Figure 5-8: Existing (2020) Roadway LOS .....	58



Figure 5-9: Existing (2022) Truck Volumes .....	60
Figure 5-10: Trip Destinations of Low-Income Active Transportation Users .....	70
Figure 5-11: Existing Demand for Active Transportation .....	73
Figure 7-1: Land Use Character Areas and Activity Centers.....	82
Figure 7-2: Valdosta State University Properties.....	83
Figure 7-3: Grade School Locations.....	84
Figure 7-4: Park Locations .....	85
Figure 7-5: Median Household Income by Census Tract.....	87
Figure 7-6: Percent Zero Vehicle Households by Census Tract .....	88
Figure 7-7: Percent Multi-Family Housing Units .....	89
Figure 8-1: Historic Population Growth Rates for Georgia vs. Valdosta Region.....	90
Figure 8-2: Base Year 2020 Population Distribution by TAZ.....	94
Figure 8-3: Base Year 2020 Household Distribution by TAZ.....	95
Figure 8-4: Base Year 2019 Employment Distribution by TAZ.....	97
Figure 8-5: Future Year 2050 Population Distribution by TAZ.....	101
Figure 8-6: Future Year 2050 Households by TAZ .....	102
Figure 8-7: Change in Population (2020 – 2050) by TAZ .....	103
Figure 8-8: Change in Households (2020 – 2050) by TAZ.....	104
Figure 8-9: Future Year 2020 Employment by TAZ.....	106
Figure 8-10: Change in Employment (2020 – 2050) by TAZ .....	107
Figure 9-1: 2050 LOS with Do Nothing Network.....	109
Figure 9-2: 2050 LOS with E+C Network .....	110
Figure 9-3: 2050 LOS with TIP/STIP Network .....	111
Figure 9-4: 2050 E+C Projects and LOS with Anticipated Household Growth .....	112
Figure 9-5: 2050 E+C Projects and LOS with Anticipated Employment Growth .....	113
Figure 9-6: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects .....	119
Figure 9-7: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects in Urban Core .....	120
Figure 9-8: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Focused Projects.....	123
Figure 9-9: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Bicycle Focused Projects.....	124
Figure 9-10: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Intersection Safety Project Locations .....	125
Figure 9-11: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Multi-Use Paths and Recreational Trails .....	126
Figure 9-12: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Fixed Route Bus Routes .....	129



Figure 9-13: Future ITS/Signalization Needs ..... 134

Figure 9-14: Electric Vehicle Existing Status and Future Needs ..... 137

Figure 10-1: Congested Travel Speed by Model Scenario ..... 142

Figure 10-2: 2050 LOS with MTP Network..... 143

Figure 13-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Roadway & Bridge Projects ..... 171

Figure 13-2: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Roadway & Bridge Projects - Inset ..... 172

Figure 13-3: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Active Transportation Projects ..... 173

Figure 13-4: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Active Transportation Projects - Inset ..... 174

Figure 13-5: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Public Transit Projects ..... 175

Figure 13-6: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended ITS & Signalization Projects ..... 176

Figure 13-7: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Electric Vehicle & Alternative Fuel Projects ..... 177



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Goal Alignment with State and National Goals.....	15
Table 3-2: VLMPO 2050 MTP Performance-based Assessment Metrics.....	17
Table 3-3: GDOT Statewide Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics.....	18
Table 3-4: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics.....	19
Table 3-5: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics.....	19
Table 5-1: GDOT Statewide Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics.....	47
Table 5-2: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics.....	48
Table 5-3: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics.....	48
Table 5-4: Key HEAL Assessment Findings .....	62
Table 5-5: Project Summary from Recent VLMPO TIPs.....	71
Table 5-6: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) .....	74
Table 6-1: Engagement Tool Utilization Per Plan Development Milestone.....	78
Table 6-2: Public Outreach Strategies and Evaluation Criteria.....	80
Table 8-1: Historic Population Growth in Georgia and Valdosta Region.....	90
Table 8-2: Base Year 2020 Socioeconomic Data Sources .....	92
Table 8-3: Base Year 2020 Population and Household data by County in MPO Area.....	93
Table 8-4: Base Year 2020 Employment Data by Type and County.....	96
Table 8-5: Base Year 2020 School Enrollment Data.....	98
Table 8-6: Comparison of 2020 and 2050 Control Total Estimates .....	99
Table 8-7: Future Year 2050 Population and Household Totals .....	100
Table 8-8: Change in Population and Household 2020 - 2050.....	100
Table 8-9: Future Year 2050 Employment by Type .....	105
Table 8-10: Change in Employment 2020 - 2050 .....	105
Table 9-1: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects.....	116
Table 9-2: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Active Transportation Projects.....	122
Table 9-3: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Transit Projects.....	127
Table 9-4: Future ITS/Signalization Needs.....	133
Table 9-5: Electric Vehicle Future Needs.....	136
Table 10-1: Emission and Fuel Consumption Rates for Passenger Cars.....	142
Table 10-2: Emission and Fuel Consumption Rates for Passenger Cars.....	146



Table 10-3: Emission and Fuel Consumption Rates for Trucks.....	146
Table 11-1: Projected Federal and State Funding Revenue .....	154
Table 11-2: Projected Local Funding Revenue .....	155
Table 12-1: Scoring Methodology .....	160
Table 12-2: Criteria Weights by Project Categories.....	161
Table 13-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Projects Prioritization Rank.....	162
Table 13-2: Draft Constrained Cost Feasible Plan .....	168
Table 13-3: Draft Aspirational Project List.....	178



## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview of the VLMPO Study Area

The Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Area (VLMPO) is located in southern Georgia, just north of the Florida state line, along the I-75 corridor. The Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO) study area includes all of Lowndes County and portions of Berrien, Brooks and Lanier Counties. Incorporated cities in the study area include Valdosta, Hahira, Lake Park, and Remerton. **Figure 1-1** depicts the VLMPO study area and components of its multi-modal transportation system while **Figure 1-2** is an inset focused on the urban core of the VLMPO study area.

### 1.2 Purpose of the MTP

The VLMPO is updating their Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to a new horizon year of 2050. The VLMPO is housed in the Southern Georgia Regional Commission (SGRC). SGRC staff are supported during the 2050 MTP by a consulting team led by Metro Analytics (MA) along with subconsultants Croy Engineering, MPH and Associates, and Pond & Company. Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) staff and their consultants are also playing key roles throughout the project. The 2050 MTP must also be consistent with MTP requirements from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

This updated plan is performance-based and compliant with federal regulations for such plans. As such, the 2050 MTP is addressing factors such as equity, supply chain issues, tourist/long-distance travel, and shifts in traditional commuting and shopping patterns. The plan identifies how the MPO will manage and operate a multi-modal transportation system (including transit, highway, bicycle, pedestrian, and accessible transportation) to meet the region's economic, transportation, development, and sustainability goals for a 25-year planning horizon. Key study objectives include the following:

- Reset the MTP for present conditions (demographic, multi-modal transportation network, travel patterns).
- Conduct a robust public outreach plan using a range of tools to maximize community participation.
- Identify right-sizing of the best and highest use of infrastructure within the VLMPO.
- Place VLMPO infrastructure within historical and social context.
- Forecast travel patterns and identify multi-modal transportation needs for the next 25 years.
- Forecast available transportation revenue, estimate project needs costs, rank, and prioritize needs, and recommend a cost-feasible plan for adoption.



Figure 1-1: VLMPO Planning Area







Figure 1-2: VLMPO Urban Core





## **1.3 MTP Process**

Successful project delivery requires a focus on key project milestones and MTP deliverables. These key milestones and their timing must reflect stages in the MTP planning process. Project milestones and deliverables reflect how each task builds on the others, leading to a completed MTP.

### **1.3.1.1 Milestone #1 (Existing Conditions Report)**

The Existing Conditions Report includes an introduction to the MTP scope and overarching objectives. This report leads to a transportation system profile that covers more specific goals and objectives, along with a discussion of transportation system assets and liabilities by transportation mode. Existing conditions and performance are described using a series of performance requirements and indicators. Emerging issues and key planning requirements are addressed, including a look at strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis. Conclusions and next steps are also addressed in the Existing Conditions report. Subconsultant scopes of services individually describe a series of memos and spreadsheets which feed into this report.

### **1.3.1.2 Milestone #2 (Future Needs Report)**

The Future Needs Report builds on the existing conditions assessment from Milestone #1. This report describes the use of an updated 2050 MPO travel demand model to identify areas of future growth and corridors expected to experience additional congestion. Year 2050 model outputs are visualized and summarized with respect to mobility measures identified as part of the Existing Conditions Report. The potential for future multimodal needs are reflected in existing system performance discussions, existing plans, areas of high-density development, and equity assessments conducted as part of Milestone #1.

### **1.3.1.3 Milestone #3 (Scenarios Report)**

Two land use and growth scenarios were developed during the 2050 MTP for presentation to the public and key stakeholders. The scenario analysis addressed challenges related to economic resilience and growth pressures in rural/urban character areas; options to improve connectivity and enhance the livability of existing and future neighborhoods; potential approaches to better integrate transportation planning and land use planning; potential impacts on revenue or value per acre of developed areas; and increased density that improves small business development and increases options for active transportation. Some of the effects of these scenarios are measurable in the travel demand model and others required off model evaluation. The scenarios report described scenario development, stakeholder engagement on these scenarios, and qualitative and quantitative evaluations of potential scenario impacts on an alternate future transportation system.

### **1.3.1.4 Milestone #4 (Fiscal Constraints)**

The Fiscal Constraints Memo includes an assessment of the estimated funding availability which can reasonably be expected to be available from all sources through the horizon year 2050. The calculations include a growth factor which was agreed upon in consultation with the MPO. This memo also provides planning level cost estimates for each project outlined in the 2050 Needs Assessment, including



preliminary engineering, design, right-of-way, and construction. The resulting cost estimates are fed into the process of project prioritization, described under Milestone #5.

### 1.3.1.5 Milestone #5 (Preferred Investments and Strategy Report)

This milestone is focused on project prioritization and development of a recommended cost affordable MTP. A project ranking and scoring methodology was proposed and discussed with stakeholders. Measures of effectiveness defined during Milestone #1, and refined through public engagement, MPO board and committee discussions, and results from the needs assessment, scenario testing, and fiscal constraints, were integral to the process of scoring and ranking all projects under consideration for funding. This process ensures that the recommended cost feasible plan reflects the principles of performance-based planning.

### 1.3.1.6 Milestone #6 (Adoption and Plan Document)

The final milestone includes plan adoption and preparation of a final MTP report. This draft final report includes chapters devoted to each of the previously described milestones. The public engagement process is described in detail including public involvement methods, stakeholder/agency outreach, public meetings, and methods employed in digital engagement. All components of the recommended 2050 cost feasible plan are described in detail, along with potential environmental impacts and societal benefits. A 30-day period is proposed for review of this draft document prior to plan adoption. The final version of this report will reflect all comments received from MPO and GDOT staff, and present the plan as adopted by the MPO Policy Committee.

It is critical that the VLMPO Policy Committee (MPO Board), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and other stakeholders understand the steps in the process. **Figure 1-3** is a visual representation of these key project milestones.

Figure 1-3: Key Milestones and Project Flow





## 1.4 Report Organization

This final report builds on the findings from previously described milestones, reports, and memos. Much of the report content has been obtained from earlier reports, for consistency, with minor edits for tense and to reflect two years of project activity. This report is organized into core sections that describe the analysis of the current transportation system and its future needs. The elements include:

- **Review of Relevant Studies:** Chapter 2 highlights previous federal, state, and MPO programs and plans that are relevant to the 2050 MTP Update to assist in understanding regional transportation needs and guide recommendations.
- **Performance Based Planning:** Chapter 3 defines the goals and performance measures for the 2050 MTP Update.
- **Existing Transportation Asset Profile:** Chapter 4 describes key features of the existing multi-modal transportation system.
- **Existing System Conditions and Performance:** Chapter 5 presents the process used to assess system performance.
- **Stakeholder Participation and Inputs:** Chapter 6 describes the public outreach process employed over two years of study.
- **Land Use and Development:** Chapter 7 depicts current land use and planned major developments.
- **Socio-Economic Profile:** Chapter 8 presents and analyzes the base year and future socioeconomic data for the VLMPO area.
- **Needs Assessment:** Chapter 9 describes future year 2050 transportation needs identified for all modes.
- **Alternatives Analysis and Testing:** Chapter 10 describes likely outcomes from implementing 2050 MTP needs projects in terms of study goals and objectives.
- **Revenues and Potential Funding Sources:** Chapter 11 identifies federal, state, and local funding sources and presents revenue projections for the next 25 years.
- **Project Identification and Prioritization:** Chapter 12 establishes a framework for project prioritization and examines the alignment 2050 projects with defined performance measures.
- **MTP Work Program:** Chapter 13 presents a recommended project priority list that balances funding constraints, completion timelines, and expected benefits.
- **Appendices:** The report includes several appendices that provide more information on key components of the plan.
  - **Appendix A:** Historical Equity Action Lens (HEAL) Support Materials
  - **Appendix B:** Stakeholder Advisory Committee Membership
  - **Appendix C:** Stakeholder Advisory Committee and Public Open House Meeting Notes
  - **Appendix D:** Online Citizen Survey Summary
  - **Appendix E:** Growth Scenario Analysis Technical Memorandum
  - **Appendix F:** Revenue Projections and Project Costs Technical Memorandum
  - **Appendix G:** Project Prioritization Technical Memorandum
  - **Appendix H:** FHWA Requirement Matrix



## 2 REVIEW OF RELEVANT STUDIES

### 2.1 Federal Policies

#### 2.1.1 BIL Overview

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the “Bipartisan Infrastructure Law” (BIL), was passed in 2021 and is a critical source of ongoing funding and authorization for transportation and infrastructure projects in the United States. This significant legislative initiative aims to improve various components of the nation's transportation and infrastructure, including highways, bridges, public transit systems, and other essential transportation assets. The implementation of BIL represents a major expansion and overhaul of federal funding to address the country's infrastructure and transportation challenges while also promoting job creation through strategic investments. Critical elements of the BIL include a heightened focus on projects that prioritize social justice, equity, and environmental sustainability.

The law has four key priorities – safety, modernization, climate, and equity – and supports various types of mobility projects, including those focused on public transportation, passenger rail, roads, bridges, electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure, and bus fleet electrification. The goal of the BIL is to provide communities with high-quality infrastructure and easy access to transportation facilities while addressing the current and future impacts of climate change, especially for historically underserved and minority communities who are often disproportionately affected by the climate change crisis due to insufficient support and who have historically been deprioritized and displaced to make room for car-centric developments.

#### 2.1.2 MTP Requirements

The MTP planning process and policy document are federally mandated and serve as a prerequisite for receiving federal transportation funding. MTPs must have a planning horizon of at least 20 years and are required to be reviewed and updated once every five years in air quality attainment areas or once every four years in non-attainment areas. Attainment areas are defined as areas with air quality that meets or exceeds national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) set by the EPA and non-attainment areas are defined as areas that do not meet these standards. The VLMPO Planning area is an attainment area; therefore, this document represents the federally required five-year update.

During the development of this MTP, the MPO and planning team members engaged in key discussions with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation to ensure that the MTP is thorough and is aligned with eligibility requirements. In addition, all individuals, groups, agencies, and organizations affected by or interested in the transportation plan were provided reasonable opportunities to comment on the MTP using mechanisms outlined in the MPO’s adopted participation plan.

In compliance with BIL, state and local transportation plans must align with national performance management goals. This encompasses enhancing safety, maintaining pavement and bridge conditions on the Interstate and National Highway System (NHS), ensuring reliable travel for both passengers and



freight, reducing peak-hour delays, and lowering transportation-related pollutant emissions. Additionally, the BIL broadens the scope of inclusive planning requirements, necessitating careful updates to the 2050 VLMPO MTP and related performance metrics and indicators.

For the VLMPO Planning Area, the NHS includes I-75 and US 84 (Hill Avenue). NHS performance measures are categorized into three groups, with updates scheduled as follows:

- **PM1 - Safety Performance Measures:** Updated annually under BIL, these measures aim to improve road safety and decrease traffic fatalities. The 2050 VLMPO MTP identifies safety priorities within the MPA and allocates funds for specific safety enhancements.
- **PM2 - Pavement and Bridge Condition on Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS Roads:** Updated every four years, focusing on keeping infrastructure in good condition. This MTP addresses infrastructure maintenance, identify pavement and bridge needs within the MPA, and allocates funds for targeted improvements.
- **PM3 - Travel Time Reliability, Peak Hour Excessive Delay, and Freight Reliability on Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS Roads:** Updated every four years, with an emphasis on improving system efficiency and reliability while reducing emissions. The MTP addresses travel reliability, freight movement, and congestion, identifying and funding necessary improvements within the MPA.

GDOT recently updated its System Performance Report to comply with the BIL's requirements. Recognizing the significant impact of I-75 and US 84 on the VLMPO regional transportation network, it is crucial for MPOs across the state, including the VLMPO, to integrate GDOT's performance measures.

## 2.2 State Plans and Policies

### 2.2.1 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan (SSTP)/2050 Statewide Transportation Plan (SWTP)

The Georgia statewide plan is a policy framework which establishes performance-driven and fiscally constrained priorities and investment opportunities through the year 2050. Its stated priorities include investing in statewide freight and logistics and enhancing the mobility of people throughout Georgia. For each of these goals, the document proposes multiple investment strategies and advanced planning strategies (including programs, partnerships, and performance measures) and justifies the investment scenario with projections of how these investments and strategies will improve safety, improve bridge and pavement quality, improve operations/roadway service, and increase capacity. Investment strategies for freight and logistics involve improving safety, optimizing operations, and enhancing capacity in key transportation corridors as well as emphasizing better connectivity, aligning with existing plans, and leveraging advanced technologies for improved efficiency and coordination.

### 2.2.2 Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan

This report uses a multistep process to make recommendations for freight improvement projects across Georgia. The steps used in this report are as follows: identifying potential freight improvement projects, project evaluation, grouping priority freight projects into packages (including description of selection process), estimating economic benefits of previously identified freight packages (in terms of economic



output and/or increased jobs and returns on investment), and discussion of funding options for freight operational programs. These programs support the effectiveness of existing transportation infrastructure in increasing the safety and efficiency of goods movement in Georgia. The plan provided data and information for the freight analysis within the greater Valdosta region.

### **2.2.3 GDOT Transportation Asset Management Plan**

The Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) describes Georgia's current bridge and pavement asset management processes for improving and preserving the condition of the NHS for the fiscal years 2022 through 2031 and improve the performance of the NHS in accordance with federal requirements. A TAMP has the following federally required elements: asset management objectives and measures, inventory and condition, lifecycle planning, risk management analysis, financial plan and investment strategies, and performance gap analysis. The plan was a critical part of the framework for the MTP update.

### **2.2.4 Georgia State Rail Plan 2021**

The Georgia State Rail Plan articulates the state's vision for freight and passenger rail services. It includes a comprehensive inventory of Georgia's rail network, its related transportation and economic impacts, and a proposed program of investments. The plan aligns with the goals set by the SWTP/SSTP, which are in turn aligned with the federal requirements. These goals include improved freight and economic development, improved reliability, relieving congestion, and improving the environment. Its content encompasses analysis of the current conditions of Georgia's rail system, including past and future economic and environmental impacts, and proposes improvements and investments for both passenger and freight rail. The plan also details the projects and strategies aligned with GDOT's vision for railroad transportation, complete with impact analysis and financing scenarios. The plan provided information for the modal analysis of the MTP.

### **2.2.5 2022-2024 Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan**

The Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan is a data-driven, comprehensive, multidisciplinary plan developed by GDOT in cooperation with the Governor's Office of Highway Safety. The plan establishes safety performance measures and goals, with results for reducing fatalities and injuries across various causes. The plan uses a "Safe System" approach and defines emphasis areas to address goals. These emphasis areas include pedestrian safety, motorcycle safety, impaired driving, protecting older drivers, distracted driving, and others. The plan defines specific countermeasures and strategies to address these emphasis areas. The plan played a key role in the framework for the MTP update.

## **2.3 Regional Plans and Policies**

### **2.3.1 Vision2045: Valdosta-Lowndes County Metropolitan Transportation Plan**

In accordance with federal regulations, the DARTS 2045 MTP, known as Vision2045, updates an earlier plan to address changing conditions within the study area and changes in projected future conditions. The document establishes existing conditions in the region based on resources from various agencies and organizations, and from this baseline develops and assesses current and future transportation



needs. A key element of this plan is the review of previous plans and programs, including the 2040 VLMPO Transportation Vision Plan, 2040 GDOT SSTP/ SWTP and the Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan. The majority of 2045 MTP projects have been grandfathered into the 2050 MTP.

### **2.3.2 2009 Freight Movement Study**

In 2009, the VLMPO completed a Freight Movement Study, looking at the general movement of freight in the region. Although this study was a good look at the general freight movements, it raised many more questions than it answered. This report series is meant to address some of those questions. The Freight Movement Study did not recommend any specific projects but the 2050 MTP benefited from study analyses.

### **2.3.3 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)**

The current VLMPO TIP is for the fiscal years (FY) 2024-2027. This document was invaluable to the 2050 MTP team in identifying existing transportation funding commitments. During the 2050 MTP prioritization process, projects partially funded in the TIP were given a high priority score in the 2050 MTP to maintain funding momentum on these projects.

### **2.3.4 Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning**

While the VLMPO has never completed a bicycle/pedestrian plan, these elements are emphasized on the MPO website, including resources such as Safe Routes to School reports, mapping of Public Hiking and Walking Trails of Southern Georgia, Senior Walking Maps, and a series of annual crash reports. The 2050 MTP includes 36 active transportation projects, gleaned from public comment, crash analysis, and big data on travel flows.

### **2.3.5 Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines**

The goal of the Valdosta-Lowndes MPO TOD Guidelines Study is to promote TOD in the area by assessing the potential for future transit-oriented development; assisting local engineers and planners on developing TOD in the VLMPO area; identifying the potential need/opportunity for micro-mobility; and promoting policies that increase access to public transit. The TOD Guidelines Study was particularly helpful during the development of an alternative land use scenario and related projects during the 2050 MTP.

### **2.3.6 Hahira Area Traffic Studies**

The Hahira Area Traffic Studies delivered a Master Plan that promotes a safe and efficient mobility network while supporting desired growth and development. The study team assessed current and future traffic patterns, new access points and connectivity, and future land use patterns to inform the project. This study provided recommendations for 2050 MTP projects within the Hahira area.

### **2.3.7 2045 Transportation Plan Socioeconomic Data Study**

This study included developing population and employment data required for the MPO's travel demand model for the 2015 base year through the 2045 planning horizon in 5-year increments. This includes



population and households, median income, school enrollment, and employment by category. These forecasts were used to extrapolate elements of the socio-economic forecasts for the 2050 MTP.

### **2.3.8 SGRC Transit Development Plan (TDP) Update**

The Regional TDP Update will build upon Southern Georgia Regional Commission's 2019 Regional TDP, which was the impetus for the regional transit system that exists today. The new Regional TDP will document conditions and trends impacting mobility in the region, evaluate current transit services, and gather input from residents on issues and concerns. Additionally, the planning process will identify the needs of vulnerable populations, address transit service gaps, focus on public transit-human services transportation and identify opportunities to further facilitate travel between counties. The 2050 MTP team has coordinating with the TDP Update team to ensure consistency between the two studies. It is anticipated that the TDP Update will be incorporating elements of a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan as part of these efforts.

## **2.4 Local Plans and Studies**

### **2.4.1 Comprehensive Plan**

The *2021 Comprehensive Plan for Lowndes County and the Cities of Dasher, Hahira, Lake Park, Remerton, and Valdosta* was very important in the development of socioeconomic forecasts for the 2050 MTP. The 2050 MTP is consistent with the goals, planning factors, and transportation objectives outlined in the 2021 comprehensive plan.



### 3 PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING

The aforementioned IIJA (also known as the BIL) serves as the source of ongoing funding and authorization for transportation and infrastructure projects in the U.S. The IIJA is a substantial legislative measure with the primary goal of enhancing various facets of transportation and infrastructure, encompassing improvements to highways, bridges, public transit, and other transportation assets. The transition to the IIJA signifies a significant revamp and expansion of federal funding to address the country's transportation and infrastructure requirements, with a concurrent focus on job creation through strategic infrastructure investments. The IIJA introduces several noteworthy components, including a renewed emphasis on prioritizing infrastructure with considerations for social justice, equity, and environmental impacts. Additionally, the IIJA broadens the requirements for inclusive planning. These modifications necessitate careful consideration in the update of the Valdosta-Lowndes MTP and related performance requirements and indicators.

#### 3.1 Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

According to the IIJA, MPOs must endorse or create explicit safety performance objectives. The VLMPO adheres to GDOT's Safety Performance Measures, which are revised annually and derived from a rolling five-year average following IIJA guidelines. The IIJA underscores the importance of enhancing safety, demanding a thorough approach to establishing and assessing targets that maintain a steadfast commitment to reducing traffic fatalities and severe injuries. Thus, **PM1** performance measures are as follows:

- Number of Fatalities
- Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT (current [2021] VLMPO area [daily] VMT is 4.2 million)
- Number of Serious Injuries
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
- Total Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries

In accordance with the IIJA, the PM2 targets are specifically allocated for the surveillance and enhancement of pavement and bridge conditions, covering both interstate and non-interstate NHS roads. These targets undergo revision every four years, with the potential for an interim adjustment at the two-year milestone. **PM2** performance measures are provided below:

- Percentage of Interstate Pavement in Good vs. Poor Condition
- Percentage of non-Interstate NHS Pavement in Good vs. Poor Condition
- Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good vs. Poor Condition

The percentage of lane-miles on the Interstate or non-Interstate NHS in good or poor condition is determined using metrics like the International Roughness Index (IRI), cracking percent, rutting, and faulting, with defined thresholds for each, indicating whether major investment is needed based on ride quality or structural deficiency. Meanwhile, the percentage of bridges on the NHS classified as good, fair, or poor condition is determined by assessing deck, superstructure, and substructure components, with specific metric rating thresholds. The overall bridge condition is based on the lowest component rating,



and the classification indicates the need for major investment, substantial reconstruction, or replacement based on safety considerations.

The PM3 set of performance measures, mandated under the IIJA, concentrate on evaluating the reliability of travel time, addressing peak hour delays, ensuring the dependability of freight mobility across both Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS facilities, along with air quality improvements. Opting for alignment with GDOT, it is anticipated that the VLMPO will be supportive of the specified **PM3** targets, subject to revision every four years with the potential for interim adjustments at the two-year interval:

- Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate System that are Reliable
- Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled on non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable
- Truck Travel Time Reliability Index
- Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita (PEHD)
- Percent Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle Travel
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Nitrous Oxides (NOx) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) Cumulative Emission Reductions

Two performance measures assess the reliability of travel times on the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS using the Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR), calculating the ratio of longer travel times to normal travel times during specific time periods, with reliable segments having an LOTTR of less than 1.5, expressed as the percent of person-miles traveled that are reliable. Meanwhile, assessing truck travel reliability on the Interstate system, the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) ratio is calculated by dividing the 95th percentile truck travel time by normal travel time for each segment, generating the TTTR Index, where a lower value indicates better performance, expressed as the sum of length-weighted segments divided by total Interstate length.

Finally, with respect to CMAQ, the Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) measure quantifies hours of delay due to congestion during weekday peak hours, while the non-SOV travel measure assesses the percentage of travel by modes other than driving alone, both within urban areas meeting specific criteria. The CMAQ emission reduction measure evaluates the CMAQ Program's performance by calculating total emission reductions of on-road mobile source emissions, considering applicable pollutants and project-funded reductions over two- and four-year periods. Coordination is required for setting unified targets within designated urban areas. According to the January 2024 map of Counties Designated "Nonattainment" or "Maintenance," the VLMPO area is not included. Therefore, air quality attainment is not of key importance during the 2050 VLMPO MTP Update.

In conclusion, the six goals found in the previous VLMPO Vision2045 plan remain relevant to the 2050 VLMPO MTP, based on a review of recent Federal and State requirements for metropolitan planning. While the goals are proposed to remain the same in the 2050 MTP, the wording of the goals has been refined based on discussions at the first VLMPO 2050 MTP Stakeholders Workshop and Public Workshop. The six 2050 MTP goals are listed below, along with changes noted in underlined text.



**Goal 1 – Safety and System Reliability:** Maintain and improve transportation system safety and accessibility for all users and improve the overall resilience of the network from natural and manmade events.

**Goal 2 – Infrastructure Condition:** Maintain an efficient transportation system within the Valdosta-Lowndes MPO area for residents, businesses, college and K-12 students, and visitors.

**Goal 3 – Congestion Reduction:** Encourage implementation of TSM and TDM to reduce traffic congestion and promote low-cost solutions to road capacity. (No changes recommended.)

**Goal 4 – Freight Movement and Economic Vitality:** Ensure a financially balanced plan that works to strengthen economic development initiatives through people and freight accessibility and movement.

**Goal 5 – Environmental Sustainability and Equity:** Limit and mitigate adverse natural, social, and environmental impacts associated with traffic and transportation system development through facilities design and system management.

**Goal 6 – Reduced Project Delivery Delays:** Promote efficient system management and operation. (No changes recommended.)

## 3.2 National Transportation Performance Measures & GDOT Targets

**Table 3-1** illustrates how the proposed goals of the VLMPO 2050 MTP Update align with the specified goals of Georgia's statewide transportation plans and the national objectives outlined in the IIJA. This alignment holds significant importance in harnessing state and federal resources to optimize the influence of the MTP Update for the benefit of residents and businesses in the VLMPO region.



Table 3-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Goal Alignment with State and National Goals

IIJA Factors	IIJA National Goals	GA 2050 SWTP/ 2021 SSTP State Goals	VLMPO 2050 MTP Goals
Increasing the Safety and Security of the Transportation System	Achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.	Improve highway safety.	Safety and System Reliability
Improving the Resiliency and Reliability	Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting the environment and improving resilience to climate change and natural disasters.	Support efforts to reduce the cost and time of goods delivery and to increase the resilience of supply chains	
Emphasizing the Preservation of the Existing Transportation System	Maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.	Evaluate options for improved connectivity and increased capacity within current revenue streams based on return-on-investment analysis	Infrastructure Condition
Enhancing the Integration and Connectivity	Improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system and enhance connectivity across modes.	Facilitate broadband and other technology deployment.	Congestion Reduction and Mobility
	Achieving a reduction in congestion on the National Highway System and improving the efficiency of the surface transportation system.	Maintain and improve freight infrastructure for safety and performance	
Increasing Accessibility and Mobility of People and Freight		Modernize freight infrastructure and operations	Freight Movement and Economic Vitality
	Improve the national freight network, support rural communities' access to trade markets, and promote regional economic development.	Expand use of existing and new data and technologies to support freight and logistics	
Supporting Economic Vitality	Strengthening the global competitiveness and productivity of metropolitan areas and enhancing the efficiency of the transportation system.	Increase access to jobs, goods, and services throughout emerging metros and rural Georgia.	
		Support strategic economic development (e.g., Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development - GRAD sites).	



IIJA Factors	IIJA National Goals	GA 2050 SWTP/ 2021 SSTP State Goals	VLMP0 2050 MTP Goals
Protecting and Enhancing the Environment	Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.	Improve emergency evacuation options.	Environmental Sustainability and Equity
Promoting Efficient System Management and Operation	Reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by improving project delivery processes.	Minimize project delivery delays.	Reduced Project Delivery Dates

Evaluating projects within the VLMP0 2050 MTP involves a thorough assessment based on the goals and objectives set forth in the IIJA. This evaluation employs a comprehensive approach, incorporating both quantitative data analysis and qualitative assessments to gauge the impact and effectiveness of each project proposed for inclusion in the 2050 MTP. The matrix provided in **Table 3-1** provides a structured framework for appraising existing conditions on segments of the NHS and regional conditions for the VLMP0 study area within the overarching goals of the IIJA.

**Table 3-2** is further expanded upon later in the study to assess the performance of potential future transportation projects for long-range prioritization and funding. Within this framework, a scoring system was devised to create an intuitive mechanism for 2050 project assessment and prioritization based on alignment with IIJA goals. For existing conditions, NHS segments are evaluated using available data from GDOT, in conjunction with outputs from the base year 2020 Georgia Statewide Travel Model, as the base year 2020 VLMP0 model was not yet available from GDOT. The horizon year 2050 VLMP0 models were used to assess future travel demand and congestion.



Table 3-2: VLMPO 2050 MTP Performance-based Assessment Metrics

2050 VLMPO MTP Goals/ Indicators	Assessment Process/ Measures and Types	Assessment Data and Methodology	Current Status	Recommended Standard
Safety and System Reliability	Accident and fatality data (Quantitative & Qualitative)	Analyze crash statistics and identify hot spots	3.15 Fatalities/ 100 million VMT; 3.68 Serious Injuries/ 100 million VMT	Strive to achieve GDOT performance targets outlined in Table 3-3.
Infrastructure Condition (bridges and pavement)	Infrastructure condition assessments (Quantitative)	Available GDOT and Valdosta condition assessments	85% of bridges are in good conditions; no state highways exhibit poor pavement	Continue to achieve 85% of bridges in good condition and no state roadways with poor pavement
Congestion Reduction and Mobility	Existing Level of Service (LOS) on area roadways (Quantitative)	Base year 2020 Georgia Statewide Travel Model, MPO model, ATTMS data	Average LOS A-C, with road segments at LOS D-F	LOS D on NHS corridors, LOS E on all other roadways (except in locations with land use constraints)
Freight Movement and Economic Vitality	Existing LOS on NHS, near rail and other freight facilities as well as high tourist roads. (Quantitative)	Base year 2020 Georgia Statewide Travel Model, base year MPO model	Highest truck volumes currently on NHS corridors	LOS D on high truck volume corridors, LOS E on all other roadways (except in locations with land use constraints)
Environmental Sustainability and Equity	Environmental assessments and underserved communities (Qualitative)	Identification of environmental features and underserved communities	Public outreach in the south side of Valdosta showed a need for improved transit access and impact sensitivity	Incorporate accessibility and poverty measures into project prioritization process
Reduced Project Delivery Dates	Operational efficiency, cost-effectiveness (Qualitative)	Review of historic MPO TIPs	Approximately 36% of project phases in recent TIPs have seen delays	Potentially reduce project delivery delays to around 25%



## 3.3 Existing System Performance

The existing transportation system is then evaluated against the previously described performance indicators and measures, building on the summary information previously provided in **Table 3-2**. Each of these indicators are discussed further in subsequent chapters. This section concludes with a brief summary of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT).

### 3.3.1 Safety and System Reliability

The VLMPO abides by the IIJA through adherence to GDOT's PM1 reports and targets, which follow the federal performance measures laid out in the IIJA as explained in the section above. **Table 3-3** lists the current GDOT safety-related targets as adopted in 2023. It should be noted that the 2021 and 2022 columns represent actual data, while the *2023 Target* column is a projected goal and not based on actual performance data. These statewide metrics are primarily useful for federal compliance and state coordination.

Table 3-3: GDOT Statewide Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics

Performance Measures	2021 Georgia Statewide Performance (Five-Year Rolling Average 2017-2021)	2022 Georgia Statewide Performance (Five-Year Rolling Average 2018-2022)	2023 Georgia Statewide Performance <u>Target</u> (Five-Year Rolling Average 2019-2023)
Number of Fatalities	1,715	1,671	1,680
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	1.23	1.21	1.36
Number of Serious Injuries	6,407	8,443	8,966
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	4.422	4.610	7.679
Number of Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	686.5	793.0	802.0

In 2021, the most recent year that all data are available, the VLMPO study area had an annual VMT of 1,519,809,630, with 48 traffic fatalities, 56 traffic serious injuries, and a total of 10 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries (2 fatalities, 8 serious injuries). **Table 3-4** provides a snapshot of the VLMPO's performance in the same measures mandated by the IIJA and calculated statewide by GDOT. The table can be used to compare the VLMPO's safety performance against statewide averages. As indicated, the per VMT fatality rate is considerably higher in the Valdosta area than the Georgia statewide average.



Table 3-4: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics

Performance Measures	2022 VLMPO Area Performance
Number of Fatalities	48
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	3.15
Number of Serious Injuries	56
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	3.68
Number of Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	10

To compare gross number PM1 measures #1, #3, and #5, the following table (**Table 3-5**) has normalized the population to provide per capita comparison of statewide and MPO data, with the Lowndes County population (2020) at 118,247, and the State population at 10,713,771.

Table 3-5: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics

Performance Measures	2022 Performance (5 year rolling average for Statewide figures)
Number of Statewide Fatalities per Capita	0.0002
Number of VLMPO Fatalities per Capita	0.0004
Number of Statewide Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.0005
Number of VLMPO Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.0005
Number of Statewide Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.00006
Number of MPO Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.00008

**Figure 3-1** through **Figure 3-4** provide visualization of major safety incidents over a five-year span from 2018-2022 in the MPO study area. The incidents are broken into Killed and Serious Injury Crashes within the Study Area and Killed and Serious Injury Crashes within the Valdosta urban core, Non-Motorized Crashes within the Study Area, and Non-Motorized Crashes within the Valdosta urban core. The security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users is of paramount concern in the VLMPO region.

Although impossible to say with certainty without site- and time-specific traffic count data, most patterns here are to be expected. That is, the higher the speed and intensity of traffic, along with the



higher rate of traffic expected based on functional classification, the greater the concentration of fatalities and serious injuries. There are a high number of fatalities and injuries along I-75, which sees heavy traffic volumes and high speeds. Fatalities on rural roads are less frequent with no concentration in any specific locations. Cyclists and pedestrians involved in accidents are involved in killed and seriously injured (KSI) crashes at much higher rates, given their unprotected road usage. However, there are a few abnormalities to the general pattern. First, within the downtown core of Valdosta, where US 221 splits east- and west-bound and US 41 business splits into Ashley and Patterson Streets, there is a conspicuous absence of KSI crashes, even among a high concentration of vehicle trips and a high number of non-KSI crashes. Also, there were four consecutive fatal crashes and no serious injury crashes along a stretch of US 84 in the eastern portion of the county.

According to the *Bicycle and Environmental Justice Areas in Lowndes County* report, a majority of bicycle-related crashes between 2014 and 2018 occurred in areas with 30 percent or higher levels of household poverty in Lowndes County. The majority of these cyclists were found to live in areas of low income or poverty. This underscores the need for safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to ensure a safe, accessible, and equitable transportation system in the VLMPO region.



Figure 3-1: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide






Figure 3-2: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core






Figure 3-3: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide







Figure 3-4: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core





## 4 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION ASSET PROFILE

### 4.1 Roadway System

The area's roadway system consists of one Interstate highway (I-75), four US highways (US 41, Business 41, 84, 221), and five state highway routes (31, 94, 122, 125, 133), plus many county routes and city streets. I-75 has six through lanes while US 84 and SR 133 are four lanes in their entirety. In addition, sections of US 41, Business 41, US 221, SR 31, SR 125, and SR 376 are also four-lane roadways. Additional local four-lane streets include Baytree Road, Gornto Road, James Road, and Norman Drive.

I-75 is a major national tourist route, with travelers making their way to and from theme parks and beaches in Florida. Lowndes County is also home to Wild Adventures theme park and zoo, on Old Clyattville Road, near its interchange with I-75. Continued accessibility for tourists is a key priority for the 2050 MTP.

According to the GDOT Traffic Analysis and Data Application (TADA) website, the highest traffic volumes presently experienced in the region are on I-75, north of SR 133, at an average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume of 61,700. AADT on other segments of I-75 range between 50,000 and 60,000, reflecting the importance of this corridor for long-distance passenger and truck travel into and out of Florida. The next highest AADT in the region is found on US 41 (North Valdosta Road) north of Ashley Street (Business US 41) at 34,200.

**Figure 4-1** depicts roadway functional classifications, **Figure 4-2** displays roadway lane configurations, **Figure 4-3** shows 2022 AADTs from the GDOT TADA website while **Figure 4-4** depicts truck percentages from the same source.



Figure 4-1: Roadway Functional Classifications






Figure 4-2: Roadway Lane Configurations






Figure 4-3: Year 2022 GDOT Traffic Counts







Figure 4-4: Year 2022 GDOT Percentage of Trucks





## 4.2 Transit Operations

Three demand responsive transit systems operate in the area. The SGRC operates a mostly rural transit system simply called SGRC Regional Transit while the City of Valdosta operates Valdosta On-Demand and Lowndes County Transit is operated by RMS (formerly MIDS, Inc). As of January 2024, service hours for Valdosta On-Demand were Monday-Friday 5:30am-9pm, with fares of \$2.00 per trip and \$1.00 for each extra passenger in a group. Service hours for SGRC Regional Transit are presently 7:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday. Service hours for Lowndes County Transit are 7:30 am-4:30 pm Monday-Friday. Valdosta State University (VSU) operates the fare free Blazer Shuttle Express, a fixed route loop around campus that operates Monday-Friday 7:30am-11pm. Thus, except for the Valdosta State campus, there is no fixed route service in the region and no weekend service at all. **Figure 4-5** depicts the coverage areas of these transit systems.

### 4.2.1.1 SGRC Regional Transit

SGRC has 37 revenue vehicles serving 70,337 annual unlinked passenger trips (2022) as a demand-responsive mode offering transportation throughout fifteen counties in the region. This service requires 24 hour notification to schedule a ride. A non-Medicaid client, under 60, and in Lowndes County would utilize Valdosta On-Demand for trips originating in the City of Valdosta. One-way trips are \$3 up to 10 miles + \$0.50/ mile after that.

### 4.2.1.2 VSU Blazer Shuttle

The VSU Blazer Shuttle Express runs as a fixed route service with 28 red line stops and 10-minute headways without a set time schedule. The Red Shuttle Express has seven stops, with some stops having reduced hours. The Valdosta Mall Run is a limited bus service offered every Monday and Thursday that school is in session at 2:00 pm and 4:00 pm to Valdosta Mall and Walmart on Norman Drive. The shuttle can be found at <http://wheretheblaze.com/>. VSU Parking and Transportation has 7 buses and is free to students. VSU estimates that the service is used by 575,000 riders per academic year.

VSU's Parking and Transportation provides Blazer Safer Ride service during the Fall and Spring semesters from 11:00 pm to 3:00 am as a safe means of transportation after normal campus shuttle hours. Service by golf cart or van runs every 15 minutes at designated stops:


- Centennial Bus Stop
- Oak Street Surface Lot
- Main Campus – Brown, Converse, Hopper, Langdale, Lowndes, Patterson, and Reade Halls

### 4.2.1.3 Valdosta On-Demand

In April 2021, Valdosta's On-Demand micro-transit service began providing public transportation services across the 35 square mile boundary of the city limits of Valdosta. Since its launch, the service has provided 65,100 rides, averaging 315 rides per day. The service operates corner to corner, assigning passengers to a virtual bus stop. The vehicle fleet consists of nine minivans, three of which are dedicated wheelchair assessable vehicles (WAV). Fares are \$2 per trip per person and \$1 for each additional person in the same group. Popular destinations for Valdosta On-Demand include the following:



Figure 4-5: Existing VLMPO Transit Systems



Data Sources: GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMPO, City of Valdosta & Valdosta State University



- Walmart (Inner Perimeter Road)
- South Georgia Medical Center
- Castle Park Shopping Center
- Valdosta State University
- Valdosta Mall
- Downtown Valdosta
- Mildred Hunter Community Center
- Walmart (Norman Drive)
- Azalea Business Park

#### 4.2.1.4 Lowndes County Transit

Lowndes County Transit is a Tier II agency with seven passenger vans, one equipped with an ADA lift, providing rural public transportation services within the County but outside the city of Valdosta. Lowndes County Transit is a demand-responsive mode with 5,969 annual unlinked trips in 2021.

### 4.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Non-motorized modes of transportation, such as walking and biking, are an important part of VLMPO's multimodal transportation system. From a system-level mobility standpoint, shifting shorter trips to walking or biking not only can reduce vehicular trips but also contributes to lower emissions, thus improving air quality. Sidewalks and trails can potentially support transit operations. Perhaps more importantly, the ability to safely walk and bike offers greater opportunities for recreation, access to economic resources, and can increase the quality of life for residents in the VLMPA.

The MTP includes recognition of the evolving dynamics of transportation, emphasizing the importance of active modes in creating vibrant, healthy, and accessible urban environments. This section details the current landscape surrounding bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure within the Valdosta-Lowndes MPO area. This analysis is pivotal in understanding the integration and functionality of non-motorized transportation modes and laying the groundwork for identifying critical enhancements needed to foster a safer and more inviting environment for cyclists and pedestrians.


This analysis is divided into six subsections: Trails, Sidewalk Coverage, Crosswalks, Pedestrian Signals, Bike Lanes, and Bike Parking. Each of these modes plays a pivotal role in shaping the accessibility, safety, and convenience of biking and walking as viable modes of transportation. Notably, a relatively small number of dedicated bicycle and pedestrian facilities exist in the study area. These facilities are concentrated primarily in the Valdosta urban core and along commercial corridors, including Valdosta, Lake Park, Hahira, and along SR 125/Bemiss Road out to Moody Air Force Base, as transitioning and rural areas typically do not include pedestrian facilities.

#### 4.3.1.1 Trails

As shown in **Figure 4-6**, there is a limited existing network of trails and multi-use paths that cater to both cyclists and pedestrians. The trail network includes the Azalea City Trail connecting W. Gordon Street to the Vallotton Youth Complex on Woodlawn Drive and another trail along the Withlacoochee River.



Figure 4-6: Existing VLMPO Trail System






## 4.3.1.2 Sidewalk Coverage

An examination of sidewalk coverage identifies locations where sidewalks are present, contributing to safe and continuous pedestrian access. According to **Figure 4-7**, the sidewalk network is largely concentrated in the Cities of Valdosta, Hahira, and Lake Park. Additionally, there is a sidewalk along SR 125/Bemiss Road connecting the City of Valdosta to Moody Air Force Base and Lowndes County Quiet Pines Golf Course. According to the Valdosta-Lowndes Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, desire paths or unplanned footpaths exist adjacent to roadways lacking sidewalks, suggesting high pedestrian or bicycle travel in these areas. The map highlights a notable challenge in which numerous facilities are disconnected, failing to create a cohesive network of sidewalks. Large areas lack coverage, and there are instances where nearby sidewalks remain unconnected, or existing sidewalk conditions have deteriorated significantly, creating sidewalk gaps. Filling these gaps over time will eventually lead to a more robust and connected network.

Figure 4-7: Existing VLMPO Sidewalk Network






## 4.3.1.3 Crosswalks

The analysis of crosswalks focuses on their availability, visibility, and safety features at intersections and key pedestrian crossing points. According to **Figure 4-8**, crosswalk locations closely align with the sidewalk network. This coordinated placement improves safety through enhanced visibility and ensures that pedestrians can cross roadways at designated points. Aligning crosswalks with the sidewalk network improves safety, accessibility, efficiency, and visibility, contributing to a well-integrated and pedestrian-friendly environment.

Figure 4-8: Existing VLMPO Crosswalk Locations






## 4.3.1.4 Pedestrian Signals

Pedestrian signals enhance safety by guiding pedestrians on when it is safe to cross a road, thereby minimizing conflicts with vehicular traffic and reducing the risk of pedestrian-related crashes. Typically integrated with traffic signals, these pedestrian signals coordinate pedestrian and vehicular movements, contributing to a well-balanced and efficient traffic management system. As shown in **Figure 4-9**, the location of pedestrian signals closely aligns with the locations of crosswalks, illustrating the region's commitment to prioritizing pedestrian safety. These signals are concentrated in Valdosta, along SR 376 in Lake Park, and along SR 125/Bemiss Road.

Figure 4-9: Existing VLMPO Pedestrian Signal Locations






## 4.3.1.5 Bike Lanes

An evaluation of bike lanes examines the existing infrastructure available to cyclists only, including separated bike lanes, shared lanes, and protected paths. **Figure 4-10** displays the existing bicycle facilities in the VLMPO region. As shown, the VLMPO area currently has a limited number of bicycle facilities. The existing ones are disconnected and spread throughout the city of Valdosta.

Figure 4-10: Existing VLMPO Bicycle Lanes





#### 4.3.1.6 Bicycle Parking

The availability of secure bicycle parking influences urban bicycle travel. Bicycle parking may consist of bicycle racks, bicycle lockers, bicycle lockups, bicycle stations, and covered bicycle parking. The availability and convenience of bicycle parking facilities helps to pinpoint areas where increased capacity could support cycling as a more attractive transportation option. There is no local database on the bicycle parking locations available.

### 4.4 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Technology

ITS improves transportation safety and mobility and enhances productivity through the integration of advanced communications technologies into both vehicles and transportation infrastructure. ITS encompasses a broad range of wireless and wire line communications-based information and electronics technologies. ITS is managed federally by the ITS Joint Programs Office (JPO), which operates as a research apparatus to improve surface transportation technology. The ITS Strategic Plan 2020-2025 focuses on six high-priority research areas: Automation; ITS4US; Cybersecurity for ITS; Data Access and Exchanges; Emerging and Enabling Technologies; and Accelerating ITS Deployment.

GDOT has provided ITS design guidelines for projects within the state. The key ITS guideline features include ramp meters, dynamic message signs (DMS), vehicle detection, closed circuit television cameras (CCTV), and environmental sensing stations (ESS). These devices should be located first on a full ITS buildout, and in that order, so that devices can be co-located whenever possible. Additionally, there are chapters in the guidelines detailing more specific ITS devices, which include dedicated logistics carrier systems (DLCS), electronically operated gates, variable speed limits (VSL), ITS safety systems, and connected vehicle equipment. These devices are not as likely to be included as part of an ITS project. Within the VLMPO study area, GDOT operates a few ITS devices, all located along I-75. These are made up of CCTVs and an electronic message board. **Figure 4-11** displays GDOT ITS devices within the VLMPO study area.

In addition to state operated ITS Devices, the City of Valdosta operates its own ITS system. In August of 2020, Valdosta was awarded the Georgia Smart Communities Challenge Grant, which it used to upgrade all major traffic signals inside the city with ITS technology. The improvements include a central command center that allows the operation of all signals from a single point. The signals were equipped with transponders that communicate with an app developed for the grant, providing real time traffic and road conditions, including audio alerts that support hands-free driving. The signal transponders also communicate with newly equipped transponders in emergency vehicles, giving preemptive green lights to first responders. **Figure 4-12** displays the location of all 128 ITS signals within the city. The smart signalization project makes up the totality of county and city ITS devices within the VLMPO study area.



Figure 4-11: Existing Regional ITS Infrastructure







Figure 4-12: Existing ITS Signal Locations





## 4.5 Emerging Transportation Technology

For the purposes of this plan, Emerging Transportation Technology will refer to automated vehicles (AVs) and electric vehicles (EVs).

**Automated Vehicles:** The USDOT ITS Joint Programs Office recognizes vehicle automation research as a “major component” of a “safe, reliable, and cost-effective” transportation network. The USDOT relies on SAE International’s classification of AVs, breaking automation into a spectrum of 6 categories, with level 0 being no automation at all, up to level 5, where a driver is not necessary for the operation of the vehicle. Classes 0 and 1 are not considered automated technology at all, class 2 is considered an “Advanced Driver Assistance System” (ADAS), and classes 3-5 are considered “Automated Driving Systems” (ADS). AV may mean anything in the ADS range.


Currently, there are no AV systems in place within the VLMPO Study Area. Given the rapid development of such emerging technology, it is worth recognizing the AV technology within the state of Georgia and the broader region surrounding the VLMPO. The State of Georgia has passed legislation allowing SAE level 5 (fully autonomous) vehicles to be operated without a licensed driver present within the vehicle. This has made further research and development possible within the state of Georgia. In partnership with the private sector, GDOT has developed a stretch of I-85 in South Georgia into “the Ray,” a test strip for AV technology.

Private companies have begun testing AVs on public roadways in Georgia and northern Florida. AV manufacturer NAVYA, along with fleet operator Beep, have begun testing AV shuttles for public use in Atlanta, while NAVYA and BEEP along with the Jacksonville Transit Authority have begun testing shuttles for both public transit and delivering goods in Jacksonville, and are currently in test team only stages. Gainesville also has a commercial AV shuttle operated by EASYMILE active and open to the public but makes use of an in-vehicle safety operator. Industry expectation is to see AVs in wide use during the 2030s. The Atlanta Regional Commission’s expectation is to see level 3 and 4 AVs (partially autonomous) at roughly 20 percent of market share by 2030, and to see AVs at 25 percent by 2035, with nearly half of those vehicles level 5 (fully autonomous).

**Electric Vehicles:** The BIL establishes a National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program (NEVI) to provide funding to States to strategically deploy electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure and to establish an interconnected network to facilitate data collection, access, and reliability. Operated through a joint office of the Department of Energy (DOE) and USDOT, the NEVI program is intended to create Alternative Fuel Corridors along major national highways and the NHS. The NEVI program is limited to EV charging stations and must be open to the public. The Alternative Fuel Corridors are split between ready corridors, those that have public charging stations within a 50-mile distance, and pending corridors, those that have charging infrastructure, but that do not meet the minimum distance or fuel specific criteria. I-75 is the only Alternative Fuel Corridor within the VLMPO. It is a ready corridor from the Tennessee border to the US 84/West Hill Avenue exit in Valdosta; from that exit south to the Florida state line, it is a pending corridor. Below in **Figure 4-13** is a map of all charging stations within the VLMPO study area, per the DOE.



Figure 4-13: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations





## 4.6 Railroads (Freight)

The VLMPO area is presently served by four different private freight railroad companies:

- **CSX** connects Valdosta eastward through Waycross and westward through South Georgia into Alabama. In Waycross, CSX branches into lines serving Atlanta, Brunswick, Jacksonville, and Savannah.
- **CaterParrott Railnet** connects Valdosta north through Ray City, Nashville and Willacoochee using tracks owned by the Georgia DOT.
- **Norfolk Southern** line parallels US 41 south to Florida and north into Atlanta and on to Tennessee and a second line that connects Valdosta to Jacksonville.
- **Valdosta Railway** is a Class 3 short line railroad that connects Valdosta and Clyattville, operated by the Genesee & Wyoming Company.

Rail yards are operated in Valdosta by CSX, Norfolk Southern, and Valdosta Railway. The CSX Intermodal yard is west of downtown Valdosta, while the Norfolk Southern Langdale yard is east of downtown Valdosta. Valdosta Railway operates a rail yard located south of downtown Valdosta. **Figure 4-14** depicts the rail network within the VLMPO study area while **Figure 4-15** displays the location of all rail crossings in the region. Discussions with stakeholders indicated that at-grade rail crossings are a great disruptor to traffic patterns in the region. Grade-separated crossings were added to the west and south of downtown Valdosta. Funding is committed to constructing a grade-separated crossing on St. Augustine Road and GDOT is studying a south bypass that could potentially include a grade-separated crossing on Clay Road.

CaterParrott Railnet also operates a passenger excursion train called the Azalea Express that runs from Nashville, Georgia or Willacoochee to Valdosta, with stops available in Ray City and Moody Air Force Base. Scheduled excursions can be found at: <https://www.dynamicticketsolutions.com/aset/index-responsive.cfm>



Figure 4-14: Railroads and Rail Yards







Figure 4-15: Railroad Crossings





## 4.7 Ancillary Truck Facilities

Despite significant truck traffic, no rail yards in Valdosta are recognized by GDOT as truly intermodal according to the Georgia State Rail Plan. Numerous warehouses have located in the region due to its location at the intersection of I-75 and US 84, and proximity to the Florida/Georgia State Line, including distribution centers for Dillard's, FedEx, Home Depot, and Lowes, among others. With the exception of Home Depot, located in suburban Lake Park, these major distribution centers, and several others, are located in a cluster along Old Clyattville Road, west of Valdosta Regional Airport.

GDOT operates northbound and southbound truck weigh stations on I-75 between Valdosta (US 41/Business Loop 75) and Hahira (US 41/SR 122), with approximately 30 truck parking spaces apiece. There are no other publicly owned truck parking facilities in the Valdosta region; however, additional truck parking is allowed at the RaceTrac truck stop and Bigfoot Travel Center, located along US 84/221 on either side of the I-75 interchange. Truck parking is also available at the Pilot Travel Center at the I-75/SR 31 interchange, the Exxon Valdosta Travel Plaza at the I-75 Lake Park exit, and the Flying J and TA Travel Centers at the Bellville Road interchange. Straddling each side of the Florida/Georgia line are state welcome centers along I-75 that also have truck parking. Across the street from RaceTrac is a GDOT owned parking lot, which is reserved for car poolers. This lot is surrounded by vacant land suggesting that if the lot were expanded, truck parking could possibly be permitted. While there are several private sector truck parking lot operators in Georgia, none of them have established locations in Valdosta.

## 4.8 Aviation Facilities

Valdosta Regional Airport, operated by the Valdosta-Lowndes County Airport Authority, provides non-stop commercial air service to and from Atlanta, GA. The airport also provides general aviation services, corporate hangers, T-hangers, free parking, and car rentals. according to Wikipedia, "Valdosta Regional Airport covers an area of 760 acres at an elevation of 203 feet above mean sea level. It has three asphalt paved runways: 17/35 measuring 8,002 x 150 ft., 4/22 measuring 5,598 x 100 ft. After the completion of runway 17/35 in the summer of 2007, Valdosta now has the third longest runway in the state of Georgia (excluding military bases)." There were 38,736 enplanements in the year 2021 at Valdosta Regional Airport, ranking it fifth most in the state of Georgia.

The Valdosta region is also home to Moody Air Force Base, operational since World War II. In terms of directionality, length, and materials, Moody's two runways are 18L/36R 9,301 ft Concrete and 18R/36L 8,002 ft PEM. According to their website, Moody houses approximately 4,499 military employees, 476 civilian employees, and 6,252 family members. Other aviation facilities include the South Georgia Medical Center Helipad, and three private airstrips (Christians Folly, Mallory Field, and Alyssas Animal Sanctuary Air Park).



## 5 EXISTING SYSTEM CONDITIONS AND PERFORMANCE

The existing transportation system is evaluated against the previously described performance indicators and measures, building on the summary information previously provided in Table 3-2. Each of these indicators are discussed further below, in addition to an assessment of bicycle and pedestrian demand. This section concludes with a brief summary of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT).

### 5.1 Safety and System Reliability

The VLMPO abides by the IIJA through adherence to GDOT's PM1 reports and targets, which follow the federal performance measures laid out in the IIJA as explained in the section above. **Table 5-1** lists the current GDOT safety-related targets as adopted in 2023. It should be noted that the 2021 and 2022 columns represent actual data while the *2023 Target* column is a projected goal and not based on actual performance data. These statewide metrics are primarily useful for federal compliance and state coordination.

Table 5-1: GDOT Statewide Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics

Performance Measures	2021 Georgia Statewide Performance (Five-Year Rolling Average 2017-2021)	2022 Georgia Statewide Performance (Five-Year Rolling Average 2018-2022)	2023 Georgia Statewide Performance <u>Target</u> (Five-Year Rolling Average 2019-2023)
Number of Fatalities	1,715	1,671	1,680
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	1.23	1.21	1.36
Number of Serious Injuries	6,407	8,443	8,966
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	4.422	4.610	7.679
Number of Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	686.5	793.0	802.0

In 2021, the most recent year that all data are available, the VLMPO study area had an annual VMT of 1,519,809,630, with 48 traffic fatalities, 56 traffic serious injuries, and a total of 10 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries (2 fatalities, 8 serious injuries). **Table 5-2** provides a snapshot of the VLMPO's performance in the same measures mandated by the IIJA and calculated statewide by GDOT. The table can be used to compare the VLMPO's safety performance against statewide averages. As indicated, the per-VMT fatality rate is considerably higher in the Valdosta area than the Georgia statewide average.



Table 5-2: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics

Performance Measures	2022 VLMPO Area Performance
Number of Fatalities	48
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	3.15
Number of Serious Injuries	56
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	3.68
Number of Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	10

To compare gross number PM1 measures #1, #3, and #5, the following table (**Table 5-3**) has normalized the population to provide per capita comparison of statewide and MPO data, with the Lowndes County population (2020) at 118,247, and the State population at 10,713,771.

Table 5-3: VLMPO Area Safety Performance-based Assessment Metrics


Performance Measures	2022 Performance (5 year rolling average for Statewide figures)
Number of Statewide Fatalities per Capita	0.0002
Number of VLMPO Fatalities per Capita	0.0004
Number of Statewide Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.0005
Number of VLMPO Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.0005
Number of Statewide Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.00006
Number of MPO Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries Per Capita	0.00008

**Figure 5-1** through **Figure 5-4** provide visualization of major safety incidents over a five-year span from 2018-2022 in the MPO study area. The incidents are broken into Killed and Serious Injury Crashes within the Study Area and Killed and Serious Injury Crashes within the Valdosta urban core, Non-Motorized Crashes within the Study Area, and Non-Motorized Crashes within the Valdosta urban core.

Although impossible to say with certainty without site- and time-specific traffic count data, most patterns here are to be expected. That is, the higher the speed and intensity of traffic, along with the higher rate of traffic expected based on functional classification, the greater the concentration of



Figure 5-1: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide



Data Sources: GDOT, GARC, VLMPO, & City of Valdosta



Figure 5-2: Roadway Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core






Figure 5-3: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Regionwide







Figure 5-4: Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries: Urban Core





fatalities and serious injuries. There are a high number of fatalities and injuries along I-75, which sees heavy traffic volumes and high speeds. Fatalities on rural roads are less frequent and unconcentrated. Cyclists and pedestrians involved in accidents are involved in killed and seriously injured (KSI) crashes at much higher rates, given their unprotected road usage. However, there are a few abnormalities to the general pattern. First, within the downtown core of Valdosta, where US 221 splits east- and west-bound and US 41 business splits into Ashley and Patterson Streets, there is a conspicuous absence of KSI crashes, even among a high concentration of vehicle trips and a high number of non-KSI crashes. Also, there were four consecutive fatal crashes and no serious injury crashes along a stretch of US 84 in the eastern portion of the county.

According to the *Bicycle and Environmental Justice Areas in Lowndes County* report, a majority of bicycle-related crashes between 2014 and 2018 occurred in areas with 30 percent or higher levels of household poverty in Lowndes County. The majority of these cyclists were found to live in areas of low income or poverty. This underscores the need for safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to ensure a safe, accessible, and equitable transportation system in the VLMPO region.

## 5.2 Infrastructure Conditions

The existing conditions of pavement and bridges represent key performance metrics for MPO long-range planning efforts, with a focus on Interstate and NHS highways.

Based on the data provided by GDOT and the 2023 National Bridge Inventory (NBI) dataset, **Figure 5-5** depicts existing bridge conditions for all bridge locations in the study area. Out of the 129 bridges in total, 109 bridges were reported to be in “good” condition. Only two bridges in the study area are rated as in “poor” condition. One of these bridges is on US 84/US 221 west of Valdosta. As this location is along an NHS corridor, correcting this deficiency is a high priority. The other location is close to the Florida/Georgia state line on Jumping Gully Road. Additionally, there are 18 bridges in “fair” condition, including: 2 along I-75—one over the railroad near the US 84/US 221 interchange (currently under reconstruction) and the other at the SR 31 interchange; 1 on US 84 over Grand Bay Creek; and 3 along US 41—one at the SR 31 interchange and two over the railroad to the east of the I-75 interchange toward the northwest side of the City of Valdosta. The bridges currently in “fair” condition necessitate regular monitoring and preservation efforts to uphold their state of good repair.

GDOT uses a rating system for pavement conditions known as the Overall Conditions Index (OCI). Current OCI data from GDOT indicates that all state roadways within Lowndes County are either in fair or good condition (i.e., no roadways are in poor condition). As indicated by **Figure 5-6**, much of I-75 exhibits good pavement conditions, along with SR 31 (Madison Highway) south of Valdosta, Business 41 (Ashley Street) through Valdosta, and SR 125 (Bemiss Road) north of Valdosta. All sections of US 84, US 221, and Inner Perimeter Road (US 41) are in fair condition. The City of Valdosta also monitors pavement conditions, as depicted in **Figure 5-7**. Most city-maintained roadways are in good or fair condition. Poor conditions are mostly limited to short, local City Street segments.



Figure 5-5: Valdosta Area Bridge Conditions








Figure 5-6: GDOT Highway Pavement Conditions in Valdosta Area<sup>1</sup>



<sup>1</sup>GDOT pavement data only provided for roadway segments within Lowndes County.



Figure 5-7: City of Valdosta Roadway Pavement Conditions





## 5.3 Congestion Reduction/Mobility

The base year 2020 VLMPO travel demand model was used to summarize a range of metrics, including volumes and capacities. The VLMPO model uses the following volume/capacity (V/C) ranges to equate with levels-of-service (LOS):

**LOS A, B, C ( $\leq 0.70$ )   LOS-D (0.70-0.85)   LOS-E (0.85-1.00)   LOS-F ( $>1.00$ )**

Applying these V/C ranges to compute LOS shows that most Interstate highway, NHS Non-Interstate highway, and remaining roadway segments operate at LOS A-C, on average. For this analysis, LOS A-C is considered acceptable, LOS D and E are considered borderline deficient, and LOS F is considered failing or capacity deficient. Since the system on average is operating at an acceptable LOS, visual representation is more effective to depict segments experiencing congestion. Figure 5-8 depicts roadway LOS using the VLMPO model V/C ranges. LOS A-C is depicted in grey, links in yellow are LOS D, LOS E links are depicted in orange, and LOS F segments are depicted in red.


Per the VLMPO model, no segments of the NHS (I-75, US 84) are currently experiencing LOS issues, other than the I-75 ramps at the SR 133 and US 84 interchanges, which have been reconstructed since 2020, along with US 84 between I-75 and Norman Drive. Primary areas of congestion are largely limited to North Valdosta Road (SR 7/US 41/Business Loop 75) and SR 125 (Bemis Road) leading to Moody Air Force Base. As expected, there is some congestion on North Ashley Street south of where Bemis Road merges into Business 41. Sections of Alden Avenue, Barack Obama Boulevard, Country Club Drive, Jerry Jones Drive, North Oak Street, and Old Clyattville Road also experience varying levels of congestion.

Congestion related comments from attendees at the first 2050 MTP Stakeholders workshop included the following:

- The combination of 2-lane roads connecting growth areas north of Valdosta to Moody Air Force Base. Areas surrounding Val Del Road, McMillan Road, Skipper Bridge/Reed Road, River Road, and Cat Creek Road are experiencing growth and development.
- Bemiss Road near Moody Air Force Base has high traffic volumes and is congested.
- Clay Road approaching US 84 is backed up when residents from the south side of town are trying to get to work and the grocery store. Traffic backs up going down US 84 at certain times of the day, both entering and exiting Clay Road.
- The roadway network is generally undersized creating a general capacity issue along many existing corridors. Existing 2-lane roads may need to become 4 lanes while several 4-lane roads need to be 6 or 8 lanes.
- Many existing roadways may be adequate across a daily average yet peak hour traffic causes problems. These issues are noted in school zones (morning drop off, afternoon pick up), daycare facilities, and popular coffee shops. Some drive through lanes at restaurants are causing lines of vehicles to queue into the roadway blocking through traffic. There is a need to examine peak hour conditions as opposed to simply average daily traffic.



Figure 5-8: Existing (2020) Roadway LOS





## 5.4 Freight Movement and Economic Vitality


The 2020 Georgia Statewide Travel Demand Model (GSTDM) is a reliable source for truck flows as it includes a nationwide freight network. **Figure 5-9** depicts base year 2000 GSTDM truck flows. Links depicted in grey have daily truck volumes of less than 500, yellow links have daily trucks of 500 to 1,000, orange links have truck volumes of 1,000 to 2,500, and red links experience daily truck trips exceeding 2,500. Roadway segments highlighted with LOS concerns in both Figures 5-8 and 5-9 are candidates for transportation solutions.

Freight truck and rail-related comments from attendees at the first 2050 MTP Stakeholders workshop included the following:

- At-grade railroad crossings create an ongoing problem of train traffic backing up. Train traffic volumes are increasing. Major rail carriers have switching yards in the core of the community causing train traffic to move slower. This results in blocked crossings for 15-30 minutes per switch. Three notable locations with this issue include Baytree Road, St. Augustine and Clay Road. St. Augustine Road is proposed to have a grade-separated overpass with TIA1 funding.
- The at-grade rail crossings are impacting commercial and industrial development land use, particularly along Clay Road. The Clay Road railroad crossing causes traffic delays and damage to cars passing over the tracks. Trucks conducting business along Clay Road create a delay causing vehicles to have to wait for them to finish their business and unblock travel lanes. Clay Road is under consideration as a south truck bypass and there is already a conflict between trucks, vehicles, and pedestrians along the road.
- Baytree Road, a major 4-lane road, is one of the busiest railroad crossings in the southeast. A grade-separated railroad overpass is needed; however, Baytree is a local street and there are environmental constraints due to the nearby Sugar Creek crossing, thus making funding a real obstacle. Any Baytree rail crossing bridge would need to cross the stream and rail line and come back to grade quickly due to two signalized intersections on either side of the crossing. The total project cost is estimated to be \$60-80 million for a Baytree rail crossing. Other issues involve jurisdictional conflicts and impacts to the properties that lie within two cities' jurisdictions. This single project would utilize most of the Transportation Investment Act (TIA) project budget which is not palatable. Due to TIA restrictions, any project designed with TIA funding must be constructed. If doing multiple phases, projects must be completed within a certain time frame creating a danger of a future TIA3 not passing.
- When trains stop, emergency vehicles cannot get through because parallel overpasses are filled with traffic and roadways are at a standstill. Traffic is backed up on Lee Street, Church Street, and Barack Obama Blvd. Discussions have taken place with the railroads regarding rail switching time. Many rail switching times are scheduled during lunchtime and at 5pm when vehicle traffic is heaviest in some areas.



Figure 5-9: Existing (2022) Truck Volumes





As expected, I-75 and US 84 experience the highest truck volumes in the region. US 84 truck volumes peak in the area west of I-75 into downtown Valdosta, leading to the two area rail yards. Other corridors with above average truck volumes include the aforementioned North Valdosta Road and Bemis Road.

## 5.5 Environmental Justice, Equity, and Sustainability

As part of its Low Impact Development (LID) Policy, “the VLMPO under 23 CFR § 450.306 supports the improvement of the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reducing or mitigating stormwater impacts of surface transportation within the Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Area.” The LID policy further states that “any roadway which is to be newly constructed or completely reconstructed should be designed and constructed to... provide for the safety and convenience of all users of all ages and abilities, including but not limited to pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and freight users; and address the needs of all users both along roadway corridors and crossing the corridors.”

The consultant team took a unique approach to equity, called the Historical Equity Action Lens (HEAL), focused on the historical relationship of disadvantaged communities to the transportation system in the VLMPO region. This assessment focused on determining how and why these communities have disproportionately borne the burdens of transportation infrastructure in the past, providing guidance on how to avoid imposing similar burdens in the future, identifying community needs related to transportation that traditional quantitative methods cannot capture, and suggesting performance measures and evaluation criteria for use in the MTP.

### 5.5.1.1 Historical Research and Public Engagement

The research process began with a thorough review of primary and secondary sources typically used in historical analysis, such as newspapers, photographs, maps, reports, historic planning documents, transportation planning materials, and existing historical narratives. Valdosta is home to a regional historical society, a large archive in the local state university, and several large caches of digital assets. Materials housed in these repositories were surveyed, prioritized, and captured over a multi-day site visit to conduct archival research. A complete account of the historical findings and the sources consulted can be found in **Appendix A**.

The visit to Valdosta included an opportunity to conduct a walking tour of important spaces in Valdosta’s historically Black neighborhood of Southside with City Councilwomen, providing invaluable feedback on the significance of the area to their community and the daily impacts of transportation decisions on their neighbors. Additionally, the HEAL team conducted ten oral history interviews with community members and led a public forum in the Southside neighborhood involving approximately twenty participants from Southside, West Hill, and surrounding neighborhoods.

While the scope of the research encompassed transportation planning in the VLMPO region as a whole, special attention was given to AoPPs and HDCs shown to have borne disproportionate burdens from prior planning decisions. Within Lowndes County, AoPPs and HDCs are concentrated in the city of Valdosta, especially in Census Tracts with high percentages of African American residents, historically and in the present.



These findings highlight the local impacts of regional transportation decisions on the centrally located neighborhood of Southside. Many decisions over the last century regarding regional transportation—including constructing a roadway overpass, coordinating freight traffic, and shaping regional economic development—have placed disproportionate burdens on Southside. Recognition of the historical impositions placed on Southside should be considered in developing an effective and equitable MTP.

## 5.5.1.2 Key Findings of HEAL Assessment

Following the oral history interviews and open forum conducted by the HEAL team, a series of key findings related to transit, safety, traffic, and other factors were compiled and are presented in **Table 5-4**, along with supporting statements from interview and forum participants.

Table 5-4: Key HEAL Assessment Findings

Key Findings	Key Quotes
<b>Transit</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valdosta On-Demand's shortcomings disproportionately affect the elderly or people with medical conditions, especially its fixed pick-up and drop-off spots. Some also found it confusing.</li> <li>People find the on-demand system confusing to use.</li> <li>Respondents connect reliable transit to economic development, connecting customers and employees to businesses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"I know they got that Valdosta [On-Demand], but [...] they won't pick you up [at] your house, there's certain areas you have to be where they can pick you up. [...] Some people's not able to walk a certain distance to be for them to come pick you up. [...] I remember one time I had an appointment to go to the dentist, and I told them where I stay, and they came way over there on the west side, and see I stayed on the south side [...] I told them 'I don't even live on the west side anymore I live on the south side of town.'"</li> <li>".. I said 'I'm too old to be walking from the south side to the west side'" – Harry Armstrong, Interview (Southside)</li> <li>"[Valdosta]'s in dire need of some kind of bus system around here, it don't have to be like modern in Atlanta, but some kind of system that can get to the mall, to the north side." – Carlton Keith Flucas, Interview (East side)</li> <li>"The public transportation here is... stifling, and the biggest stigma that we have. It keeps a lot of businesses away. It keeps a lot of residents away. Where they come, they can't stay." -- Joe Marshall Sr., Interview (Barrack Obama Boulevard)</li> <li>"I get around because I have a car. But I have seen the elderly peoples that could hardly make it on walkers and everything, and the cabs or buses that the city have, they put those people like a block before supposed to be [...] It's hard for me to do a lot of walking [...] at the age that I am." – Mary Moye, Interview (Southside and west side)</li> </ul>
<b>Safety (esp. sidewalks and bike lanes)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walking and biking on many streets is unsafe because of lack of suitable infrastructure, especially sidewalks.</li> <li>Lack of infrastructure does not prevent people from walking or biking—they just do so in the streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"If you go down Mary St., which is a street that goes from one side of town slap to the other side, and you got no sidewalks. You got Ann Street, you got Brookwood. You got a lot of streets, there's just no sidewalk. And children going to the park, they have to walk in the street just to get to the park. And don't nobody see nothing wrong with that, something's wrong with them." – Carlton Keith Flucas, Interview (East Side)</li> <li>"[when asked if biking to the doctor's and South Georgia Medical Center feels safe] No, I have to ride on the sidewalk, I can't ride on the side of the road [...] and then a lot of the time I give out, and I have to stop and rest because of my blood pressure." – Harry Armstrong, Interview (Southside)</li> <li>"But as he was saying before me they need sidewalks. As you were saying people still walk in the roads. That's dangerous [...] people walk in the road because they don't have sidewalks." – Mary Jean Garrett</li> </ul>
<b>Economic Development</b>	



Key Findings	Key Quotes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation is understood as a key to securing and keeping employment.</li> <li>Business incentives in Southside's historic commercial area may provide some restitution for overpass construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Transportation will lead to enhanced employment. Some underprivileged Blacks on the Southside can't get to a job without walking or riding a bike [...] we say they're lazy, don't wanna work, but let's help them try and make it better for them to get to work." – Joe Marshall Sr., Open Forum (Barrack Obama Boulevard)</li> <li>"When they put the bridge [James Beck Overpass] down there [...] no incentive was given to help build up those businesses, not south of the tracks [...] they did provide services and businesses for the downtown north of the tracks, but south of the tracks was downtown as well. And a lot of people did not get the incentive, a lot of people may not have known to go get the incentive and it wasn't put out there. That is past and gone, so my thing is, what can be done now to give restitution back there to those areas?" – Councilwoman Sandra Tooley, Open Forum</li> </ul>
Traffic and Congestion	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents understand and appreciate projects on important roadways to alleviate congestion.</li> <li>Trains often stop on the railroad tracks for long periods of time which impedes movement between Southside and the rest of Valdosta, including for emergency services. This has only been marginally relieved by the James Beck overpass.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"I told you I live on Obama Boulevard [...] they been widening that road for about 25 years. Ain't that something? And it's not widened yet. And you got a volume of traffic, every person that lives on the south end of town, and a lot of them that live on the north end where I am, they have to use that road." – Joe Marshall Sr., Interview (Barrack Obama Boulevard)</li> <li>"The idea was to [...] move traffic from the north to the south so they could have better emergency services coming to the south. But right here on this street [...] traffic get bogged down because of the train, because there's double train tracks here, and then one street over, there's double train tracks. So those people when they get trains <i>sitting</i> on the track... you're stopping them from movement [...] so when you say that the problem has been solved [...] with Beck's overpass, it's been a band-aid." – Open Forum</li> </ul>
Access to Jobs, Food, Medical Care, Retail, Recreation, etc.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many resources in Valdosta, such as libraries, grocery stores, banks, and the voter registration office, are concentrated in the north side of town, which makes it harder for residents of east side, Southside, and other communities around downtown from accessing them.</li> <li>Respondents connect lack of access to necessities to the lack of robust transit infrastructure.</li> <li>Lack of access affects the elderly and low-income the most.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"I think some people have a hard time [...] getting to their doctor's appointments. I know I do because I have to ride a bicycle, because [...] every time I try to get transportation to go to the doctor or whatnot, I have a problem with that." – Harry Armstrong, Interview (Southside)</li> <li>"Even the voting registration office is way on the north side. Stuff like that should be centrally located [...] our library, most of the people don't even know where the library is no more. [...] They moved it further out. Well, who's the library for? The rich people, that got computers and everything? The library's supposed to be for everybody, and need to either have some kind of system where people can get on the bus, at least be able to get to the library. You go down to the library right now, you don't see no kids there [...] because they have to walk 5 miles down the street [...] A lot of these people over here don't have no car, no trucks, no way to get way out to the library." – Carlton Keith Flucas, Interview (East Side)</li> <li>"The Southside is mainly the area that really need the transportation because everything has been moved far away from here. [...] There's a need for transportation, mainly for the elderly folks." – Harvey Jones, Interview</li> <li>"Just think about the fact that you got two Wal-Marts back on this side, one on that side. But now, the people that need it, the low-income folks, they live on the Southside. Now how they gonna get out there?" -- Open Forum</li> <li>"You know how we got Piggly-Wiggly? [...] Every time they had a meeting, I brought up 'We don't have a grocery store on the Southside.' Eventually somebody heard me." – Vivian Miller-Cody, Open Forum</li> </ul>
Mental Health and Wellness	



Key Findings	Key Quotes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lack of available transportation forces certain members of the community, such as seniors, to stay at home, which may contribute to a deterioration of their mental and physical health.</li> <li>Participants have a holistic appreciation of the importance of transportation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“And a lot of these seniors, they wanna get out and do something, but they do not have transportation [...] so they stuck in the house. When they’re stuck in the house, that means the only transportation they’re worried about, going to the grocery store, going to the doctor, and going to church. So that means they sitting home eating, they’re not exercising. So their health is going down [...] transportation affects every aspects of your life and being able to move about.” – Open Forum</li> <li>“You’ve got to think about something: if you ain’t got no transportation, you are depressed, oppressed, and you at the house, because you can’t get out.” – Open Forum</li> </ul>
Rail	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Though overpasses have mitigated train blockages, it remains a problem in other areas.</li> <li>Overpasses are appreciated as solutions to congestion and as improvements to access for emergency vehicles.</li> </ul> <p>Historically, access to passenger rail provided opportunities for Southside residents without cars to take trips beyond the city.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“That train track right there; in 1970, my aunt, she had got shot by her boyfriend. So the ambulance couldn’t go over the train track, so they had to build that [overpass] in order for [...] the emergency service to go over.” – Harvey Jones, Interview</li> <li>“[about the passenger train] I rode it one time. I was a little girl, I went to Miami on it. I never forget [...] It was a lot of fun [...] But they don’t have that anymore.” – Mary Jean Garrett, Interview</li> </ul>
Displacement (of homes, businesses, etc.)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction of the James Beck overpass uprooted numerous local African American businesses which never recovered after their demolition.</li> <li>Businesses not destroyed by overpass construction lost significant amounts of passer-by traffic, which eventually forced them to close.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“My dad [...] he started his business in 1964 [...] he witnessed the overpass, we witnessed that as well, we grew up around the barber shop [...] that overpass did kill pretty much all those businesses below the overpass [...] so if a business was not already established [...] they could not rely on passer-by traffic to find them. We had a restaurant down in that area, and used to be a lot of traffic come by before the overpass, and a lot of people would see the restaurant and stop. After overpass came, all that traffic was redirected, and our restaurant eventually closed.” – Wayne Washington, Open Forum</li> <li>“It was a lot more things down on the side. It was a lot of mom and pop restaurants like Gold Plate for one, Mine Groovers. It was a lot of great eating places. Now we have nothing.” – Antonio Harrington</li> <li>“A lot of stuff changed, a lot of stuff gone that [...] I grew up with ... like downtown when I got back to pool hall was gone, Barber shop was gone, Mitchell’s BBQ stand was gone.” – Harry Homes</li> </ul>
Community perceptions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People were afraid to speak up against the poor conditions and treatment, but that is now beginning to change.</li> <li>There is a perception that other areas of the town and the region are prioritized over Southside.</li> <li>People believe that Valdosta should have a fixed public transit system by now</li> <li>The May 9, 2024, public meeting revealed a gap between elected officials’ perspectives on what community experiences should be, given investments in Southside and available resources, and the actual experiences of residents reported in interviews and the open forum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“People was always scared to speak up. People was afraid to speak. Now they’re more braver. Back in the day they was scared.” – Mary Jean Garrett</li> <li>“Valdosta is one of those cities that left the Southside behind. ... All the new construction, the widening the streets and everything’s on the north, The Southside, like I said, it’s like it is non-existent when it comes to the politicians or the government.” – Lewis Gordon</li> <li>“I’ve always thought [...] through the years that Valdosta was a large enough town that they should have some form of transportation like a busing system or something that helps [...] the community go from one place to another.” – Antonio Harrington</li> <li>“We didn’t have public transportation around that time [in the 1960s] [...] we wondered why we never could get a bus system like Albany.” – Wayne Washington, Open Forum</li> <li>“The last time we asked Sonny [Vickers] about it, he couldn’t really give us an answer what happened to the money, because the money was allocated for the MLK Corridor [...] right there in front of the monument [...] if we could get some answers on that, and let them go ahead and renovate that area where the money was allocated for that project.” – Rosetta Carrington, Open Forum</li> </ul>



Key Findings	Key Quotes
<b>Historic Preservation</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents feel that their history is being ignored and that historic structures are neglected.</li> <li>• Community members have tried and often failed to preserve historic structures without government support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “They were gonna demo this building, a historical building we have here downtown, on 68. It was there before I was born. Like when it comes to historical things. It seems to be like not of importance on right up in that area. It’s like either being demoed or whatever, and don’t even try to help out. Like Lomax School [...] and even out there in Pinevale, it was almost like they had begged to get them to [...] do things for the place [...] like help out with windows, and whatever was needed [...] back to that building that was demoed [...] I don’t know why it wasn’t televised more [...] and I know they knew it was a historical building [...] it was a pool hall there, and a liquor store [...] it was others activities going on where people that’s a little older than me, they used to go afterschool and play.” – Linda Battle, Open Forum</li> <li>• “When you are dealing with even infrastructure down there, a lot of the time people, from what I understand, that have tried to even revitalize places down there, they ran into brick walls, because then too they put so high of restrictions on the codes [...] there was the theater, you all remember that? Some people have tried to revitalize that, but when you get down to city hall, y’all [...] then you run into an obstacle.” – Joe Marshall Sr., Open Forum (Barrack Obama Boulevard)</li> <li>• “Let us enjoy we know about, what was black history. Up there [downtown Valdosta] that wasn’t what was black history. This [Southside] is.” – Councilwoman Sandra Tooley</li> <li>• “And that’s why I understand why we as a city don’t want to recognize this as being a story when it is a story, especially for the African Americans.” – Councilwoman Vivian Miller-Cody</li> </ul>

### 5.5.1.3 Historical Roots of Present Needs

Table 5-4 suggests two important realities:

1. The burdens and inadequacies of the region’s transportation system are not evenly distributed across the region.
2. The transportation challenges AAoP and HDC areas face today have often been compounded, rather than redressed, by past priorities, actions, and decisions.

The Southside neighborhood in Valdosta is a clear example of how burdens and inadequacies in the region’s transportation system are not evenly distributed across the region. Southside, which meets the criteria of an AoPP and HDC, has disproportionately borne transportation burdens and paid extra costs as host of regional infrastructure, such as dislocation, economic de-development, and loss of historic properties, among other things. Its current conditions, especially its current problems, stem from the history of the neighborhood and region.

**Rail Lines:** While area rail lines are important to the local economy and movement of goods and freight, Section 4.6 highlighted some of the negative impacts of the rail lines that bisect the city. The HEAL assessment also found that for many decades, rail lines served as physical barriers between white and Black neighborhoods, keeping the races separate for much of Valdosta’s history and making it more difficult for Black residents of the town to access government services, which were in historic white neighborhoods, including downtown. During the first half of the twentieth century, schools were the only government services located south of the tracks because of “separate-but-equal” education. The fire department, police station, public library, and hospital were north of the tracks. Congestion and blocked train intersections also posed a safety problem, restricting the movement of ambulance, fire,



and police vehicles. While the construction of rail overpasses has provided a lifeline for vehicular traffic, pedestrians and cyclists are not allowed on the primary overpass between Southside and Downtown, forcing them into the hazardous situation of climbing between stalled train cars blocking the at-grade streets.

**Overpass Construction:** For decades, Black residents bore the burdens of transportation burdens caused by the railroad tracks and the centralization of public services in white sections of town. Overpasses have alleviated many of these problems, but their location in Black neighborhoods also meant that Black residents of Valdosta have borne the long-term costs of overpass construction. This statement is especially true in Southside for the bridge on Business US 41 (finished in 1988), which lifts traffic over two rail lines just south of downtown Valdosta. The bridge on US 84 (West Hill Avenue—finished in 2014), which lifts east-west traffic over a railroad line west of downtown, had far fewer impacts and appears popular among residents who live on the west side of town.

**The James Beck Overpass (Business US 41):** In the 1980s, Valdosta’s historic Black neighborhood, Southside, became home to a much-needed railroad overpass that increased safety and reduced congestion by enabling traffic on Business US 41 to pass uninhibited over two railroad lines. For the neighborhood, the price for the improvement went far beyond construction and right-of-way costs: businesses closed; century-old buildings were demolished; and the neighborhood was bisected by a tall and visually intrusive barrier. Southside is still living with the consequences of past transportation infrastructure decisions, in which they had little say.

**Displacement:** Prior to construction of the railroad overpass on Business US 41, Black-owned businesses lined South Patterson Street near the railroad tracks and on the adjacent local streets. The area was home to Valdosta’s Black downtown, where Black economic, cultural, and social life was concentrated, in response to discrimination in the white sections of town. Restaurants, movie theaters, dry cleaners, funeral homes, and other establishments served the residents of Southside. The overpass forced these businesses to move or close; those that survived construction rarely survived the years after, as the overpass diverted traffic away from their storefronts. Valdosta’s historic Black downtown became somewhere to drive over rather than somewhere to drive to.

**Economic Development:** Historically, decisions regarding transportation in the region have largely sought to benefit economic development in downtown Valdosta, and north and northwest of downtown. The overpass on Business US 41, for instance, was constructed in part to ease traffic congestion through downtown. The overpass was shortened at its northern terminus to spare downtown’s economic fortunes; only after construction was the CSX track relocated underneath the overpass. Valdosta’s Black main street died so its downtown could live. Past transportation decisions continue to inhibit economic development in Valdosta’s AOPPs and HDCs in two major ways: traffic is designed to go through the areas rather than to them, particularly as railroad overpasses lift automobiles away from commercial sites on the ground. Residents also indicated that a deficit in transit options and pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure make it harder for people to get to jobs or to places where they would spend money.

**Historic Preservation:** Intrusive transportation projects have either destroyed historic sections and buildings or created the conditions for surviving structures to remain dilapidated and eventually be



demolished. The James Beck Overpass so altered the neighborhood's western section that it was no longer eligible for recognition on the National Register of Historic Places in 2007. The area around the overpass remains blighted and historic buildings are at risk of destruction. In 2024, the Liberty Theater, a Black-owned music hall dating to 1935, was demolished after years of vacancy. Though not initially destroyed by overpass construction, the Liberty Theater was nevertheless impacted by it. The Phyllis Wheatley Reading Room on US 84 (West Hill Avenue) suffered a similar fate. Spared by the construction of the overpass on US 84, the building at the foot of the overpass, which served as the headquarters for Valdosta's Phyllis Wheatley Club, a Black women's organization that provided space and opportunity for political discussion, socialization, education, and entertainment, was demolished in recent years.

#### 5.5.1.4 Transit Accessibility and Needs

The desire and need for transit has been made acute by a lack of access to stores and services that provide basic necessities. The concentration of these resources in other areas of the city is, in part, a legacy of Jim Crow segregation and the displacement of local businesses by transportation infrastructure.

**An Issue of Access:** Valdosta's Southside neighborhood was once home to a thriving Black downtown, where residents did most of their shopping. After the construction of the Business US 41 overpass, restaurants, cleaners, barber shops, entertainment venues, and other businesses closed and were never replaced. Many public services and amenities remain outside Black neighborhoods.

Given the high percentage of Southside residents who do not have cars, the displacement of neighborhood businesses and the continued concentration of resources in other areas of the city create an additional accessibility barrier. This issue is compounded by the inadequacy of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, which further inhibit safe, efficient, and accessible transportation (see Figures 4-7 and 4-10). Elderly and low-income residents that must travel to neighboring communities for work, medical appointments, school, shopping, and recreation are particularly affected.

**Transit Challenges Today:** Those most likely to use and benefit from Valdosta On Demand are also those most likely to have the hardest time using it. Because demand exceeds capacity, residents reported that Valdosta On Demand was unreliable, especially for those seeking to make trips on short notice. Some residents noted that the process of securing a ride could be more user-friendly. One common complaint was the distance elderly residents had to walk to get to pick-up locations. Elected officials present at the VLMPO MTP Public Meeting on May 9, 2024, noted the existence of ADA-compliant vehicles in the Valdosta On Demand fleet and indicated that accommodations were available for users with mobility challenges. Yet, residents who were interviewed and who attended the open forum repeatedly cited accessibility challenges associated with Valdosta On Demand. The gap between elected officials' perceptions of available resources and actual user experience requires further study to determine if these resources are inadequate, inaccessible, and/or insufficiently publicized.

#### 5.5.1.5 Community Perspectives

"Valdosta left the Southside behind," Lewis Gordon told HEAL interviewers in April 2024. Gordon was no outlier among the people who attended a public meeting in the Southside neighborhood, organized by



HEAL and two members of Valdosta’s city council for the purposes of gathering perceptions about current conditions and oral histories of life in Valdosta. As everyone shared their perspectives, a consensus was clear: Residents of Southside love where they live but have little faith that their perspectives are heard by planners and decision-makers.

On the one hand, this perception is grounded in decades of discrimination, segregation, and disenfranchisement. As one interviewee stated, people have been “afraid to speak up.” It was not until 1985, after a lawsuit filed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), that Black residents of Valdosta began to be regularly represented on city council. By then, the overpass that destroyed Black commercial activity in Southside had already been built. Before construction, the planning process for the project included only one public meeting. *Residents are thus left to live with the consequences of many infrastructure and transportation decisions in which they had no say.* On the other hand, calls to redress these problems often appear to stall. Many pointed out little progress on safety improvements, like sidewalks near schools and parks that go unmet. Frustration over lack of progress in transit, walkability, street projects, and many other related issues abound.

### 5.5.1.6 Travel Patterns in Low Income Communities

Members of the study team used Replica software to identify low-income user travel patterns. Understanding low-income user travel patterns can reveal distinct opportunities for transportation mode choice influenced by financial constraints. Understanding travel patterns in lower income areas enables the development of accessible and equitable transportation systems that address the unique needs and challenges faced by individuals with limited financial resources. **Figure 5-10** depicts the destinations of walking and bicycle trips taken by low-income users.

### 5.5.1.7 Environmental Sustainability

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) maintains rigorous standards for all transportation projects receiving federal funding, working in collaboration with other federal agencies, state departments of transportation, and MPOs for evaluation and compliance. VLMPO and other Georgia MPOs follow the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual, which calls for National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) review under the following criteria:

- Federal funds or assistance are used at some phase of the project
- Federal permit(s) is (are) required; Federal approval of an action is required
- Federal funding or assistance eligibility must be maintained.

There are two reasons for documenting the NEPA process: To provide complete disclosure of the environmental analysis process, and to present the results (i.e., the decision). Transportation projects have varying degrees of severity or potential to affect the environment. There are three classes of actions [23 CFR 771.115], defining the way that compliance with NEPA is documented in terms of the action's impacts:


- Class I, Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) are prepared for projects whose action will have a significant effect on the environment.



- Class II, Categorical Exclusions (CE) are prepared for projects that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental effect.
- Class III, Environmental Assessments (EA) are prepared for projects in which the significance of the environmental impact is not clearly defined.



Figure 5-10: Trip Destinations of Low-Income Active Transportation Users





All actions that are not Class I or II are Class III. All actions in this class require the preparation of an EA to determine the appropriate environmental document required. There are currently no projects programmed in the VLMPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for environmental study. Several projects proposed for funding as part of the Southern Georgia Transportation Investment Act (TIA) will require some level of environmental analysis.

The BIL/IIJA has several initiatives that directly or indirectly address environmental mitigation. Among the \$110 billion dedicated to surface transportation infrastructure are:

- \$7.5 billion for Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grants, which delivers “safer, cleaner infrastructure to communities of every size” for projects traditionally difficult for the USDOT to implement
- \$1 billion for Culvert Removal, Replacement, and Restoration Program, which addresses stormwater management
- \$5 billion for the Safe Streets and Roads for All program, which includes funding for non-motorized transportation projects but no money for roadway capacity projects
- \$7.2 billion for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), with eligible projects that include planning, design and construction of trails, environmental mitigation activities to address stormwater management, among others

Also included in the BIL, carried forward from the previous FAST Act, is the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program. CMAQ provides a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the NAAQS for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas). The VLMPO contains no nonattainment or maintenance areas.

## 5.6 Project Delivery

It is not uncommon for MPO projects to encounter delays for a variety of reasons. As stated in the Vision2045 report, “transportation projects are regularly delayed for various reasons. The FHWA, GDOT, and local partners use various programs to reduce those delays. However, delays can also be reduced by identifying potential areas of delay early in the process.” To assess the occurrence of recent project delays, the study team reviewed VLMPO Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) for FY 2018-2021, 2021-2024, and 2024-2027. Table 5-5 depicts roadway projects funded during these fiscal years by project phase. Red text indicates project phases that were delayed from one TIP to another.

Table 5-5: Project Summary from Recent VLMPO TIPs

Text highlighted in Red represents delayed Phases			FY2018-2021				FY2021-2024				FY2024-2027			
Sponsor	Project Name	Type of Work	2018	2019	2020	2021	2021	2022	2023	2024	2024	2025	2026	2027
GDOT	SR 31 from SR 7/Lowndes to SR 135/Lanier	Passing Lanes	PE		ROW	CST		ROW	CST					
Lowndes	CR 136/Old Quitman Rd @ CSX #637487Y 6mi W of Valdosta	Bridge		PE	ROW		ROW		CST		CST, UTL			
GDOT	CR 274/CS 1078/Lake Park Belleville Rd from SR 7 to I-75	Widening		ROW		CST, UTL	CST, UTL							
GDOT	I-75 @ CR274/Lake Park Belleville Road - Phase II (Exit 2)	Interchange		CST, UTL										
GDOT	I-75 @ SR 31 - Phase II (Exit 11)	Interchange		CST, UTL			CST, UTL							
Valdosta	CR 784/Jerry Jones Dr/Eager Rd from Baytree Rd to Oak St	Turning Lanes		ROW	CST, UTL			CST, UTL						
GDOT	I-75 @ SR133 - Phase II (Exit 18)	Interchange				PE	PE			ROW				
Valdosta	South Valdosta Truck Bypass	Roadway Project					SCP							
GDOT	I-75 @ 376 - Phase II	Interchange								SCP				
GDOT	I-75 @ CR 783/ Loch Laurel Road- Phase II	Bridge								SCP	SCP			



As shown in **Table 5-5** above, the following projects appear multiple times in the TIPs in the same phase:

- SR 31 from SR 7/Lowndes to SR 135/Lanier
- CR 136/Old Quitman Rd at CSX #637487Y 6mi W of Valdosta
- I-75 @ SR 31 - Phase II (Exit 11)
- CR 784/Jerry Jones Dr/Eager Rd from Baytree Rd to Oak St

In sum, 4 out of 10 projects were delayed (40%) while 8 out of 22 phases were delayed (36%). Additional information has been requested to ascertain the reasons for these project delays.


## 5.7 Assessment of Bicycle and Pedestrian Demand

Replica software was used to identify high demand areas for active transportation within the VLMPO region. The demand profile shown in Figure 5-11 identifies those parts of the region where there is currently significant walking and biking activity. As expected, the VSU campus, retail areas located between Remerton and I-75, Downtown Valdosta and areas near the South Georgia Medical Center are shown as high demand areas for bicycle and pedestrian activity. Portions of the Lake Park Census Tract also exhibit high demand.

Further analysis indicates that the majority (95%) of all non-motorized trips were walking trips. Approximately half of these non-motorized trips were for recreational purposes such as shopping (36%) or socializing (13%) and more than 35% were estimated to be completed in under 5 minutes with an additional 18% estimated between 5 to 10 minutes. Additionally, an estimated 70% of walking and biking trips completed by low-income residents were estimated to be less than a mile.



Figure 5-11: Existing Demand for Active Transportation



## 5.8 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT)

Table 5-6 depicts a SWOT assessment used to summarize findings from the existing conditions analysis. This assessment sets the table for later sections of this report.



Table 5-6: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT)

2050 VLMPO MTP Goals/ Indicators	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Safety and System Reliability	Serious injuries/ 100 million VMT is below GDOT target	High fatality rate for bike/ped accidents; fatal accidents/100 million VMT exceeds GDOT target	VLMPO has a good accident monitoring system in place (annual updates)	Increased use of alternate modes could also result in greater accidents and fatalities absent additional safety enhancements
Infrastructure Condition (bridges and pavement)	Most bridges in the region are in good condition; year over year improvement in index of pavement conditions	Two bridges in region are in poor condition; Several Interstate and NHS segments have only fair pavement conditions	GDOT has prioritized bridge and pavement quality, particularly on Interstate and NHS highways	Increasing traffic and truck volumes might lead to accelerated deterioration of bridge and pavement conditions
Congestion Reduction and Mobility (reliability and accessibility)	Existing average LOS A-C on area roadways	Several road segments operating at LOS D-F	TIA funding opportunities	Currently available funding is likely to be insufficient to provide acceptable LOS on all roads
Freight Movement and Economic Vitality	Average LOS A-C on roadways with heavy truck traffic, truck parking exists	Connection between I-75 and Moody AFB (moderate trucks)	Explore all FHWA and GDOT funding opportunities	Connecting roadways not currently on STRAHNET
Environmental Sustainability and Equity	VLMPO policies require environmental impact mitigation and consider all transportation users	Underserved communities have poor access to transportation options	The 2050 MTP is including outreach to underserved communities	Lack of fixed guideway transit services continues to impact access to jobs and healthy food options
Reduced Project Delivery Dates	A majority of project phases in recent TIPs were completed in the year programmed	36% of project phases funded in recent TIPs were delayed to a later fiscal year	Recent passage of regional transportation sales tax demonstrates citizen interest	FY 2024-2027 TIP has few projects with GDOT funding



## 6 STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

---

### 6.1 Introduction

The overall goal of the Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO) is to maintain a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process. Since its inception, the VLMPO has sought to foster an environment that facilitates an optimal collaborative process between local officials and citizens alike. Led by three standing committees, the process is designed to encourage involvement by all interested groups, such as the business community, neighborhood associations, environmental organizations, social service agencies, educational institutions, and the public.

A robust stakeholder and public involvement program was utilized throughout the VLMPO 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update as public involvement is integral to the VLMPO's transportation planning mission. This document serves as a record of the strategies and activities that were utilized to both educate and involve the community during the plan development process. Input and involvement were sought from leaders and community members in the VLMPO area.

The Valdosta Urbanized Area and Metropolitan Planning Area includes all of Lowndes County and portions of Berrien, Brooks and Lanier Counties as illustrated previously. The stakeholder and public engagement process was centered around three key milestones during plan development: (1) Study Process and Existing Conditions Review; (2) Future Conditions and Improvement Possibilities; and (3) Investment Recommendations and Funding Prioritization.

### 6.2 Public Participation Structure

#### 6.2.1 MPO Committees

The VLMPO is guided by three standing committees. The Policy Committee is the regional forum for cooperative decision-making by local elected officials, City and County Managers, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Administrators, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Directors, and the Southern Georgia Regional Commission (SGRC) Executive Director. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is a committee of technical professionals advising the policy committee on technical matters relating to transportation plans and programs. The TAC is made up of city and county engineers, GDOT District engineers, GDOT planners, local school board representatives, bicycle and pedestrian advocates, emergency response officials, and a representative from the FHWA Georgia Division. The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) serves as a public information and involvement committee that represents a cross section of the community in diversity and interests, as well as local authorities. The study team provided MTP development updates to the three MPO Committees during each of the three milestone periods through stakeholder committee meetings or direct briefings.

#### 6.2.2 Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

The VLMPO utilized a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) specifically designed to guide the development of the 2050 MTP Update. The SAC was comprised of governmental and community organizations representing the needs of multimodal transportation users plus agencies involved in



implementing plan recommendations. The SAC served to guide the development of the study goals and objectives, offered input into the methodology used to evaluate improvement options, and provided input on the study deliverables including existing and future conditions, evaluation criteria, and draft recommendations. The SAC met at each of the key milestone points during plan development. The SAC met before each Public Open House to review input provided by the study team and MPO Committees. The Stakeholder Committee meetings were held on March 6, 2024; November 7, 2024; and May 15, 2025. The membership list for the SAC is included in **Appendix B**. SAC and Public Open House Meeting Notes are included in **Appendix C**.

### **6.2.3 Public Open Houses**

During each milestone, once findings were presented to the MPO Committees and the SAC, the VLMPO held a public open house to inform and engage the public and interested parties. Each open house allowed the public to interact one-on-one with the study team and MPO professional staff to offer meaningful input in the transportation planning process. Public Open House Meetings were held on May 9, 2024; November 7, 2024; and May 15, 2025.

Environmental Justice is an essential aspect of public involvement. This term refers to providing reasonable opportunities for all interested parties to comment on transportation planning activities. Equitable involvement requires convenient and accessible locations and access to electronic formats. The VLMPO engaged minority business alliances, faith-based organizations, community/neighborhood organizations, and low-income/elderly and disabled advocacy groups in outreach opportunities through a mailing list of resource and partner agencies and other interested parties. The VLMPO notified these organizations of public engagement opportunities and plan review comment periods. The mailing list was updated with new contact information as new partners and contacts were identified.

Public comment forms were provided at all public meetings to allow attendees to provide comments and concerns related to the plan development process and review. The VLMPO website included a telephone number and email address for the public to provide comments to the MPO staff throughout the planning period. Public Open House Meeting Notes are included in Appendix D.

## **6.3 Stakeholder and Public Involvement Tools**

The stakeholder and public involvement tools outlined in this section were designed to aid in a robust stakeholder and public involvement program to enhance the development of the VLMPO 2050 MTP Update. These tools were designed to educate stakeholders and members of the community while also encouraging involvement in the planning process through participation and by providing feedback. The tasks outlined below were performed during the study.

### **6.3.1 Stakeholder and Public Involvement Plan**

The VLMPO Stakeholder and Public Involvement Plan (SPIP) outlined the stakeholder and public involvement approach to be taken during plan development. The SPIP was reviewed and amended throughout the study process as needed. Collection of public input occurred throughout the duration of the study and amendments were made to enhance the outreach process. The purpose of the SPIP was to define how staff, stakeholders, and the public could be involved throughout plan development.



### **6.3.2 Webpage**

A webpage for the VLMPO 2050 MTP Update was linked to the [sgrc.us](http://sgrc.us) website. This page contained up to date study information including a link to a printable fact sheet, press releases, study findings, draft documents, meeting information, and study team contact information. The consultant team provided webpage materials to be posted by the VLMPO staff on a routine basis. The webpage was established and operational prior to issuing the first study Press Release and remained active throughout the draft plan public comment period.

### **6.3.3 Fact Sheet**

A study fact sheet was developed to provide background information regarding the plan update. An overview of the study process and study schedule was included. Contact information for the study team was included to ensure that stakeholders and the public were able to obtain information about the progress, findings, and recommendations resulting from the study process. The fact sheet was available at the SGRC offices and distributed as community members requested information about the study.

### **6.3.4 Online Citizen Survey**

An online survey was developed to solicit input on needs, opportunities, and multimodal alternatives for improvement. The survey was developed early in the planning process and remained open through the data collection phase of the study. The input received was used to guide the consultant team and SAC as plan recommendations were developed.

Thirty-seven (37) community members responded to the survey. Fifty-eight (58) percent of participants reported living in the City of Valdosta, thirty (30) percent in Lowndes County outside of the City of Valdosta, three (3) percent in Lanier County and nine (9) percent indicated they live outside of the VLMPO study area. Of the respondents, seventy (70) percent commute to work in the VLMPO area and ten (10) percent commute to work outside of the VLMPO area. Twenty (20) percent of participants do not commute to work outside of their home. Of the respondents that do commute to work, ninety (90) percent commute alone by car, seven percent travel by walking and three percent commute by public transportation. For general transportation needs outside of commuting to work, ninety-two (92) percent of respondents reported driving alone as the transportation mode they use most often. Five (5) percent of respondents walk most often, and three (3) percent use public transportation.

Respondents varied by age as follows: eight (8) percent were 18-24; four (4) percent were 25-34; thirty-two (32) percent were 35-44; sixteen (16) percent were 45-54; twelve (12) percent were 55-64 and twenty-four (24) percent were over age 65. Four percent of the respondents did not report their age.

Participants were asked to share transportation needs and opportunities regarding safety, bicycle needs, pedestrian needs, transit, railroad crossings, and traffic congestion. Participants indicated top funding priority needs such as roadway repair and roadway maintenance, and a need for grade separated rail crossings, public transportation, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities. A detailed summary of the online survey findings is available in Appendix E.



## 6.3.5 HEAL and ArcGIS StoryMaps

As previously documented earlier in this report, the consultant team took a unique approach to equity, called HEAL, focused on the historical relationship of disadvantaged communities to the transportation system in the VLMPO region. This analysis was utilized by the study team, stakeholders, and community to inform the impacts of transportation system investment in the VLMPO area.

ArcGIS StoryMaps, a tool utilizing mapping and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data as interactive content, was used during the initial public workshop to inform and engage stakeholders and the community. This visual outreach technique was used to describe the study process, findings, and equity elements throughout the study.

## 6.3.6 Press Releases

A press release was prepared during each of the three rounds of stakeholder and public involvement during the study period. All press releases included information about the study process, key findings, opportunities for engagement, the study webpage address, and VLMPO staff contact information. VLMPO staff sent all press releases to local newspapers, television, and radio media. All press releases were also posted on the study webpage and distributed to the VLMPO mailing list and SAC to share via email with members of their organizations. **Table 6-1** summarizes the tools used during the stakeholder and public involvement element of the MTP Update.

Table 6-1: Engagement Tool Utilization Per Plan Development Milestone

Engagement Tool	SPRING 2024 Study Process and Existing Conditions Review	FALL 2024 Future Conditions and Improvement Possibilities	SPRING 2025 Recommendations and Funding Prioritization
MPO Committee Briefing			x
SAC Meeting	x	x	x
Public Open Houses	x	x	x
Fact Sheet	x	x	x
Webpage Updates	x	x	x
Online Citizen Survey	x		
HEAL Analysis	x		
ArcGIS StoryMaps	x		
Press Releases	x	x	x
Legal Notice of Draft Plan			x



## 6.4 MTP Document Notification, Review, and Documentation Procedures

For each public open house, a notice was posted on the VLMPO website and sent to committee members, the VLMPO mailing list, media outlets and other interested parties at least two weeks prior to the event. All meetings hosted by the VLMPO were open to the public and held at the McMullen Southside Library, which is accessible for people with disabilities and located in one of the area's largest minority communities. All meetings were held from 4-7 PM to offer convenience to the broadest population possible. The notice for a public meeting or open house included a statement that accessibility aids would be made available at the public event per a written request made at least one week prior to the event.

The VLMPO made the draft MTP available for public review electronically and in hard copy for a period of 30 days from August 1 to September 2, 2025, and held a Public Open House at Southern Georgia Regional Commission, located at 1937 Carlton Adams Road, Valdosta, GA from 1pm to 4 pm on August 6, 2025. The draft MTP was available at the office of the Southern Georgia Regional Commission, McMullen Southside Library, and local government offices in counties within the VLMPO Metropolitan Planning Area, and on the VLMPO website. A legal notice was placed in the Valdosta Daily Times before the first day of publication of the document for public comment. The legal notice provided information on the study, the dates for public review period, means of submitting comments and plans for the open house to review the plan. This information was posted on the VLMPO website and sent to the VLMPO mailing list and media contacts. Members of the VLMPO standing committees (Policy, Technical, and Citizen's) were given an advanced review period of 30 days for key planning documents beginning June 4, 2025.

All comments received during the plan development and public comment period become a record of the MTP and are included in an appendix to the Final Report. Comments received and any necessary responses were also shared with the VLMPO Policy Committee and other appropriate agencies.

## 6.5 Evaluation of Public Involvement Tools

The VLMPO strives to meet all goals and strategies of the SPIP. At the conclusion of each of the three milestone periods, the measures outlined in **Table 6-2** were considered by VLMPO staff, the consulting team and plan development committee to ensure the effectiveness of the outreach and involvement strategies and activities. Adjustments to the outreach approach were made, as necessary, during plan development.



Table 6-2: Public Outreach Strategies and Evaluation Criteria

Strategies	Evaluation Criteria
1. Raise public awareness and understanding of the transportation planning process including the functions, responsibilities, and programs of the MPO and identify how interested citizens can become involved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of public meetings</li> <li>• Number of newsletters/publications</li> <li>• Number of staff speaking engagements</li> <li>• Attendance at public meetings</li> <li>• Number of media engagements</li> </ul>
2. Provide the public and stakeholders with early, ongoing, and meaningful opportunities for involvement in the 2050 MTP Update process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency of contact with the public</li> <li>• Timely updates to websites</li> <li>• Response to public comments</li> <li>• Accessibility of staff to the public</li> </ul>
3. Maintain timely contact with key stakeholders and the public throughout the 2050 MTP Update process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of stakeholder meetings</li> <li>• Number of public meetings/events</li> <li>• Number of SAC meetings</li> <li>• Number of notices sent to resource and partner agencies.</li> <li>• How stakeholder issues were addressed in planning documents</li> <li>• Accessibility of technical information</li> </ul>
4. Identify, involve, and mitigate impacts on traditionally underserved communities (those communities with high concentrations of minority, low-income, elderly, or disabled populations) in the 2050 MTP Update planning process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of public meetings</li> <li>• Number of hours for public meetings</li> <li>• Accessible location of public meetings</li> <li>• Frequency of outreach to traditionally underserved populations</li> <li>• Number of new relationships with human service agencies</li> <li>• Demographic data survey at public meetings with anonymous demographic related questions</li> </ul>
5. Employ visualization and outreach techniques to better describe and communicate metropolitan transportation plans and processes to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of published documents</li> <li>• There are a number of different outreach techniques including ArcGIS StoryMaps and HEAL tools.</li> </ul>



## 7 LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

Keeping in mind the strong linkage between land use and travel behavior, this chapter of the report provides background information on land use patterns in the VLMPO study area.

### 7.1 Inventory of Existing Land Uses

Land use character areas are identified to provide a greater understanding of the density of development in different parts of the study area, along with the location of specific activity centers, including Valdosta State University (VSU), grade schools, and parks. The density and location of activity centers, in particular, can aid in focusing scarce funding for active transportation and transit to locations most likely to benefit from such investments.

#### 7.1.1 Activity Centers

Activity centers are destinations that attract large numbers of people to specific locations and include places with significant economic activity. Activity centers are destinations that attract large numbers of people to specific locations and include places with significant economic activity and generally include large numbers of students or workers. Activity centers have a greater potential to generate pedestrian and bicycle trips than lower density areas. **Figure 7-1** depicts activity centers in the study area along with land use character areas.

Key activity areas include the following:

- Valdosta State University (VSU)
- City of Valdosta (excluding VSU) – areas around Valdosta Mall, Valdosta Regional Airport, and areas south of US 84/US 221 where there are industrial land uses such as the Lowe’s Distribution Center, ADM/Stratas Foods, Dillard’s Distribution Center, Outsource Logistics Warehouse.
- Downtown Hahira
- Moody Air Force Base
- Lake Park


The following text focuses on areas where investments in active transportation will likely have the greatest impact (VSU, grade schools, and parks). Chapter 8 describes how land uses are represented as socio-economic data in the VLMPO base year 2020 and horizon year 2050 travel demand models.

##### 7.1.1.1 Valdosta State University

Valdosta State University serves as a significant hub of education, employment, and community engagement, attracting a large population of students, faculty, and staff. The University community relies on a range of transportation modes to navigate both the university campus and its surrounding areas. As a result, Valdosta State University serves as a major origin and destination in the region, highlighting its role as a trip generator for walking and biking. Campus properties are shown in **Figure 7-1**.




Figure 7-1: Land Use Character Areas and Activity Centers



Data Sources:  
GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMO & City of Valdosta



Figure 7-2: Valdosta State University Properties






## 7.1.1.2 Grade Schools (K-12)

Since many younger students may lack access to personal vehicle transportation, pedestrian facilities are vital in areas within close proximity of schools. Comfortable walking distance to schools is estimated to be approximately a half-mile buffer around the entrance of schools. **Figure 7-3** shows the locations of the 96 grade schools within the VLMPO region.

Figure 7-3: Grade School Locations






## 7.1.1.3 Parks

Parks, which are often programmed with ballfields, playgrounds, and pools, are an important walking and bicycling destination. Not only are walking and bicycling an extension of the recreational park use, but parking may also be limited, particularly in smaller neighborhood parks. Parks are a common community facility—accordingly, many areas in the City of Valdosta are within walking distance of a park.

**Figure 7-4** shows the location of parks in the VLMPO region.

Figure 7-4: Park Locations





## 7.2 Areas of Persistent Poverty

Much of the area inside the loop of I-75 and US 41 (Inner Perimeter Road) has been defined by the US DOT as either an area of persistent poverty (AoPP) or a historically disadvantaged community (HDC). AoPP areas are present throughout the region, especially within the Valdosta city limits, while HDCs are more prevalent south of US 84. **Figure 7-5** depicts annual median household income by Census Tract, using data from the 2016-2020 American Community Survey (ACS). This map shows large areas within the loop exhibiting low household income (lightly shaded areas). Other areas likely experiencing transportation challenges are those depicted by the dark shaded areas in **Figure 7-6** as having a large percentage of households with zero vehicles available. Another indicator of poverty, and related transportation challenges, is the percentage of multi-family dwelling units, as depicted in **Figure 7-7**. As noted elsewhere in this report, Metro Analytics is employing HEAL tools to document the legacy of transportation challenges within these areas.



Figure 7-5: Median Household Income by Census Tract






Figure 7-6: Percent Zero Vehicle Households by Census Tract







Figure 7-7: Percent Multi-Family Housing Units





## 8 SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE

The Valdosta region (Berrien, Brooks, Lanier, and Lowndes Counties) has experienced varying levels of growth over the past decades. While the state of Georgia has consistently experienced double digit decade growth rates since 1950, the Valdosta region has typically experienced growth rates lower than the state as a whole. In the most recent decade for which complete Census data are available (2010-2020), the state of Georgia grew by 11 percent while the Valdosta region grew by only 5 percent. Only small portions of Berrien, Brooks, and Lanier Counties are included in the MPO area, which had a 2020 population of approximately 122,000. Lowndes County was home to 118,000 of the total MPO area population estimate and was the only county in the region to show statistically significant population growth. **Table 8-1** depicts historic changes in population by decade for the region and the state, while **Figure 8-1** depicts decade growth rates for Georgia versus the Valdosta region.


Table 8-1: Historic Population Growth in Georgia and Valdosta Region

Year	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020
<b>Georgia</b>	<b>2,216,331</b>	<b>2,609,121</b>	<b>2,895,832</b>	<b>2,908,506</b>	<b>3,123,723</b>	<b>3,444,578</b>	<b>3,943,116</b>	<b>4,589,575</b>	<b>5,463,105</b>	<b>6,478,216</b>	<b>8,186,453</b>	<b>9,687,653</b>	<b>10,711,908</b>
Decade Growth Rates		18%	11%	0%	7%	10%	14%	16%	19%	19%	26%	18%	11%
<b>Berrien</b>	19,440	22,772	15,573	14,646	15,370	13,966	12,038	11,556	13,525	14,153	16,235	19,361	18,166
<b>Brooks</b>	18,606	23,832	24,538	21,330	20,497	18,169	15,292	13,739	15,255	15,398	16,450	16,246	16,299
<b>Lanier<sup>1</sup></b>	-	-	-	5,190	5,632	5,151	5,097	5,031	5,654	5,531	7,241	10,104	9,880
<b>Lowndes</b>	20,036	24,436	26,521	29,994	31,860	35,211	49,270	55,112	67,972	75,981	92,115	109,689	118,249
<b>VLMPO~</b>	58,082	71,040	66,632	71,160	73,359	72,497	81,697	85,438	102,406	111,063	132,041	155,400	162,594
Decade Growth Rates		22%	-6%	7%	3%	-1%	13%	5%	20%	8%	19%	18%	5%

Source: US Census Bureau

<sup>1</sup>Lanier County was established in 1920

Figure 8-1: Historic Population Growth Rates for Georgia vs. Valdosta Region





All MPOs use travel demand models to forecast traffic growth. Traffic projections also require demographic forecasts and a validation process to ensure that models accurately estimate current traffic volumes. Most models use the most recent Census year for the base year validation process. Thus, the latest base year model is being developed and validated to reflect year 2020 conditions. The VLMPO consulting team prepared a set of socioeconomic data by traffic analysis zone (TAZ) for use in the model validation process. Base year 2020 socioeconomic estimates used data from the U.S. Census, Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD), area Chambers of Commerce, local school boards, Valdosta State University, Wiregrass Georgia Technical College, and Moody Air Force Base.

This chapter describes data sources and methodologies used to estimate base year 2020 and horizon year 2050 socioeconomic data at the regional, county, and traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level. Base year 2020 TAZ data were validated to standards provided in the report titled *Georgia MPO Travel Demand Models Socioeconomic Data Development Guide* while summed data were compared against multiple data sources. Horizon year 2050 data were disaggregated down from official Georgia County level population forecasts, using existing relationships among demographic variables, recent employment announcements, planned developments, and previously estimated 2045 demographic data for the VLMPO area.

## 8.1 Base Year 2020 Demographic Profile

Base year 2020 socioeconomic data were compiled at the TAZ level to support the travel demand model validation process. The base year was determined to be 2020 for this data set, for consistency with the U.S. Decennial Census. Population figures, including group quarter populations, number of households, and median household income, were sourced from the 2020 U.S. Census at the block level and then aggregated to the TAZ level. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, and its impacts on employment, GDOT requested that 2019 Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD) data be used to estimate employment, rather than 2020. School enrollment data for the 2020-2021 academic year was sourced from The Governor's Office of Student Achievement, while university enrollment data was gathered from Valdosta State University and Wiregrass Georgia Technical College. Employment estimates for Moody Air Force Base (AFB) were obtained directly from AFB staff. Primary data sources and links to each are provided in **Table 8-2**.



Table 8-2: Base Year 2020 Socioeconomic Data Sources

Data	Year	Primary Data Source(s)	Link
Population	2020	US Decennial P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data	<a href="https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/rdo/summary-files.html">https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/rdo/summary-files.html</a>
Group Quarter Population	2020		
Households	2020		
Median Income	2016-2020	American Community Survey (ACS)	<a href="https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html">https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html</a>
Total Employment	2019	LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES)	<a href="https://lehd.ces.census.gov/data/lodes/LODES8/ga/wac/ga_wac_S000_JT00_2019.csv.gz">https://lehd.ces.census.gov/data/lodes/LODES8/ga/wac/ga_wac_S000_JT00_2019.csv.gz</a>
Agriculture, Mining, and Construction (AMC) Employment	2019		
Manufacturing, Transportation, Communication, Utilities and Warehousing (MTCUW) Employment	2019		
Retail Employment	2019		
Service Employment	2019		
School (K-12) Enrollment	2019-2020	The Governor's Office of Student Achievement	<a href="https://download.gosa.ga.gov/2020/Enrollment%20By%20Grade%20Level%20Dec112020.csv">https://download.gosa.ga.gov/2020/Enrollment By Grade Level 2020 Dec112020.csv</a>
University Enrollment	2019-2020	Valdosta State University, Moody Air Force Base	<a href="https://www.valdosta.edu/administration/institutional-research/documents/factbook/factbook_2020_update.pdf">https://www.valdosta.edu/administration/institutional-research/documents/factbook/factbook_2020_update.pdf</a>

To ensure accuracy, base year 2020 socioeconomic data were cross-checked with local sources, land use, and satellite imagery. TAZ data were validated to GDOT standards provided in the report titled *Georgia MPO Travel Demand Models Socioeconomic Data Development Guide*, prepared in August 2023. Summed data were also compared against other data sources such as Woods & Poole, the Georgia



Department of Labor, and the Georgia Department of Education. Thematic mapping of key demographic attributes was also used as a logic check on TAZ estimates

## 8.1.1 Population and Households

The population within the VLMPO region is primarily concentrated towards the northern areas of Valdosta and Remerton, extending from downtown Valdosta to the areas around US-41. Significant population concentrations are also found to the northeast along Bemiss Road, extending towards Moody AFB, and in the northwest in and around Hahira. The western areas of the VLMPO region, particularly west of I-75 around US-84 and GA-133, have been identified as rapidly growing in recent years. Additionally, there is a notable population cluster in the city of Lake Park, particularly towards the south and southwest. The year 2020 household distribution within the VLMPO region at the TAZ level largely mirrors the population distribution patterns. **Table 8-3** presents a summary of the base year 2020 population and households. Maps depicting the distribution of the 2020 population and households by traffic analysis zone (TAZ) are depicted in Figure 8-2 and Figure 8-3, respectively.

Table 8-3: Base Year 2020 Population and Household data by County in MPO Area

County	Population	Group Quarter Population	Households	Median Income
Berrien	44	0	9	\$42,893
Brooks	2,188	0	889	\$44,873
Lanier	1,783	0	597	\$43,839
Lowndes	118,262	5,527	44,210	\$42,328
<b>VLMPO Area</b>	<b>122,277</b>	<b>5,527</b>	<b>45,705</b>	



Figure 8-2: Base Year 2020 Population Distribution by TAZ







Figure 8-3: Base Year 2020 Household Distribution by TAZ





## 8.1.2 Employment

Employment within the VLMPO region is concentrated around major corridors such as I-75 and US-41, near the cities of Valdosta, Remerton, and areas in and around the Valdosta Regional Airport. Moody Air Force Base is the largest employer in the region with over 6,000 employees, followed by South Georgia Medical Center, Walmart, Valdosta State University, and the Valdosta and Lowndes County school systems.

**Table 8-4** summarizes the base year 2020 employment within the VLMPO region by county and four major employment categories:

- AMC: Agriculture, Mining, and Construction
- MTCUW: Manufacturing, Transportation and Warehousing, Communications, Utilities, and Wholesale Trade
- RET: Retail Trade
- SERV: All Service sectors (including public administration)


Table 8-4: Base Year 2020 Employment Data by Type and County

County	AMC Employment	MTCUW Employment	RET Employment	SERV Employment	TOTAL Employment
Berrien	0	0	0	0	0
Brooks	27	4	26	11	68
Lanier	0	0	1	4	5
Lowndes	3,121	7,875	29,135	10,403	50,534
<b>VLMPO Area</b>	<b>3,148</b>	<b>7,879</b>	<b>29,161</b>	<b>10,418</b>	<b>50,607</b>

Figure 8-4 depicts the distribution of total employment by TAZ.



Figure 8-4: Base Year 2019 Employment Distribution by TAZ





## 8.1.3 K-12 and University Enrollment

**Table 8-5** below compiled from The Governor’s Office of Student Achievement provides the K-12 enrollment data for public schools within the VLMPO area. Based on the location of these schools, the school enrollment data is assigned to the respective TAZ.

Table 8-5: Base Year 2020 School Enrollment Data

School Name	School District	TAZ ID	K-12 Enrollment
W.G. Nunn Elementary	Valdosta City	45	962
S.L. Mason Elementary School	Valdosta City	265	820
Sallas Mahone Elementary	Valdosta City	380	1,039
J. L. Lomax Elementary School	Valdosta City	110	593
Pinevale Elementary School	Valdosta City	103	557
Valdosta Middle School	Valdosta City	367	1,110
Newbern Middle School	Valdosta City	39	932
Valdosta High School	Valdosta City	70	2,111
Dewar Elementary	Lowndes County	36	781
Westside Elementary School	Lowndes County	245	888
Moulton-Branch Elementary School	Lowndes County	113	564
Lake Park Elementary School	Lowndes County	162	653
Hahira Elementary School	Lowndes County	413	750
Pine Grove Elementary School	Lowndes County	390	683
Clyattville Elementary School	Lowndes County	206	598
Hahira Middle School	Lowndes County	416	947
Lowndes Middle School	Lowndes County	178	840
Pine Grove Middle School	Lowndes County	390	837
Lowndes High School	Lowndes County	247	2,934
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>18,599</b>

These enrollment figures provide insight into the educational landscape, demographic distribution, and school trips within the VLMPO area.

## 8.2 Horizon Year 2050 Demographic Profile

Recently there has been much discussion in numerous fields about Decision Making Under Deep Uncertainty (DMDU). According to the DMDU Society, “deep uncertainty exists when parties to a decision do not know, or cannot agree on, the system model that relates action to consequences, the probability distributions to place over the inputs to these models, which consequences to consider and their relative importance.” In the field of transportation planning, DMDU refers to uncertainty over future development patterns, demographic and work trends, and adoption of new transportation modes.



Thus, while socioeconomic and traffic forecasts described in this section of the report are consistent with recent trends and population growth estimates from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budgeting (GOPB), it is important to acknowledge that predicting the future is fraught with unpredictability. Nonetheless, it is important to plan for the long-term future and periodically reassess these predictions using new data. Hence, Federal requirements for updating MTPs and their assumptions every five years. Appendix E documents an alternative future land use scenario, the assumptions in making this alternate future come to life, and some of the implications for planning the region’s transportation system.

Future year 2050 population and household forecasts are primarily based on county-level forecasts provided by the GOPB. These county-level population projections serve as control totals for TAZ-level population projections within the VLMPO region. For counties that are only partially within the VLMPO region, specifically Berrien, Brooks, and Lanier counties, proportional estimates were applied to align with the regional boundaries. It was assumed that the proportion of the county population located within the VLMPO study area in 2050 would be the same as found in 2020.

Assumptions were made to maintain household sizes (population per household) and employment per population ratios consistent with base year values for the projections. For validation, the results were cross-checked with the Woods & Poole 2021 Forecasts for the year 2050, though the OPB data were prioritized as the primary source.

**Table 8-6** provides a comparative overview of the control totals for population, households, and employment between the base year (2020) and projected year (2050) across all counties within the VLMPO region.

Table 8-6: Comparison of 2020 and 2050 Control Total Estimates

	Berrien	Brooks	Lanier	Lowndes
<b>Base Year - 2020</b>				
<i>Population</i>	18,160	16,301	9,877	118,251
<i>Households</i>	7,118	6,359	3,570	44,207
<i>Employment</i>	3,806	2,764	1,244	48,096
<i>Employment per Population</i>	0.21	0.17	0.13	0.41
<i>Population per Household</i>	2.55	2.56	2.77	2.67
<b>Georgia Governor's Office of Planning and Budget Population Forecasts (OPB) - 2050</b>				
<i>Population</i>	18,634	15,305	10,741	144,657
<b>Wood &amp; Poole Forecasts 2021 Forecasts - 2050</b>				
<i>Population</i>	22,233	14,852	14,510	145,587
<i>Households</i>	6,541	7,816	4,093	87,114
<i>Employment</i>	9,249	6,380	5,892	56,051
<i>Employment per Population</i>	0.42	0.43	0.41	0.39
<i>Population per Household</i>	3.40	1.90	3.55	1.67



Employment proportions across categories were assumed to remain stable throughout the projection period. School enrollment growth was projected to match population growth rates, with adjustments made for Moody Air Force Base based on recent plans to accommodate additional soldiers. Enrollment at Valdosta State University was assumed to remain constant based on information from university officials. The preliminary projection results were aligned with GDOT standards on persons per household and employment per student enrollment at each school site.

## 8.2.1 Year 2050 Population and Households

The majority of population growth within the VLMPO region is anticipated in areas identified for future development by VLMPO staff, particularly in the “Val Del” area north of Valdosta and Remerton, around Bethany Road between Old US 41N and GA-125. Additionally, significant population increases are expected west of I-75, around US-84 and GA-133.

**Table 8-7** presents the projected totals for population and households by county for the year 2050 within the MPO study area, while **Figure 8-5** and **Figure 8-6** illustrate the spatial distribution of population and households by TAZ.

Table 8-7: Future Year 2050 Population and Household Totals

County	Population	Group Quarter Population	Households	Median Income
Berrien	44	0	13	\$42,893
Brooks	2,403	0	973	\$44,873
Lanier	1,827	0	613	\$43,839
Lowndes	144,300	6,284	53,833	\$42,328
<b>VLMPO Area</b>	<b>148,574</b>	<b>6,284</b>	<b>55,432</b>	

**Table 8-8** highlights the changes in population and household totals from the base year 2020 to 2050, along with the corresponding percent change and Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR). **Figure 8-7** and **Figure 8-8** provide visual representations of these changes by TAZ, indicating areas with the most significant growth in the darkest hues. Residential growth is anticipated to be greatest in outlying suburban communities presently experiencing significant housing construction and increasing congestion.

Table 8-8: Change in Population and Household 2020 - 2050

	Population				Households			
	Base (2020)	Future (2050)	Percent Change	CAGR*	Base (2020)	Future (2050)	Percent Change	CAGR*
Berrien	44	44	0.0%	0.0%	9	13	44.4%	1.2%
Brooks	2,188	2,403	9.8%	0.3%	889	973	9.4%	0.3%
Lanier	1,783	1,827	2.5%	0.1%	597	613	2.7%	0.1%
Lowndes	118,262	144,300	22.0%	0.7%	44,210	53,833	21.8%	0.7%
<b>VLMPO</b>	<b>122,277</b>	<b>148,574</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>45,705</b>	<b>55,432</b>	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>

\*CAGR = Compound Annual Growth Rate



## 8.2.2 Employment

Employment in the VLMPO region is projected to grow across all sectors, with notable concentrations around Valdosta, Hahira, Moody AFB, and Valdosta Regional Airport. The employment projections by type for 2050, broken down by county, are detailed in **Table 8-9**, while **Figure 8-9** depicts the distribution of employment by TAZ.

Figure 8-5: Future Year 2050 Population Distribution by TAZ






Figure 8-6: Future Year 2050 Households by TAZ






Figure 8-7: Change in Population (2020 – 2050) by TAZ






Figure 8-8: Change in Households (2020 – 2050) by TAZ






Table 8-9: Future Year 2050 Employment by Type

County	AMC Employment	MTCUW Employment	RET Employment	SERV Employment	TOTAL Employment
Berrien	2	0	0	1	3
Brooks	28	4	35	14	81
Lanier	0	0	1	8	9
Lowndes	4,616	9,795	12,283	36,051	62,745
<b>VLMPO Area</b>	<b>4,646</b>	<b>9,799</b>	<b>12,319</b>	<b>36,074</b>	<b>62,838</b>

**Table 8-10** compares the base year (2020) employment with future projections (2050), showing the expected changes in employment by county, along with the percent change and CAGR, within the MPO study area. **Figure 8-10** provides a visual representation of these employment changes by TAZ, highlighting areas of significant employment growth within the region. The most significant changes in employment are anticipated along major highway corridors and areas where significant employment already exists.

Table 8-10: Change in Employment 2020 - 2050

County	Base Year 2020 Employment	Future Year 2050 Employment	Difference (2020-2050)	Percent Change	CAGR*
Berrien	0	3	3	-	-
Brooks	68	81	13	19.1%	0.58%
Lanier	5	9	4	80.0%	1.98%
Lowndes	50,534	62,745	12,211	24.2%	0.72%
<b>VLMPO Area</b>	<b>50,607</b>	<b>62,838</b>	<b>12,231</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>0.72%</b>

\*CAGR = Compound Annual Growth Rate

## 8.2.3 K-12 and University Enrollment

The projected growth in K-12 school enrollment is expected to align with the expected population growth rates across the region. Barring any more detailed information, student enrollment at all public schools was increased using the same growth rate as the study area population. Officials contacted at Valdosta State University indicated that enrollment was expected to remain constant. Enrollment was also assumed to remain unchanged over the planning period at Wiregrass Georgia College. Recent announcements at Moody AFB formed the basis of employment growth assumptions at this military facility.



Figure 8-9: Future Year 2020 Employment by TAZ







Figure 8-10: Change in Employment (2020 – 2050) by TAZ





## 9 NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This section of the report describes recommended 2050 projects for all modes of transportation. These projects were identified through a review of projects recommended in the previous 2045 MTP along with partially funded commitments in the TIP and TIA, 2050 travel demand forecasts and level-of-service (LOS) deficiencies, stakeholder meetings, public workshops, and special outreach to underserved communities through the HEAL framework, described earlier in this report.

### 9.1 Future Year 2050 Travel Demand Forecasts

GDOT has taken the lead in the development, validation, and calibration of travel demand forecasting models for most MPOs in the state. GDOT and its consulting team used the base year 2020 socioeconomic estimates presented in the MTP Existing Conditions Report as input to their model development process. Once this base year model was developed, GDOT looked to VLMPO staff and the 2050 MTP study team to identify transportation projects completed since the 2020 base year and funded in the MPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Statewide TIP (STIP), along with local funding sources such as the Southern Georgia Transportation Investment Act (TIA). Using this information in combination with the 2050 socioeconomic forecasts, the GDOT team prepared 2050 travel demand forecasts for three network scenarios:

- 2050 Do Nothing – 2020 Base year plus any projects that either opened to traffic since the base year or are currently under construction
- 2050 Existing-plus-Committed (E+C) – Do-Nothing plus projects with construction (CST) funding in the STIP years 2024-2027 plus local projects with CST funded in the MPO's current TIP
- 2050 TIP/STIP – E+C plus projects with preliminary engineering (PE) and/or right of way (ROW) funded in the STIP years 2024-2027 plus local projects with PE and/or ROW funding in the MPO's current TIP

**Figure 9-1** through **Figure 9-3**, prepared by the GDOT consulting team, depict 2050 LOS for each of the above scenarios, respectively. As noted, even with the inclusion of committed roadway projects, there will likely be a significant number of roadway segments experiencing congestion (LOS E or F).

**Figure 9-4** and **Figure 9-5** provide composite overlays of household and employment growth, respectively, along with 2050 E+C level-of-service (LOS) and committed roadway projects. These composite maps show (1) where 2050 LOS is expected to be problematic; (2) where committed transportation investments are in relation to poor LOS; and (3) a background layer showing where these things occur in relation to population and employment growth. As noted, even with the inclusion of committed roadway projects, there will likely be a significant number of roadway segments experiencing congestion (LOS E or F) in the year 2050, including the following corridors:

- SR 7/Valdosta Road
- I-75 interchange ramps at US 84, SR 133, and SR 7
- US 84/Hill and Central Avenues
- Alden Avenue (*continued on page 114*)



Figure 9-1: 2050 LOS with Do Nothing Network






Figure 9-2: 2050 LOS with E+C Network






Figure 9-3: 2050 LOS with TIP/STIP Network







Figure 9-4: 2050 E+C Projects and LOS with Anticipated Household Growth



## Mobility Needs and Committed Improvements

Data Sources:  
VLMPO Travel Demand Model

VLMPO Extents

Household Change (2020-50)

No Change  
 1 - 50  
 51 - 100  
 101 - 500  
 More than 500

County Boundaries

E+C VC Ratio


A/B  
 C  
 D  
 E  
 F

E+C Project Category

Freight Facilities  
 Intersection & Interchange Improvements  
 Operation & Safety Improvements  
 Roadway Capacity and Widening  
 Roadway and Bridge Maintenance



Figure 9-5: 2050 E+C Projects and LOS with Anticipated Employment Growth



## Mobility Needs and Committed Improvements

Data Sources:  
VLMPO Travel Demand Model

VLMPO Extents

County Boundaries

Employment Change (2020-50)

E+C VC Ratio

- No Change
- 1 - 50
- 51 - 100
- 101 - 250
- More than 250

- A/B
- C
- D
- E
- F

E+C Project Category

- Freight Facilities
- Intersection & Interchange Improvements
- Operation & Safety Improvements
- Roadway Capacity and Widening
- Roadway and Bridge Maintenance



- North Ashley Street
- North Oak Street
- Clyattville Road
- Old Clyattville Road
- Forrest Street Extension
- Studstill Road
- North St. Augustine Road
- SR 125/Bemiss Road
- Cherry Creek Road
- McMillan Road
- Bemiss Knights Academy Road
- Cat Creek Road
- Mulligan Road
- Madison Highway
- Ulmer Avenue
- Brookwood Drive

As indicated by these maps, future congestion will likely be at its worst in growing residential and commercial areas, particularly on the north side of Valdosta. These maps visualize the connection between transportation and land use growth and also point to the need for additional investments in transportation facilities to address increasing congestion.

Future transportation needs go beyond attempts to solve roadway congestion. For starters, not every LOS deficiency can be solved with additional through lanes, as some of these corridors have significant development and/or environmental constraints. Furthermore, not all citizens have access to personal vehicles for routine trip making. Some 2050 project needs are aimed at other issues such as safety, freight, resiliency, and environmental justice.

Ongoing travel behavior trends to consider in identifying future transportation needs include the preponderance of working from home (WFH), e-commerce, and the use of micro-mobility devices (e.g., scooters) for short trips. Input from underserved communities in Valdosta have highlighted the need for additional sidewalks and fixed route transit services. Rail crossing delays cannot be simulated in a daily travel demand model, but this issue is one of the most pressing transportation problems in Valdosta, based on feedback from stakeholders and the general public. These modal trends are addressed with a series of transportation projects proposed in subsequent sections of this report.

## 9.2 Future Roadway Needs

Most roadway projects in the 2045 MTP “illustrative list” are also included in the 2050 MTP roadway needs package. Each 2045 project was reviewed with respect to 2050 LOS deficiencies and consistency with the latest commitments in the TIP, STIP, and TIA. A few 2045 illustrative projects were found to be duplicative with projects on parallel corridors that are forecasted for a worse 2050 LOS. Some of the 2045 projects were recommended for different termini based on forecasted 2050 LOS. After conducting an exhaustive review of the 2045 illustrative list, the team focused on reviewing notes from the



stakeholder and public workshops to identify any potential roadway needs not previously identified in the 2045 MTP.

Finally, a review of the remaining 2050 LOS deficiencies was conducted that resulted in 20 new roadway projects not found in the 2045 MTP listings. New roadway projects range from intersection improvements to roadway extensions, realignments, center turn lanes, and additional through-lane capacity. **Table 9-1** is a listing of all 65 roadway projects. The source of each project is included, along with the type of improvement, project termini, and number of lanes. **Figure 9-6** and **Figure 9-7** depict these same projects for the entire VLMPO study area and the urban core of Valdosta, respectively. It should be noted that there are a few projects on this listing and associated maps that were presented earlier on either the E+C or TIA listings but were only partially funded. Thus, these projects are again presented here as additional funding considerations are needed in order to complete these projects.



Table 9-1: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects

MTP ID	Project	From	To	Improvement	Project Category	Existing Lanes	Future Lanes	Source List
R-1	Alden Avenue	N Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	3	Illustrative List
R-2	Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Center Turn Lane	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	3	New Road Projects
R-3	Baytree Road	Norman Dr	N Oak St	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	Illustrative List
R-4	Baytree Road / Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Norman Drive	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-5	BAYTREE ROAD GRADE SEPARATION	NS Railroad	NS Railroad	Grade Separation	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-6	Baytree Road North Extension	Baytree Road	Coleman Road	Extend existing roadway	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	New Road Projects
R-7	Baytree Road/ Sherwood Drive	Baytree Road	Sherwood Drive	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-8	Bemiss Knights Academy Road	Studstill Road	Old Bemiss Road	Turn lanes at terminus points	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-9	Bemiss Knights Academy/Old Pine Roads Intersection	Old Bemiss Road	Bemiss Road/ Old Pine Rd Ext	Intersection Realignment	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	New Road Projects
R-10	Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Moody AFB	Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	New Road Projects
R-11	Bemiss Road / Connell Road	Bemiss Road	Connell Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-12	Bemiss Road / Davidson Road	Bemiss Road	Davidson Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-13	Bemiss Road / Skipper Bridge Rd	Bemiss Road	Skipper Bridge Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-14	Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter	Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-15	Boone (Dairy) Road CSX Crossing			Potential safety improvements	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-16	Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-17	Cat Creek Road / Pine Grove Road	Cat Creek Road	Pine Grove Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-18	Cat Creek Road /State Route 122	Cat Creek Road	SR 122	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-19	Cat Creek Road/ Radar Site Road	Cat Creek Road	Radar Site Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-20	Cherry Creek Road	Oak Street Ext.	Orr Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	4	Fed-State Draft Const List
R-21	Dasher Grove Road Extension	Dasher Grove Road	Val Del Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	Developer Funded
R-22	Five Points Roundabout	Northside Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	New roadway reconfigurations	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-23	Gornto Road	N/S Railroad	N/S Railroad	Grade Separation	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-24	Hagan Bridge Road	E Coleman Dr	SR 122	Intersection Improvements	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-25	I-75 @ CR 783/LOCH LAUREL ROAD - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

MTP ID	Project	From	To	Improvement	Project Category	Existing Lanes	Future Lanes	Source List
R-26	I-75 @ SR 376 - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance
R-27	I-75 @ US 84	Exit 16	Exit 16	Interchange Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	1	2	Illustrative List
R-28	I-75 @ New Interchange	Between SR 133	and SR 7 interchanges	New Interchange	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	0	New Road Projects
R-29	I-75/SR 7 Connector	New I-75 Interchange	SR 7 near Country Club Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	New Road Projects
R-30	Inner Perimeter Rd./ Brookfield Rd./Lake Laurie Dr.			Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-31	Inner Perimeter Road/S. Patterson Street	Inner Perimeter	South Patterson	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-32	James Beck Overpass	S. Ashley St/E. Savannah Ave. intersection		Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-33	James Road Extension/ Western Perimeter N	James Road	Indian Ford Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-34	Jumping Gulley Road at Bevel Creek			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance
R-35	Knight Academy Road/Studstill Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-36	Lamar Street at Sugar Creek in Valdosta			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance
R-37	Loch Laurel Road / Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bridge Replacement	Roadway and Bridge Maintenance	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-38	Loch Laurel Road / Corinth Church Road	Loch Laurel Road	Corinth Church Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-39	McMillan Road/Staten Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-40	N. Ashley Street / Northside Drive	North Ashley Street	Northside Drive	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-41	N. Oak Street Ext. / Bemiss Road	N. Oak Street Ext.	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-42	N. Valdosta Road / Inner Perimeter Road	N. Valdosta Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-43	North Ashley Street	Vallotton Drive	Bemiss Road	Additional SB Lane	Roadway Capacity and Widening	3	4	New Road Projects
R-44	North Lee Street	Vallotton Drive	East Park Avenue	Center Turn Lane	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	3	New Road Projects
R-45	North Oak Street	Baytree Road	W. Moore Street	One-way to Two-way	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	2	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-46	North Oak Street	W. Alden Avenue	Canna Drive	Center Turn Lane	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	3	New Road Projects
R-47	North Oak Street Extension	Five Points Roundabout	Cherry Creek Road	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	4	New Road Projects
R-48	North Valdosta Road	US 41/Five Points	I-75	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-49	Park Avenue	Ashley Street	N. Patterson Street	Center Turn Lane	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	3	Illustrative List
R-50	Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road	Prewitte Street	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-51	South Valdosta Truck Bypass	St. Augustine Road	US 84/Clay Road	New Construction	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	4	Fed-State Draft Const List




MTP ID	Project	From	To	Improvement	Project Category	Existing Lanes	Future Lanes	Source List
R-52	SR 122	I-75	Union Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	3, 4	4	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-53	SR 122	I-75	Morven Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	3, 4	4	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-54	SR 122/Skipper Bridge Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-55	SR 122/Val Del Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-56	St. Augustine Rd./Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	St. Augustine Road	Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-57	US 84/Hill Avenue at Fry Street	US 84/Hill Avenue	Fry Street	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-58	Val Del Road / McMillan Road / Bethany Road	Val Del Road	McMillan Road/ Bethany Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-59	Val Del Road / North Valdosta Road	Val Del Road	North Valdosta Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-60	Webb Road Realignment	SR 122	Webb Road	Realignment, Roundabout	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-61	Weigh Station at I-75 NB in Lowndes County			Truck parking				Funding Continuance
R-62	Weigh Station at I-75 SB in Lowndes County			Truck parking				Funding Continuance
R-63	West Gordon Street	N. Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Center Turn Lane	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	3	Illustrative List
R-64	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	New Road Projects
R-65	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Norman Drive		Intersection Improvement	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-66	West Magnolia Street	Orange Street	Lamar Street	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	Illustrative List
R-67	West Marion Avenue (SR 7)/ Lakes Blvd.	West Marion Avenue	Lake Blvd.	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements		N/A	Illustrative List
R-68	West Marion Avenue / N. Gordon Street	West Marion Avenue	N. Gordon Street	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements		N/A	Illustrative List
R-69	Western Perimeter S	SR 31/Madison Hwy.	Old Clyattville Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening		2	Illustrative List



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 9-6: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects



## VLMPO 2050 MTP Roadway Projects [DRAFT]

- VLMPO Extents
- County Boundaries
- City Boundaries
- Lakes and Ponds
- Rivers and Streams
- Railroads

### Project Category


- Intersection & Interchange Improvements
- Operation & Safety Improvements
- Roadway Capacity and Widening
- Roadway and Bridge Maintenance
- Freight Facilities

Data Sources:  
Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 MTP Update



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 9-7: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects in Urban Core



## Valdosta 2050 MTP Roadway Projects [DRAFT]

- VLMPO Extents
- County Boundaries
- City Boundaries
- Lakes and Ponds
- Rivers and Streams
- Railroads

### Project Category

- Intersection & Interchange Improvements
- Operation & Safety Improvements
- Roadway Capacity and Widening
- Roadway and Bridge Maintenance
- Freight Facilities

**Data Sources:**  
Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 MTP Update



## 9.3 Future Active Transportation Needs

In the 2050 VLMPO MTP, all bicycle and pedestrian projects are grouped under the umbrella of “active transportation modes.” The rationale for this grouping is that several recommendations include improvements for both bicycle and pedestrian modes. Thus, separating these projects into two separate listings would result in some duplication.

**Table 9-2**, on the next page, is a singular listing of all recommended 2050 active transportation projects, including sidewalk construction and connectivity, bicycle lane networks, pedestrian and bicycle safety enhancements, intersection improvements, multi-use paths, recreational trails, and a cyclist education program. Conversely, it was determined that when mapping active transportation project locations, separate maps by mode were needed for readability. The following text describes active transportation projects further by mode, along with maps for each.

### 9.3.1 Pedestrian Focused Projects

Recommended improvements to sidewalk infrastructure aim to increase connectivity and fill gaps in the existing network. Emphasis is given to roads that provide connections from residential areas to locations such as schools, commercial centers, and public services. Specific locations are described in **Figure 9-8**.

### 9.3.2 Bicycle Focused Projects

A network of bicycle facilities is recommended, primarily in the urban core of Valdosta, to improve safety and access for cyclists. The development of this network should provide connections to major destinations in Valdosta, as well as neighborhood connections to schools and parks. Areas that have high accident rates or lack infrastructure are prioritized for improvements, such as principal and minor arterial roads. Recommendations on these larger roads generally include separation from vehicle traffic to ensure the safety of cyclists while providing major connections. Bicycle facility recommendations on smaller and less trafficked roads include less separation, highlighting opportunities for conventional bike lanes on local roads. Recommended locations are detailed in **Figure 9-9**.

### 9.3.3 Pedestrian Intersection Safety Projects

Intersection improvements are recommended to aid in crossing movements for pedestrians and cyclists. Many of these improvements are recommended in conjunction with sidewalk or bike facility improvements to ensure safe crossings at busy intersections and near key destinations. While specific recommendations vary based on the context at each location, these recommendations work to improve safety and visibility of pedestrians and cyclists navigating roadways shared with vehicle traffic. Specific locations for intersection improvements are shown in **Figure 9-10**.

### 9.3.4 Multi-Use Paths and Recreational Trails

Multi-use paths are recommended to provide designated facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists. Recommendations for this facility type are located along major roadways that experience high volumes of traffic traveling at high speeds, such as Bemiss Road. These recommendations ensure that both pedestrians and cyclists are adequately separated from vehicle traffic while also providing connections from residential areas to key destinations. Multi-use paths are also recommended in natural areas away



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

from roadways, such as along the Withlacoochee River, creating opportunities for recreational connections across the region. Multi-use path locations of these facilities are shown in **Figure 9-11**.

Table 9-2: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Active Transportation Projects

VLMP O ID	Project Name	From	To	Improvement
A-1	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Eastern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Valdosta High School	Multi-Use Path
A-2	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Northern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Freedom Park	Multi-Use Path
A-3	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Southern Extension	Sustella Trail	John W. Saunders Memorial Park	Multi-Use Path
A-4	Azalea City Trail/Sustella Trail - Western Extension	Wainwright Drive	Valdosta Mall	Multi-Use Path
A-5	Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Infill sidewalks, bike lanes
A-6	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Knight Academy Road	Fill sidewalk gaps and consider bike lanes north of Inner Perimeter Road
A-7	Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements
A-8	Berkley Drive	Gornto Road	Eager Rd	Install 5-foot-wide sidewalks, benches, and rest areas
A-9	Country Club Drive	Highway 7/US 41	Jerry Jones Drive	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings
A-10	Cyclist Education Program			Public Outreach / Education
A-11	E Park Avenue	N Ashley Street	Inner Perimeter Road	Install bike lanes, construct sidewalks where gaps exist
A-12	Eager/Jerry Jones Drive	Oak Street	Baytree Drive	Construct sidewalks for pedestrian safety, Install protected bike lanes
A-13	Gornto Road	North Oak Street	Jerry Jones Drive	Construct sidewalks on both sides
A-14	Implement Complete Streets			Improve Connectivity and Sidewalk Infrastructure
A-15	Inner Perimeter Road	Valdosta Road	Forrest Street Extension	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings
A-16	Lake Park Road	Holiday Street	South Street	Fill sidewalk system gap
A-17	Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Hill Avenue	Fill sidewalk gaps, install protected bike lanes
A-18	Norman Drive at Baytree Road			Intersection Improvements
A-19	Norman Drive at St. Augustine Road			Intersection Improvements
A-20	North Oak Street	Gornto Road	Valdosta Middle School	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides
A-21	North Oak Street Extension at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements
A-22	North Valdosta Road	Country Club Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	Improve pedestrian sidewalk connectivity
A-23	Northside Drive	North Oak Street	Bemiss Road	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure
A-24	Old Hudson Street and/or McDougal Street	Lake Park	Fry Street	Construct sidewalks
A-25	Park Avenue	N Patterson Street	N Ashley Street	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes on both sides, install 2-3 foot green buffers, and protected or buffered bike lanes
A-26	Pineview Drive	Bemiss Road	E Park Avenue	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure
A-27	South Oak Street	W Central Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Add clearly marked bicycle lanes, signage, and road markings indicating priority for cyclists
A-28	St. Augustine Road	Harmon Drive	Twin Street	Fill sidewalk system gap
A-29	Toombs Street	W Crane Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Install sidewalks
A-30	U.S. Highway 84	RR Xing	Blanchard St.	Install sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, buffers, benches, and bike-friendly intersections
A-31	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Consider adding sidewalks and bike lanes
A-32	Withlacoochee River Trail - north and south of Langdale Park	Cherry Lake	Sugar Creek Landing	Multi-Use Path
A-33	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Moody Air Force Base	Install protected bike lanes
A-34	E Park Avenue	Pineview Dr	Inner Perimeter Road	Install new sidewalk and fill gaps in existing sidewalks
A-35	N St Augustine Rd	Twin St	River St	Multi-Use Path
A-36	N Oak Street	Northside Dr	Baytree Drive	Install bike facility



Figure 9-8: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Focused Projects







Figure 9-9: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Bicycle Focused Projects





# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 9-10: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Intersection Safety Project Locations







Figure 9-11: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Multi-Use Paths and Recreational Trails





## 9.4 Future Transit Needs

In response to numerous comments from our public workshops and HEAL meetings, the 2050 VLMPO team has recommended a small fixed-route bus system consisting of three routes, coupled with expansion of existing on-demand transit services, and the addition of mobility hubs, bus super stops, connected bus stops, upgraded bus amenities, transit app upgrades, additional upgrades to pedestrian and transit infrastructure, and bicycle infrastructure upgrades. These bicycle and pedestrian projects are included under the list of transit improvements as these would be implemented in conjunction with the proposed fixed route transit system. **Table 9-3** provides a complete listing of 2050 VLMPO MTP transit projects.

Table 9-3: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Transit Projects

VLMPO ID	Project Name	Improvement
T-1	Route 1: North-South Loop	Fixed-Route Bus Route
T-2	Route 2: East-West Connection	Fixed-Route Bus Route
T-3	Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base	Fixed-Route Bus Route
T-4	Expand Valdosta On-Demand Services	Reliability Improvements
T-5	Mobility Hubs	Develop Transit Hubs and Mobility Hubs
T-6	Bus Super Stops	Provide Transit Connectivity, Reliability and Amenities
T-7	Connected Bus Stops	Improve Sidewalk Infrastructure and Connectivity to Proposed Transit Services
T-8	Upgraded Bus Amenities	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure
T-9	Transit App Upgrades	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure

### 9.4.1 Fixed Route Transit Service

The fixed route transit system is proposed as follows:

- **Route 1: North-South Loop** – This route connects North Valdosta, Freedom Park, Downtown Valdosta, and the Southside community, utilizing Ashley Street for northbound travel and Patterson Street for southbound travel. It passes through key intersections like Bemiss Road and Baytree Road. Stops are recommended at major destinations including Valdosta State University and South Georgia Medical Center.
- **Route 2: East-West Connection** – This route connects residential areas in the East (Inner Perimeter Road) to West Valdosta, following key corridors like Baytree Road, Oak Street, and Park Avenue, providing a direct connection between the eastern and western parts of the city. Stops are recommended at Valdosta High School, nearby industrial parks, Valdosta Mall, Lowndes High School, and Valdosta State University, offering convenient access for students, workers, and residents along this corridor.
- **Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base** – This route serves Moody Air Force Base and surrounding neighborhoods, providing service for military personnel and civilians commuting to the base. It connects the base with residential areas and commercial centers in Valdosta. A southern terminus with a park-and-ride lot at Perimeter Road or Ashley Street could allow transfers to Route 1



(North - South Loop), enhancing connectivity for those traveling between the base and other parts of Valdosta.


**Figure 9-12**, on the next page, depicts the proposed fixed route bus system. Many of the proposed transit related amenities previously described in **Table 9-3** are either not geographically specific or would require additional study to determine optimum locations and thus are not depicted in mapped form.

To encourage ridership on the fixed route system, frequent service should be provided during peak commuting hours (e.g., early mornings and late afternoons), with buses ideally running every 20-30 minutes during these times. Peak Hours (6:00 AM - 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM - 7:00 PM): Higher frequency along major routes, particularly those serving commuters to downtown, industrial parks, and educational institutions. Off-Peak Service (Midday): Buses preferably every 40-60 minutes during non-peak hours to ensure coverage, but at a reduced frequency. Evening and Weekend Service: Extend service until 11:00 PM to accommodate students, workers with late shifts, and recreational users. Weekend services should ideally ensure at least 60-90 minute headways, focusing on key routes like downtown Valdosta, Valdosta Mall, and major residential areas.



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 9-12: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Fixed Route Bus Routes



## Fixed Route Transit Recommendations

- Route 1: North-South Loop
- Route 2: East-West Connection
- Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base
- VLMPO Extents
- County Boundaries
- City Boundaries
- Park
- School
- Interstate
- Principal Arterial
- Minor Arterial
- Major Collector
- Lakes and Ponds
- Railroads
- Aviation Facilities

Data Sources:  
GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMPO & City of Valdosta



## 9.4.2 On-Demand Transit Services

The 2050 VLMPO MTP also includes recommended improvements to on-demand transit services that address reliability concerns by adding more vehicles and improving pickup location convenience. The current fleet should be expanded by at least 6 more vehicles, including standard and wheelchair-accessible vehicles. In order to align existing systems with regional and national environmental goals, the addition of electric vehicles should be considered for a more sustainable and cost-effective operation. These additional vehicles should be allocated to areas with higher demand, such as around Valdosta State University, downtown Valdosta, Valdosta Mall, and South Georgia Medical Center. These areas experience peak usage during specific hours; increasing the fleet size could reduce wait times for riders.

In addition, in the absence of recommended fixed-route bus routes, on-demand services should expand and optimize the number of virtual bus stops to improve the convenience of pickup locations, especially in underserved communities. Service should ensure virtual stops are strategically placed to minimize walking distances for riders, particularly the elderly and people with disabilities. Consideration should be given to locate stops closer to major building entrances in shopping malls, healthcare facilities, and universities. Where possible, shelters or designated waiting areas should be installed at frequently used pickup locations to improve rider comfort while waiting.

Without planned fixed-route bus services, on-demand service hours should be extended to include evenings and weekends, which are currently underserved. A late-night service (e.g., until 11:00 PM or midnight) should be added to accommodate riders who work late shifts, such as healthcare and retail workers, or students traveling between Valdosta State University and prime employment locations. Service hours should be extended on Saturdays and Sundays, especially near retail centers like Valdosta Mall and recreation areas like Freedom and Langdale Parks, which attract more riders on weekends.

In the absence of recommended fixed-route bus routes, the geographical coverage of on-demand services should be increased to include Moody Air Force Base, nearby suburban areas, and growing residential communities that are currently underserved. Target areas include those like Val Del Road that are seeing growth in residential development but currently lack reliable transit options. This will help connect suburban residents with urban amenities like Valdosta Mall and downtown Valdosta.

Improvements to the Valdosta On-Demand app are also recommended. Upgrades should be made to provide better track vehicle locations and provide clearer notifications, so riders are more informed about the status of their ride.

## 9.4.3 Transit Hubs and Mobility Hubs

Strategically placed mobility hubs can be implemented in conjunction with fixed route and on-demand services to create areas that integrate multiple modes of transportation, such as bike share programs, scooter stations, electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, and bus stops. These hubs should be placed in areas of high activity such as downtown Valdosta, Valdosta Mall, and North Valdosta. Bus “super stops” can be designed and located at major destinations and intersections along fixed transit routes to provide enhanced amenities like shelters, benches, and wayfinding signage.



## 9.4.4 Connectivity and Sidewalk Infrastructure

Complementary to transit services, area transit providers should ensure that all bus stops are connected to well-maintained sidewalks and have crosswalks for safe pedestrian access. Walkability in these areas should be improved by filling gaps in the sidewalk network, especially near potential transit stops. Complete Streets principles should be implemented in transit-oriented development (TOD) areas, ensuring that roadways accommodate all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders. Street design in TOD areas should include bike lanes, wide sidewalks, and traffic calming measures, where applicable, to enhance safety and comfort.

## 9.4.5 Mixed-Use Development

Local planning agencies should ensure that zoning codes promote mixed-use development in TOD areas, allowing for a blend of residential, commercial, and office spaces within a walkable distance to transit stops. Key areas include Valdosta Mall, downtown Valdosta, and Remerton. Higher-density residential developments (e.g., apartments, townhomes) should be encouraged near potential transit corridors, aiming for densities that support transit ridership (e.g., 22 dwelling units per acre). The VLMPO recently published a report entitled *Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines* that provides additional guidance on implementing TOD in the region. This report can be downloaded or viewed here:

<https://www.sgrc.us/documents/transportation/FY24%20Transit-Oriented%20Development%20Guidebook%20for%20Rural%20and%20Urban%20Areas.pdf>

## 9.4.6 Public Transit Infrastructure

In order to provide quality services, improvements to transit infrastructure are recommended. The MPO should ensure that all proposed bus stops along key routes have shelters with seating, lighting, and trash bins. Real-time bus tracking should be provided through apps and at major stops using digital signage. This will make public transit more reliable and reduce uncertainty for riders. Bus bulbs should be installed near Valdosta Mall, downtown Valdosta, and other high-demand areas. Bike racks or bike/scooter sharing stations could be placed near key transit hubs and major destinations like Valdosta State University, South Georgia Medical Center, and Valdosta Mall to encourage cycling as a last-mile solution.

## 9.5 Future Needs for Other Transportation Modes

This section covers anticipated needs of other transportation modes including Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology, planning for electric vehicles, rail, and aviation.

### 9.5.1 ITS and Signalization

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology is studied, engineered, and implemented in order to further improve and achieve a fully connected and info-rich transportation system. FHWA focuses ITS efforts predominately on three areas:

- Safety
- Efficiency
- Communications



## Safe Roads

In 2021 the City of Bellevue, WA, began applying traffic conflict analysis, that leverages cloud computing, artificial intelligence, and video analytics (which offers predictive insight into when, where, and why crashes are most likely to occur) to its high-injury network corridors, integrating conflict analytics into the road safety assessments (RSA) it conducts to identify and prioritize projects.

## Safe Vehicles

Many Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS) – pedestrian detection/avoidance, lane departure warning/correction, traffic sign recognition, automatic emergency braking, and blind spot detection – assist drivers daily with maneuvering, intersection movement, left turning and merging as well.

## Safe Road Users

In the City of Marysville, Ohio, part of the Smart Mobility Corridor, intelligent infrastructure has been enabled to improve safety for vulnerable road users in real time with GPS coordinates, utilizing thermal cameras to track pedestrians. ITS monitors and analyzes camera metadata and broadcasts personal safety messages (PSMs) to connected vehicles and generates Basic Safety Messages (BSMs) for non-connected vehicles that can be used on dynamic message signs.

## Safe Speeds

Many agencies already use Reduced Speed Zone, Work Zone Warning, Dynamic Speed Harmonization, and Curve Speed Warning Systems. Agencies can also make more use of speed safety cameras (SSCs) as an effective and reliable technology to supplement more traditional methods of enforcement, engineering measures, and education. SSCs use speed measurement devices to detect speeding and capture photographic or video evidence of vehicles that are violating a set speed threshold. SSCs can be deployed as: Fixed units—a single, stationary camera targeting one location, Point-to-Point (P2P) units—multiple cameras to capture average speed over a certain distance and Mobile units—a portable camera, generally in a vehicle or trailer.

## Post-Crash Care

The ability to clear incidents quickly while providing safety to on-scene responders and travelers is one measure of the success of a Traffic Incident Management (TIM) program. Successful on-scene activities are supported by integrated interagency communications and technology when adequate warning is provided to motorists approaching the incident queue. Positive traffic control is provided at all incident scenes on a 24-7 basis via Advanced Traffic Management Systems and Advanced Traveler Information Systems. These efforts could potentially include a “road ranger” service in the future.

The VLMPO study area ITS Future Needs Assessment recommendations are aimed at supporting FHWA focus areas and existing ITS infrastructure within the study area. Within the VLMPO Study area, the City of Valdosta has an ITS system capable of operating all signals from a single point. The signals are equipped with transponders that communicate with an app providing real time traffic and road conditions, including audio alerts that support hands-free driving. The signal system also communicates



with newly equipped transponders in emergency vehicles, giving preemptive green lights to first responders.

These ITS capabilities cover safety, efficiency, and communication. The primary recommendation from the ITS future needs assessment is to upgrade and update all signals within the study area to the standards and systems within the City of Valdosta. This would require a coordinated regional joint City-County- effort. Although independent systems are feasible and would be an improvement, communication and coordination efforts are curtailed without some means of integration.

Beyond the system-wide integration recommendation, safety and crash data along with traffic model projections for 2050 were reviewed both by volume and level of service in order to identify high-priority intersections and corridors for either new or improved ITS signalization. Three locations were identified for new signalization, and three for enhanced signalization. These were identified primarily based on volume projections to continue to support ease of access on and off of the interstate.

The new signal locations are all in support of I-75 traffic:

- I-75 at SR 122/US 41 (Hahira);
- I-75 at SR 7/US 41 (east side of I-75); and
- I-75 at Old Clyattville Rd.

The Enhanced Signalization locations are all identified signals where new timing, communication, or detection methods may be needed to improve traffic flow with increased volumes in order to maintain an ideal level of service. The enhancement locations are not specific intersections but rather corridors with projected high volumes. The locations identified that will see the heaviest volume in relation to existing infrastructure over the time horizon of this study are:

- Bemiss Rd. from US-41 to GA-122;
- US-41 from I-75 to Bemiss Rd; and
- I-75 interchange signals from SR7/US-41 to US-84/US-221.


**Table 9-4** presents a project listing of all recommended future ITS and signalization enhancements while **Figure 9-13** depicts the locations of these same projects.

Table 9-4: Future ITS/Signalization Needs

VLMO ID	Project Name	From	To	Improvement
I-01	I-75 Exit at Old Clyattville Rd New Signal			Deploy interchange signalization to support future traffic volumes
I-02	I-75 at Madison Hwy New Signal			Deploy interchange signalization to support future traffic volumes
I-03	I-75 at Bellville Rd New Signal			Deploy interchange signalization to support future traffic volumes
I-04	Bemiss Road Signalization Enhancement	US-41	GA-122	Optimize signalization along route to support future volumes, level of service; ITS Priority Route
I-05	US-41 Signalization Enhancement	I-75	Bemiss Road	Optimize signalization along route to support future volumes, level of service; ITS Priority Route
I-06	I-75 Interchange Signalization Enhancement	US-41	US-84	Optimize signalization along route to support future volumes, level of service; ITS Priority Route
I-07	ITS System Enhancement			Integrate non-Valdosta traffic signals to City of Valdosta ITS Smart System, OR; create complementary integrated County operated ITS system



Figure 9-13: Future ITS/Signalization Needs





## 9.5.2 Electric Vehicles

Providing electric vehicle infrastructure that is fast, reliable, and readily accessible across the entire transportation network is perhaps the biggest hurdle to widespread EV adoption. The joint U.S. Departments of Energy and Transportation have created the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Program to address that issue along “alternative fuel corridors (AFCs),” or major U.S. routes where non-fossil fuel vehicles are most critically needed. These alternative fuel corridors have been divided into complete and pending based on the level of infrastructure supporting the particular corridor.

The Federal Highway Administration released guidance in February 2022 that required states to submit an EV Infrastructure Development Plan by August 2022. Georgia has submitted that plan and the Joint Office has approved Georgia’s plan. The Valdosta-Lowndes County MPO has one alternative fuel corridor, I-75, in its study area. The corridor is divided into both complete and pending segments. In order to be considered complete, certain criteria must be met.

The federal NEVI requirements, included in GDOT’s EV Infrastructure Development Plan, are that NEVI-funded EV charging stations must be:

- Open to the public or to authorized commercial vehicle operators from more than one company
- Located first on Georgia’s AFC network such that stations are installed
- No more than 50 miles apart
- Less than one mile from the AFC
- Direct Current (DC) Fast Chargers with at least four Combined Charging System (CCS) ports capable of delivering a minimum of 150 kilowatts (kW) of power per port simultaneously for a total of at least 600 kW per station
- Program must deliver 40% of the overall benefits to federally defined Disadvantaged Communities which includes rural and underserved populations
- Once the AFC network is built out to NEVI standards and certified by the Secretary of Transportation, Georgia DOT may use any remaining funds for EV charging infrastructure on any public road or publicly accessible location

This study has identified the EV charging infrastructure within pending corridor as a future need. In particular, charging stations that are NEVI-compliant and within a .5 mile radius of each exit along the pending corridor are recommended. These locations are I-75 at Old Claymore Rd., I-75 at Madison Hwy, I-75 at Lakes Blvd., and I-75 at Belleville Rd. In addition, two non-NEVI sites that support the transportation network and VLMPPO community have been identified. While not NEVI locations, this study recommends following NEVI standards for infrastructure installment at both the Valdosta Mall and the Valdosta Regional Airport.

**Table 9-5** presents a project listing of all recommended future EV enhancements while **Figure 9-14** depicts the locations of these same projects along with AFC one-mile. The green buffer is part of the AFC that meets federal and Georgia planning specifications and is considered “complete.” The yellow buffer highlights the “pending” AFC, which still lacks the infrastructure to be considered complete. In addition to the one-mile buffer along the AFC to be compliant with federal standards, the map shows a 1-mile




and half-mile buffer around I-75 exits, which are optimal locations for traveler convenience, though not federally mandated.

Table 9-5: Electric Vehicle Future Needs

VLMPD ID	Project Name	Improvement	Notes
E-01	I-75 at Old Clayville Rd NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-02	I-75 at Madison Hwy NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-03	I-75 at Lakes Blvd NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-04	I-75 Bellville NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-05	Airport EV Infrastructure Installment	Install charging infrastructure at the Valdosta Regional Airport	This project does not qualify for NEVI, but the project should recommend NEVI consistent infrastructure as a standard
E-06	Valdosta Mall EV Infrastructure Installment	Install charging infrastructure at the Valdosta Mall	This project does not qualify for NEVI, but the project should recommend NEVI consistent infrastructure as a standard



Figure 9-14: Electric Vehicle Existing Status and Future Needs





## 9.5.3 Rail Freight

As described in both the existing conditions report and the section of this report on roadway projects, Valdosta is bisected by four different rail lines, including numerous at-grade rail crossings. Rail crossing delays were among the most frequent complaints from attendees at stakeholder and public workshops. These periodic delays result from the locations of rail yards and rail lines in close proximity to major thoroughfares in the core of Valdosta. The 2050 MTP recognizes the need for four grade-separated rail crossings in the future, as follows:

- CS 1539/St. Augustine Road @ CSX Rail Line south of SR 38/US 84 – funds are secured for construction (included in existing-plus-committed network);
- South Valdosta Truck Bypass, from St. Augustine Road to US 84/Clay Road – this corridor is presently under study by GDOT and could potentially include a grade-separated crossing over both the CSX and Norfolk Southern rail lines;
- Baytree Road at Norfolk Southern rail line; and
- Gornto Road at Norfolk Southern rail line.

While the last three of the above projects will be evaluated against other 2050 MTP projects for prioritization and funding, these projects are very costly and will unlikely be fundable through conventional transportation revenues. Discussions should continue between local stakeholders and railroad representatives to seek creative ways to minimize ongoing delays at these and other locations.

There are presently no plans for instituting passenger rail along these lines, beyond the existing excursion service via CaterParrott Railnet connecting Valdosta north through Ray City, Nashville and Willacoochee using tracks owned by the Georgia DOT. Regular intercity passenger rail service would potentially exacerbate delays already being encountered at area rail crossings. The nearest potential for intercity passenger rail is the push for returning AMTRAK service to the Jacksonville-Tallahassee-Pensacola-Mobile-New Orleans corridor, which could include stations in Lake City and Madison, Florida.

## 9.5.4 Aviation Access

Current aviation facilities in the Valdosta region are described in the Existing Conditions report for the 2050 MTP. While construction continues on a new control tower for Valdosta Regional Airport, ground should break on a new general aviation terminal which right now is under the existing tower. Plans are also underway to reconfigure the private airport parking at the airport. Moody Air Force Base is slated to be home to the next active-duty F-35A Lightning II mission, which will require additional investments in the base and a significant influx of military personnel moving to Valdosta. There are a number of 2050 MTP roadway projects, described previously in **Table 9-1** and depicted in **Figure 9-6** and **Figure 9-7**, that will improve landside access and relieve future congestion along roadway corridors near Moody AFB and Valdosta Regional Airport, as well as the South Georgia Medical Center, home to a key heliport.



## 10 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS AND TESTING

This section of the report describes the anticipated impact of identified 2050 MTP needs projects in addressing study goals and objectives described earlier in this report and discussed in detail in the earlier Existing Conditions Report. The previously described travel demand model was updated to include proposed MTP roadway capacity projects, resulting in a comparative analysis of changing traffic conditions between the base year 2020, and all of the scenarios tested for the year 2050. In addition to quantitative analyses of model outputs, qualitative assessments are made regarding the impacts of other modes of transportation on future mobility conditions.

### 10.1 Safety and System Reliability

Earlier sections of this report describe GDOT statewide and VLMPO area safety performance-based assessment metrics. The recommended VLMPO 2050 MTP has a number of projects that could have a positive impact on previously identified accident locations. In particular, there are 4 MTP TIA projects and 7 MTP Roads projects classified as “Operation and Safety Improvements,” and 4 pedestrian safety enhancements in the Active Transportation project category. In addition, other projects can provide safety benefits while not being primarily classified as safety projects.

The majority of these safety-related projects are located in central Valdosta or just north of downtown. Compared against accident maps in the Existing Conditions Report, the improvements are located on or near the highest concentration of Killed and Serious Injury (KSI) incidents in the County (excluding I-75), which coincides with both population and trip density. Aligning the majority of safety projects with trip density creates a broader impact by affecting the largest amount of drivers possible with the fewest changes.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has published research addressing the impacts that safety improvements are expected to have. The FHWA reports that intersection turn lanes significantly impact the crash rate at given intersections. Exclusive turn lanes can reduce crashes by 18-77 percent, with a 50 percent reduction on average, and rear-end crashes are reduced by between 60-88 percent. Each intersection identified for improvement in the 2050 MTP will require subsequent design studies to determine the desired features to be included, with turn lanes a likely outcome.

Other safety projects become slightly more difficult to quantify, because of a number of variables. The VLMPO can expect similar results to any reconfigurations that include dedicated or left turn lanes. One-way to two-way conversions, such as those planned for a section of North Oak Street, have the potential to increase pedestrian accidents but generally, FHWA finds that two-way conversions reduce vehicle speeds and in-turn reduce both the number and severity of crashes.

Active transportation projects have similar safety impacts. The addition of bike and pedestrian capacity has a difficult-to-quantify effect of removing some vehicles from traffic through mode-switching. FHWA has quantified the impact of bike and pedestrian facilities on crash rates, more specifically bike lanes located on urban local roads, noting that the installation of said facilities can decrease crashes by as much as 49 percent. *The Journal of Accident Analysis and Prevention* found in a central Florida study that



the addition of sidewalk along a roadway can reduce the likelihood of a pedestrian crash per mile by three times. This would remain true for any capacity or new roadway project that includes added sidewalks.

ITS and Transit projects could also have positive impacts on safety figures within the VLMPO area. ITS can be deployed to increase emergency service response times, which could impact the severity level of a crash. By employing adaptive signal control and real time traffic updates, traffic lanes can be controlled and diverted, preventing congestion and the likelihood of secondary crashes. The U.S. Government Accountability Office found that ITS technology reduced crashes by 5 percent.

Transit usage is significantly safer than single occupant vehicle travel by both incident rate and crash severity. In Chatham County, GA it was found that crash risk was reduced by 90 percent for transit users as compared to personal vehicle drivers. The impact that transit projects within the 2050 MTP could have will vary depending on ridership numbers. If ridership grows relative to population, positive crash and safety benefits should be a result.

Conversely, some recommended projects within the 2050 MTP may have adverse effects on crash rate and severity throughout the region. These are primarily roadway capacity projects. The effect of capacity on crash rates can vary widely depending on the extent of the project. *The International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* studied the effects of congestion on crash rates and found that accident occurrence is a function of both the speed and total number of vehicles on a road. High congestion areas see a higher rate of crashes due to the total number of cars on the road, while low traffic volumes induce higher rates of speed, which, in turn, can induce accidents. Low traffic volume crashes tend to be more severe in nature, so efforts to positively impact the VLMPO's PM1 safety rates and KSI incidents should be focused on identifying excess roadway capacity and ensuring new capacity is not wider than necessary for future growth estimates.

## 10.2 Infrastructure Condition

Earlier sections of this report describes current bridge and pavement conditions on all Federal and State highways, plus all local streets within the city of Valdosta.

### 10.2.1 Anticipated Bridge Conditions

As noted in the Existing Conditions Report, only two bridges in the study area were rated in "poor" condition. Funds have been included in the current VLMPO TIP for both of these projects:

- 0015614 – CR 136/Old Quitman Road @ CSX #637487Y 6 Mi W of Valdosta (S of US 84/US 221)
- 0019937 – Jumping Gulley Road @ Bevel Creek 6 Mi SW of Lake Park

Construction funding is in place for project 0015614 along with the following projects:

- 0016272 – CR 775/Shiloh Road From CR 239/Snake Nation Road to I-75 (TIA funding)

Right-of-way funding is committed to the aforementioned project 0019937. Other bridge projects with ROW funding in the TIP include:



- 0010296 – I-75 @ CR 783/Loch Laurel Road - Phase II
- 0010295 – I-75 @ SR 376 - Phase II
- 0020144 – Lamar Street @ Sugar Creek in Valdosta

All four of these bridge projects with ROW funding have been included in the 2050 MTP for construction funding consideration. Additionally, TIA funds are anticipated for the Howell Road Bridge, presently noted to be in “fair” condition. The remaining 14 bridges currently in “fair” condition not listed above will require regular monitoring and preservation efforts to uphold their state of good repair through the year 2050, though it is uncertain how soon these additional bridges will need replacement.

### 10.2.2 Anticipated Pavement Conditions

As noted earlier, current data from GDOT indicates that all state roadways within Lowndes County are either in fair or good condition (i.e., no roadways are in poor condition). Obviously, all roadway capacity projects recommended in the 2050 MTP will include new pavement. Additionally, TIA funding for repaving is anticipated for the following roadways:

- Black Road, SR 38 (US 84) to Byrd Road
- Cat Creek, Bemiss Road to Berrien Co. Line
- Copeland Road, Madison Hwy to SR 31
- Hardee Road, Old Clyattville Road to Seckinger Road
- Melody Lane/Lankford Drive, St. Augustine Road to Baytree Road
- Register Road, Vienna Church Road to River Road
- Sermons Lane, Val Del Road to Dead End

Some of these projects include other features such as the widening of through lanes, shoulder widening, pedestrian enhancements, and drainage improvements. It is anticipated that all remaining roadways with fair pavement conditions are likely to need resurfacing between now and the year 2050. Much like bridges, it is difficult to predict how soon these roadways will need resurfacing, though GDOT roadways will continue to be maintained on a revolving schedule for repaving.

## 10.3 Congestion Reduction

As discussed earlier, GDOT and its consulting team were largely responsible for the year 2050 travel demand forecasts. In addition to the previously described model networks, GDOT was responsible for coding the draft 2050 unconstrained MTP into a 5th model network. As described in Appendix E, an alternative 2050 land use scenario was developed that incorporates higher densities and a better mix of land uses. This “15-Minute City” alternative scenario is more fully documented in a separate report deliverable, entitled Growth Scenario Analysis Technical Memorandum. Metro Analytics conducted a model run with the alternative 2050 land use scenario land use forecast and the previously described 4th (STIP/TIP) network. **Table 10-1** is a comparative summary of several congestion-related metrics across different land use and network scenarios.




Table 10-1: Emission and Fuel Consumption Rates for Passenger Cars

Metric	2020 Base	2050 Do- Nothing	2050 E+C Network	2050 STIP/TIP Original	2050 STIP/TIP Alt LU Scenario	2050 MTP Unconstrained
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	4,261,863	5,279,364	5,280,312	5,273,643	5,269,642	5,256,449
Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)	114,465	146,070	145,939	145,772	146,319	144,103
Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD)	4,086	5,033	4,997	4,985	5,202	4,736
Congested Travel Speed	27.04	25.25	25.33	25.40	25.29	26.02
Volume/Capacity (V/C) Ratio	0.37	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.41

As indicated, vehicle-miles traveled (VMT), vehicle-hours traveled (VHT), vehicle-hours of delay (VHD) and volume/capacity ratio all increase considerably for the 2050 scenarios, when compared against the base year 2020 scenario. Conversely, congested speed decreases in 2050 vs. 2020, due to anticipated increasing roadway congestion and traffic delay. As expected, the 2050 MTP alternative provides for reductions in VMT, VHT, VHD, and V/C while resulting in higher congested speeds, when compared to the other 2050 scenarios tested using the GDOT model. While the 2050 MTP is expected to reduce traffic congestion, the model indicates that there will likely still be more regional congestion in the year 2050 than in the base year of 2020.

**Figure 10-1** is a graph depicting the impact of changes to land use and highway network projects on regionally congested travel speed. When viewed in a graph, it is easy to visualize how the 2050 MTP scenario improves travel speeds. **Figure 10-2** is a map of anticipated 2050 LOS with the proposed MTP projects in place. One can understand how these projects, numbered on the map, perform with respect to LOS. **Figure 10-2** can be compared against similar maps found in earlier sections of the report to see how LOS improves.


Figure 10-1: Congested Travel Speed by Model Scenario





# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 10-2: 2050 LOS with MTP Network





## 10.4 Freight Movement and Economic Vitality

Freight movement and economic vitality have been key factors in the identification of roadway projects for the 2050 MTP. **Chapter 9** highlights projects aimed at rail crossing improvements that can reduce unpredictable delays encountered by truck flows, many of which have trip origins and destinations near rail lines crisscrossing Valdosta. GDOT has committed partial funding to add truck parking at the two existing truck weigh stations on I-75 in Lowndes County.

## 10.5 Environmental Sustainability and Equity

There are two primary categorical effects of transportation projects upon the environment: air quality and stormwater. These categories are the prime targets for mitigation from planned transportation projects in the VLMPO area. The Federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) program directly addresses air quality in non-attainment and maintenance areas, of which the VLMPO area is not. Culvert restoration addresses stormwater directly, while RAISE grants address “sustainability” and “cleaner infrastructure”, which apply to both categories. Safe Streets for All (SS4A) and Transportation Assistance Programs (TAPs) focus on alternative transportation modes with potential impact to congestion reduction and air quality improvement.

While noise and wildlife impacts are additional categories of environmental impact, these are not generally considered at the regional level. Equity impacts, discussed extensively in the Existing Conditions Report, will also be addressed later in this section.

### 10.5.1 Potential Stormwater Impacts and Mitigation

Beginning with stormwater, there are a number of projects that could adversely affect stormwater runoff. Intuitively, any new roadway or pavement projects, which remove permeable surface area and replace it with an impermeable pavement will increase the risk of poor water quality and runoff issues. The extent of the road widening, extension, or new capacity will determine the extent to which stormwater will be impacted. Stormwater impacts from one project can impact downstream locations also.

Mitigation efforts include standard stormwater features (e.g. curb and gutter) but can also include more costly yet more sustainable features such as permeable paving surfaces, bioswales, and responsible grant management, ensuring only partner agencies with the capacity or infrastructure to handle increased runoff and maintenance to their systems receive new capacity funding.

Conversely, there are four projects, all TIA, which specifically address drainage issues: TIA-02, TIA-08, TIA-20, and TIA-21. Although the VLMPO study area is at a higher risk for flooding due to geographical location, so long as stormwater needs are met in new capacity projects and maintenance needs are met as applicable as in the TIA project list, the area should remain in compliance with stormwater standards.

**Truck Safety:** *Plans to construct additional truck parking on I-75 could enhance safety for truck drivers.*

**Freight Access:** *The proposed South Bypass should improve truck flow through the community and provide access to industrial areas south of downtown.*



## 10.5.2 Potential Air Quality Impacts and Mitigation

Air quality is the second category of environmental sustainability assessed in light of MTP projects. To assess properly, the link between capacity, congestion, and air quality must be established. First, congestion leads to increases in air pollutants and a reduced air quality. In heavy traffic, travel times are increased, vehicle idle times are increased, and engines start and stop more frequently, resulting in efficiency losses. A 2013 Beijing study found that PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are five times greater at idle speed than at a smooth speed. In addition, US DOT notes in its Improved Travel Demand Modeling that new capacity can lead to an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions as a result of adding new lanes through a process known as induced demand. AASHTO recognizes that even increased traffic efficiency from ITS systems has some effect on demand, potentially offsetting over time some of the positive environmental effects of increased traffic flow.

Given that baseline understanding, any projects that decrease congestion could be understood to have a positive impact on air quality, but that positive impact may only be realized during the short-term depending on the latent demand of the additional capacity or traffic efficiency, which is more pronounced on highway projects and smaller in areas with high road density ratios.

There are no projects in the MTP with the stated goal of increasing congestion, or that would even be understood to have an increased impact on congestion (except, perhaps, during construction). The majority of projects in the MTP TIA project list, as well as 23 MTP road projects out of 67, specifically address roadway capacity and widening. These can be expected to have up to a five times reduction in PM<sub>2.5</sub> depending on the increase in level of service over the road in the short term, and those results could remain or diminish depending on latent demand in the long run.

Other projects that have an impact on air quality do not involve the amount of pollutants in a fossil-fuel-powered single occupant vehicle but instead aim to reduce air pollutants by replacing either single occupant car trips or replacing the combustion engine with an electric engine. National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) charging projects and non-NEVI Electric Vehicle (EV) charging installations do not directly impact air quality but do incentivize the switch from fossil-fuel burning vehicles to EVs by supplying the infrastructure to properly charge vehicles, reducing concerns about range anxiety. The Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality has estimated average fossil fuel sedan and light truck emissions, assuming 12,000 miles and 24mpg and 15,000 miles and 17mpg, respectively. **Table 10-2** provides these emission and fuel consumption rates for passenger cars while **Table 10-3** presents these rates for trucks.



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Table 10-2: Emission and Fuel Consumption Rates for Passenger Cars

Pollutant / Fuel	Emission & Fuel Consumption Rates (per mile driven)	Calculation	Annual Emission & Fuel Consumption
VOC	1.034 g	$(1.034 \text{ g/mi}) \times (12,500 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	27.33 lb
THC	1.077 g	$(1.077 \text{ g/mi}) \times (12,500 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	28.47 lb
CO	9.400 g	$(9.400 \text{ g/mi}) \times (12,500 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	248.46 lb
NO <sub>x</sub>	0.693 g	$(0.693 \text{ g/mi}) \times (12,500 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	18.32 lb
PM <sub>10</sub>	0.0044 g	$(0.0044 \text{ g/mi}) \times (12,500 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	0.12 lb
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.0041 g	$(0.0041 \text{ g/mi}) \times (12,500 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	0.11 lb
CO <sub>2</sub>	368.4 g	$(368.4 \text{ g/mi}) \times (12,500 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	9,737.44 lb
Gasoline Consumption	0.04149 gal	$(12,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (24.1 \text{ mi/gal})$	497.93 gal

Table 10-3: Emission and Fuel Consumption Rates for Trucks

Pollutant / Fuel	Emission & Fuel Consumption Rates (per mile driven)	Calculation	Annual Emission & Fuel Consumption
VOC	1.224 g	$(1.224 \text{ g/mi}) \times (15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	32.35 lb
THC	1.289 g	$(1.289 \text{ g/mi}) \times (15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	34.07 lb
CO	11.84 g	$(11.84 \text{ g/mi}) \times (15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	312.95 lb
NO <sub>x</sub>	0.95 g	$(0.95 \text{ g/mi}) \times (15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	25.11 lb
PM <sub>10</sub>	0.0049 g	$(0.0049 \text{ g/mi}) \times (15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	0.13 lb
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.0045 g	$(0.0045 \text{ g/mi}) \times (15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	0.12 lb
CO <sub>2</sub>	513.5 g	$(513.5 \text{ g/mi}) \times (15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (1 \text{ lb}/454 \text{ g})$	13,572.69 lb
Gasoline Consumption	0.05780 gal	$(15,000 \text{ mi/yr}) \times (17.3 \text{ mi/gal})$	693.64 gal



## NOTE:

*These emission factors and fuel consumption rates are averages for the entire in-use fleet as of July 2008. Newer vehicles generally emit less pollution and use less gasoline, while older vehicles generally emit more pollution and use more gasoline. This is due to several factors, including the increasing stringency of emission standards over time and the deterioration (degradation) in the performance of emission control technology (e.g., catalytic converters) with increasing age and accumulated mileage.*

*Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), while not regulated as an air pollutant, is the transportation sector's primary contribution to climate change. Carbon dioxide emissions are essentially proportional to fuel consumption (and inversely proportional to fuel economy) – each 1% increase in fuel consumption results in a corresponding 1% increase in carbon dioxide emissions. About 19.4 lb CO<sub>2</sub> is produced for every gallon of gasoline combusted. Passenger cars and light-duty trucks also emit small amounts of other greenhouse gases (GHGs); thus, total GHG emissions from these vehicles are slightly greater than the CO<sub>2</sub> emission totals shown in this fact sheet.*

EVs do not produce tailpipe exhaust, and thus do not produce VOC, THC, CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, or gasoline consumption. EVs do produce some PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, primarily from brake and tire wear, but less than traditional emission vehicles, where tailpipe exhaust is a major source of PM<sub>2.5</sub>. It can be assumed, then, for every vehicle shift from traditional gas powered to EV within the VLMPO study area that the reduction in air pollutants will be approximate to the tables above. Traditional emissions can also be reduced by replacing single-occupant vehicle travel with other transportation modes.

### 10.5.3 Potential Equity Impacts and Mitigation

The Historical Equity Action Lens (HEAL) framework, referenced earlier in this report, was applied in the development of projects for consideration during the 2050 VLMPO MTP. Historical research and outreach to underserved communities helped identify shortcomings in the equitability of Valdosta's existing transportation system. Thus, the draft 2050 MTP includes transit and active transportation projects in areas of the City often ignored historically. At the same



time, care was taken to minimize major roadway projects that would adversely affect these same communities. The South Valdosta Bypass, currently under study by GDOT, could potentially have a mix of positive and negative impacts on southside communities depending on final route selection. On the negative side, corridor alternatives for this project might traverse properties close to lower income neighborhoods. On the positive side, construction of the bypass could include contractual requirements for job creation in the community, and project completion could redirect truck traffic out of these same neighborhoods and provide active transportation amenities for use by local residents. This corridor could also improve safety and reduce delays in crossing rail lines that run through these communities, a common complaint from local residents.



All projects recommended for inclusion as part of the 2050 VLMPO MTP will be further evaluated in subsequent study phases for both positive and negative environmental impacts. These analyses will be used to prioritize projects for funding in the 2050 VLMPO Cost Affordable Plan.

## 10.6 Reduced Project Delivery Delays

One key to reducing project delivery delays is ensuring that projects partially funded in the TIP, or the TIA program are continued into the 2050 MTP for consideration of funding for subsequent project phases. This issue will be further addressed in subsequent phases of the projects where project prioritization takes center stage. It is important that evaluation criteria include consideration of existing funding commitments when prioritizing projects for funding in the 2050 cost affordable plan. This would include eight projects with ROW funding commitments in the current VLMPO TIP. In addition to the bridge replacement projects noted earlier, other partially funded projects include the addition of truck parking at the two existing truck weigh stations on I-75 in Lowndes County and the grade separated CSX rail crossing along St. Augustine Road, forming part of the South Valdosta Truck Bypass, currently under study by GDOT.



## 11 TRANSPORTATION REVENUES AND COST ASSUMPTIONS

This chapter presents an overview of potential funding sources at the federal, state, and local level that can be utilized for transportation infrastructure improvements in the VLMPO region. The information in this chapter forms the basis of revenue streams used to craft the constrained 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. While grant programs are described in this chapter, only recurring revenue streams can be used in the constrained (cost feasible) MTP. This chapter concludes with a summary of assumptions used to estimate project costs.

### 11.1 Funding Sources

#### 11.1.1 Federal Funding Sources

The aforementioned BIL authorized \$550 billion to be put toward investment in the nation's infrastructure, with \$350 billion going towards investment in highway facilities and programs over fiscal years 2022 through 2026. The \$350 billion goes towards financing over a dozen new highway programs, with a focus on safety, resilience, carbon reduction, bridges, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, reconnecting communities, and wildlife crossings.<sup>1</sup>

Additionally, the BIL made changes to existing programs and created new programs related to highway development and funding, including:

- **National Highway Freight Program:** Managed by state DOTs, this program allocates funds to states by formula, with the objective of enhancing the efficient movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). It now allows states to use up to 30% of funds on intermodal freight or rail projects, instead of the previous standard of 10%. It also includes the rehabilitation of lock and dam and marine highway corridors that are part of the national highway freight network as eligible projects for funding. I-75 is the only highway in the VLMPO region that is included in the NHFN.
- **National Highway System (NHS) Funds:** These funds are closely tied to GDOT's performance targets for the statewide NHS network. Consequently, these funds are often directed towards major interstate facilities. In addition to I-75, NHS facilities in the VLMPO area include US 84, and segments of US 41, SR 133, and SR 31.
- **The National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)** provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS), for the construction of new facilities on the NHS, and to ensure that investments in Federal-aid funds for highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a state's asset management plan for the NHS.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/docs/BIL\\_overview\\_update\\_2022-11-8b.pdf](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/docs/BIL_overview_update_2022-11-8b.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/nhpp/>



- **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP):** This program allows for non-infrastructure safety projects such as those related to emergency services and safe routes to schools for funding and expands the definition of safety improvements to encompass rail- highway grade crossing separations, traffic control devices to pedestrians, and roadway improvements that separate vehicles from pedestrians and cyclists.
- **Railway Highway Crossing Program** clarifies that funds are eligible for reducing pedestrian injuries and fatalities from trespassing at crossings. Funds for this are set aside from the HSIP; the nationwide annual set-aside will be \$245 million from FY 2022 through FY 2026.<sup>3</sup>
- **Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Funds - Urban:** This federal program offers substantial flexibility, allowing for the preservation and improvement of conditions and performance on Federal-aid highways and bridges. Eligible projects encompass non- motorized transportation facilities, transit capital projects, and public bus terminals and facilities.
- **STBG - Transportation Alternatives Program:** Within the broader STBG program, funds are set aside specifically for smaller-scale transportation projects, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, recreational trails, and safe routes to school initiatives.
- **Metropolitan Planning Program (MPP):** Formerly known as Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds, the MPP provides planning assistance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to GDOT, which then channels these funds to MPOs for planning programs.
- **National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program (NEVI):** The NEVI Program was introduced as part of the IIJA Act in 2021, with the intent to create a nationwide network of fast-charging electric vehicle (EV) stations along national corridors. This program was canceled in February of 2025. As such, the VLMPO cannot expect to rely on NEVI funding for its EV projects for the time, but re-instatement of the program is a possibility in future administrations and is worth monitoring during the lifetime of the MTP.

Additionally, the BIL retained existing discretionary grant programs and introduced new ones, offering further opportunities for federal funding:

- **Safe Streets for All (SS4A):** Makes \$5 billion available for local initiatives that prevent transportation-related deaths and injuries on roadways. MPOs and local and tribal governments are eligible to receive these funds for developing safety action plans; planning, designing, and developing activities for infrastructure projects; or executing the projects in safety action plans.
- **Local and Regional Project Assistance Grants (Formerly RAISE):** These discretionary grants have been recently updated and awarded based on merit criteria that encompass safety, environmental sustainability, quality of life, economic competitiveness, state of good repair, innovation, and partnership. Projects falling within the range of \$5 million to a maximum of \$25 million are eligible for RAISE funding.
- **Nationally Significant Multimodal Freight and Highway Projects (Formerly INFRA):** This program awards competitive grants for multimodal freight and highway projects of national or regional significance. The objective is to enhance the safety, efficiency, and reliability of freight

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://highways.dot.gov/safety/hsip/xings/railway-highway-crossing-program-overview>



and passenger movement across rural and urban areas. Projects that promise to eliminate freight bottlenecks and enhance critical freight movements are prioritized.

- **National Infrastructure Project Assistance or "Megaprojects":** This program, sometimes referred to as the "Megaprojects program" or MEGA, offers grants to support multijurisdictional or regional projects of significance that cut across multiple transportation modes. These grants assist communities in completing large-scale projects that would otherwise be challenging to accomplish independently. Eligible projects include improvements on the National Multimodal Freight Network, National Highway Freight Network, National Highway System, and rail-highway grade separations.
- **Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation (PROTECT) - Discretionary:** This discretionary program, akin to the formula counterpart, is aimed at funding projects that promote system resilience.
- **Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvement (CRISI) Grants:** Administered by the Federal Railway Administration (FRA), this program funds projects that enhance the safety, efficiency, and reliability of intercity passenger and freight rail. Eligible projects span a wide spectrum, including capital investments in freight and passenger rail, safety technology deployment, planning, environmental analyses, research, workforce development, training, and locomotive emission reduction initiatives.
- **Railroad Crossing Elimination Grant:** Also administered by the FRA, this program finances rail crossing improvements, with a focus on enhancing safety and freight mobility. Eligible projects encompass grade separated rail crossings, including planning, environmental review, and design components.

### 11.1.2 State Funding Sources

Federal level grants and programs are not the only potential source of funding for projects in the VLMPO region. The state of Georgia also features numerous opportunities for the VLMPO to pursue funding for transportation infrastructure projects. Potential state revenue sources, competitive GDOT funding programs, and relevant policies are listed below.

- **Transportation Investment Act of 2010 (TIA):** Allows its economic regions to impose a one percent sales tax to fund multimodal transportation projects. All counties within the Southern Georgia Regional Commission (SGRC) boundaries, including the VLMPO study area, participate in a funded TIA program. This is discussed further under "Local Funding Sources."
- **Transportation Funding Act (HB 170) Funds:** This program represents a cornerstone of state funding, supporting a wide array of initiatives aimed at repairing, enhancing, and expanding Georgia's transportation network. These funds can be harnessed for both routine maintenance and capital improvement projects.
- **Quick Response Projects:** Designed for efficiency and cost-effectiveness, the Quick Response Projects program targets lower-cost operational endeavors that can be executed rapidly, typically within one year, and with budgets under \$200,000. These projects encompass critical tasks such as restriping, intersection improvements, and the addition or extension of turn lanes.
- **Local Maintenance & Improvement Grant (LMIG):** The LMIG program operates on an allocation model based on the total centerline road miles within each local road system and the population



of counties or cities in comparison to statewide figures. This approach ensures equitable distribution of resources. Eligible projects for LMIG funding are diverse, encompassing preliminary engineering, construction supervision and inspection, utility adjustments or replacement, roadway maintenance and resurfacing, grading, drainage, base and paving of existing or new roads, storm drainpipe or culvert replacement, intersection improvements, turn lanes, bridge repair or replacement, sidewalk construction within the right of way, roadway signage, striping, guardrail installation, and signal installation or improvement. Due to the passage of TIA the LMIG match went from 30% to 10%.

- **Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank (GTIB):** Administered by the State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA), GTIB presents an opportunity for grant and loan funding for projects with budgets of up to \$10 million, which provides grants and low interest loans for state, local, and regional entities for transportation infrastructure improvements. When pursuing GTIB support, key considerations include demonstrating economic development potential, project readiness, and feasibility. Over the fiscal year of 2023, GTIB had awarded \$3.36 million in grant amounts and \$13.9 million in loan amounts, with an investment amount of \$199 million since 2010 assisting in producing projects that total over \$1.1 billion.
- **GDOT Freight Operations Program:** Tailored to address freight-specific operational challenges, the GDOT Freight Operations Program is responsive to the needs of communities grappling with issues related to truck and freight rail activity. The program targets solutions such as improving turn lanes and enhancing signal timing at key intersections along freight-heavy routes. The program offers awards of up to \$2 million.

### 11.1.3 Local Funding Sources

Local funds come from several different sources, including sales and property taxes, vehicle fees, general revenues, and are put toward matching requirements for federal grants. Lowndes County passed its first one cent Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) in November of 2019 that will raise roughly \$134 million over six years. The dedicated project list includes road and bridge transportation projects for the County and each incorporated city within. Lowndes County is also part of the Southern Georgia Region that, utilizing the Transportation Investment Act (TIA), passed a Transportation-SPLOST (T-SPLOST) of 1 percent over 10 years for dedicated transportation projects. This TIA cycle is expected to bring in \$513 million for the Southern Georgia region, which is made up of 18 counties, including Lowndes. In addition, Lowndes County has enacted a Local Option Sales Tax, which is a general purpose, goes to the general fund, and can be used to support a wide variety of projects.

## 11.2 Revenue Projections

Current federal regulations require that a metropolitan transportation plan be fiscally constrained, demonstrating that the total estimated costs for transportation projects and improvements in the plan do not exceed reasonably expected revenue from federal, state, and local funding sources.

To forecast the expected revenues and achieve fiscal constraint for the 2050 MTP, a financial plan was developed that reviewed past transportation-related expenditures by state and local governments to anticipate future revenues in accordance with 23 CFR 450.322. This document identifies revenue



resources for the operation, maintenance, and construction of the MPO's highway projects and provides planning-level cost estimates for identified projects to keep the plan fiscally constrained. Revenue estimates for transit capital and operations, and highway operations and maintenance were also identified and separated from the revenue estimates for highway capacity projects. Transit revenue estimates are described later.

Pursuant to federal regulation CFR 23 450.324, "revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use inflation rate(s) to reflect 'year of expenditure dollars.'" It is estimated that the available Year of Expenditure (YOE) revenues for funding transportation improvements through the 2025-2050 planning period will total over \$1 billion dollars.

Revenues for 2025 to 2050 were estimated based on the past five years of funding allocated for projects in the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). The funding allocation amounts were gathered from the FY18-21 through FY21-24 Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) and the FY18-21 and FY21-24 GDOT State TIPs. The revenues were averaged from the 2020-2024 five-year period and the average served as the 2025 first year assumption. The base year amount was then forecast to grow at an inflation rate of 2% for the final year of IJA/BIL and 1% after 2026. It should be noted that all funding in the Transit category was allocated towards existing on-demand service in the area, and additional transit projects should assume additional funding necessary. Based on these assumptions, it is estimated, within reason, that the available funding from Federal, State and Transit revenue will total nearly \$1.2 billion. Yearly totals by category are provided in **Table 11-1**, along with annual inflation assumptions.

Also included are some local level funding dollars through the aforementioned TIA, or Transportation Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (TSPLOST). The previously enacted TSPLOST is not included because funding has already been programmed, and thus no projections are necessary. A second round of TSPLOST dollars was approved on May 21, 2024, via referendum for another cycle of funding. Although, like the first TSPLOST, most funding is earmarked for specific projects, there is a discretionary fund available that can be used to fund projects in the 2050 MTP. The total expected to be collected is 820 million regionally. The FY27-36 TSPLOST discretionary fund projections are included in the revenue forecast as noted in **Table 11-2**.



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Table 11-1: Projected Federal and State Funding Revenue

Fiscal Year	Federal Highway	State Highway	Federal and State Transit	Total Federal and State Funding	Inflation
2025	\$ 24,582,904.47	\$ 9,642,349.00	\$ 5,232,962.15	\$ 39,458,215.62	Baseline
2026	\$ 25,074,562.56	\$ 9,835,195.98	\$ 5,337,621.39	\$ 40,247,379.93	2%
2027	\$ 25,325,308.18	\$ 9,933,547.94	\$ 5,390,997.61	\$ 40,649,853.73	1%
2028	\$ 25,578,561.27	\$ 10,032,883.42	\$ 5,444,907.58	\$ 41,056,352.27	1%
2029	\$ 25,834,346.88	\$ 10,133,212.25	\$ 5,499,356.66	\$ 41,466,915.79	1%
2030	\$ 26,092,690.35	\$ 10,234,544.38	\$ 5,554,350.23	\$ 41,881,584.95	1%
2031	\$ 26,353,617.25	\$ 10,336,889.82	\$ 5,609,893.73	\$ 42,300,400.80	1%
2032	\$ 26,617,153.42	\$ 10,440,258.72	\$ 5,665,992.66	\$ 42,723,404.81	1%
2033	\$ 26,883,324.96	\$ 10,544,661.31	\$ 5,722,652.59	\$ 43,150,638.86	1%
2034	\$ 27,152,158.21	\$ 10,650,107.92	\$ 5,779,879.12	\$ 43,582,145.24	1%
2035	\$ 27,423,679.79	\$ 10,756,609.00	\$ 5,837,677.91	\$ 44,017,966.70	1%
2036	\$ 27,697,916.59	\$ 10,864,175.09	\$ 5,896,054.69	\$ 44,458,146.36	1%
2037	\$ 27,974,895.75	\$ 10,972,816.84	\$ 5,955,015.23	\$ 44,902,727.83	1%
2038	\$ 28,254,644.71	\$ 11,082,545.01	\$ 6,014,565.39	\$ 45,351,755.11	1%
2039	\$ 28,537,191.16	\$ 11,193,370.46	\$ 6,074,711.04	\$ 45,805,272.66	1%
2040	\$ 28,822,563.07	\$ 11,305,304.16	\$ 6,135,458.15	\$ 46,263,325.38	1%
2041	\$ 29,110,788.70	\$ 11,418,357.20	\$ 6,196,812.73	\$ 46,725,958.64	1%
2042	\$ 29,401,896.59	\$ 11,532,540.77	\$ 6,258,780.86	\$ 47,193,218.22	1%
2043	\$ 29,695,915.55	\$ 11,647,866.18	\$ 6,321,368.67	\$ 47,665,150.41	1%
2044	\$ 29,992,874.71	\$ 11,764,344.84	\$ 6,384,582.36	\$ 48,141,801.91	1%
2045	\$ 30,292,803.46	\$ 11,881,988.29	\$ 6,448,428.18	\$ 48,623,219.93	1%
2046	\$ 30,595,731.49	\$ 12,000,808.18	\$ 6,512,912.46	\$ 49,109,452.13	1%
2047	\$ 30,901,688.81	\$ 12,120,816.26	\$ 6,578,041.59	\$ 49,600,546.65	1%
2048	\$ 31,210,705.69	\$ 12,242,024.42	\$ 6,643,822.00	\$ 50,096,552.12	1%
2049	\$ 31,522,812.75	\$ 12,364,444.66	\$ 6,710,260.22	\$ 50,597,517.64	1%
2050	\$ 31,838,040.88	\$ 12,488,089.11	\$ 6,777,362.82	\$ 51,103,492.81	1%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 732,768,777.25</b>	<b>\$ 287,419,751.20</b>	<b>\$ 155,984,468.02</b>	<b>\$ 1,176,172,996.47</b>	



Table 11-2: Projected Local Funding Revenue

Fiscal Year	Total TIA Funding	Inflation	Discretionary Only
2027	\$14,443,098.47	Baseline	\$2,327,086.47
2028	\$15,041,042.75	2%	\$2,423,427.85
2029	\$15,663,741.92	2%	\$2,523,757.76
2030	\$16,312,220.83	2%	\$2,628,241.33
2031	\$16,987,546.78	2%	\$2,737,050.52
2032	\$17,690,831.21	2%	\$2,850,364.42
2033	\$18,423,231.63	2%	\$2,968,369.50
2034	\$19,185,953.42	2%	\$3,091,260.00
2035	\$19,980,251.89	2%	\$3,219,238.16
2036	\$20,807,434.32	2%	\$3,352,514.62
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$174,535,353.21</b>		<b>\$28,121,310.65</b>

## 11.3 Project Cost Assumptions

This section documents estimated project cost assumptions and sources used to develop the constrained (i.e., cost affordable) plan. In general, these are planning-level estimates made with the best planning-level data available at the time of estimation. Similar to the previous 2045 MTP, it was assumed that locally funded projects can be completed for a lower cost than those with federal funds. This assumption was reflected in lower contingency costs for locally funded projects. As required by federal regulations, all cost estimates must be in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. Initial cost estimates used 2025 dollars, while subsequent work ensured that financially constrained project cost estimates reflected YOE based on priority selection scores and ranking.

TIA projects already committed to funding are not included in the state and federal constrained list of projects; however, many TIA projects will be completed within the same band over the next ten years. These dollars have already been committed to specific projects and phases of projects. Some projects are only partially funded by TIA, in which case, project completion will require other state and Federal revenues, outlined earlier in 10-1. The following are key assumptions used for cost estimation by transportation mode.

- Highway, Roads and Bridges:** To maintain consistency with the previously adopted 2045 MTP, the same percentage breakdowns for project engineering (PE), right-of-way (ROW), and utilities have been applied for the 2050 MTP. Existing 2045 MTP Projects have received a 35% increase in cost for the 2050 MTP, which is a planning-level rate of inflation based on industry trends since 2020. New 2050 projects use planning-level cost estimates. All updated cost estimates for previous 2045 projects were reviewed by an in-house roadway engineer, and new 2050 project



cost estimations developed by a roadway engineer, ensuring costs are accurate and account for the latest industry trends and information available.

- **Active Transportation:** Active transportation projects were priced using the *Costs for Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements* prepared by the University of North Carolina (UNC) Highway Safety Research Center for the FHWA and applying an inflationary adjustment using the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index (CPI) calculator. Distance estimates were rounded up to the nearest 100 feet for linear feet measurements and up the nearest .25 mile for mileage measurements. Project A-14, Implement Complete Streets, is a unit-cost estimate of per linear mile. Project costs were rounded up to the nearest \$10,000 for projects under \$100,000 and to the nearest \$50,000 for projects over \$100,000.
- **Transit:** Transit cost estimates are sketch-level, as no transit studies have been conducted to design routes, number of stops, or level of infrastructure necessary. Projects T-1 through T-3 assume two busses in operation during peak hours, one additional bus in reserve, 10 transit stops with shelters, benches, a trash receptacle, a bus stop sign, street lighting, a striped crosswalk on the street, and a shade tree. The cost also includes liability insurance, 3 full time CDL (commercial driver licensed) drivers, and one transit manager. Projects T-5 through T8, T-10, and T-11 are all priced in unit cost. *Costs for Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements* were used to develop unit costs for some infrastructure, applying an inflationary adjustment using the Bureau of Labor Statistics' CPI calculator.
- **ITS/Signalization:** In Georgia, the average cost to install a new traffic signal typically ranges from \$200K to \$250K. For interchange projects, a higher budget of \$500K is assumed to signalize two ramp terminals. ITS signal integration is estimated to cost \$160k per signal resulting in a total of approximately \$4.5 million for 28 signals.
- **Electric Vehicles:** The cost of EV charging stations, at \$1 million per site of 4 ports each, are based upon GDOT's Georgia EV Development Plan figures for 4 existing sites along the I-75 corridor. Thus, the total cost estimate for the 6 EV sites included in the 2050 MTP is \$6 million.



## 12 PERFORMANCE-BASED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

This chapter presents the methodology, analysis, and outcomes of a project prioritization process for the Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 MTP. The primary objectives of this chapter are to:

- Define a clear, transparent prioritization framework that aligns with the goals and objectives of the 2050 MTP, as established through stakeholder engagement.
- Evaluate the anticipated benefits and impacts of each recommended transportation project, including performance improvements, community outcomes, and cost considerations.
- Rank and score projects in accordance with the prioritization framework to establish an ordered list of investments.
- Develop a fiscally constrained, cost-feasible work program that sequences project implementation based on anticipated revenue streams and strategic importance.

By establishing a prioritized, performance-based investment strategy, this chapter provides the actionable foundation for the subsequent preparation of the final MTP and the ongoing system performance monitoring framework. This approach ensures that the Valdosta-Lowndes region pursues the most effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation investments through the year 2050.

### 12.1 Scoring Criteria and Metrics

The project scoring methodology employs a consistent four-point scale (0-3) for each performance indicator, where a score of 0 denotes no anticipated benefit or a potential adverse impact, and a score of 3 represents the highest level of alignment with an MTP goal. **Table 12-1** provides a summary of individual measures and categorical thresholds. Scoring definitions for each category are calibrated to reflect both Federal performance measure thresholds (PM1-PM3) and regionally specific objectives. The following sections offer a concise overview of the scoring approach by goal.

#### 12.1.1 Safety

Safety scores reflect expected reductions in total crashes, fatal and serious injury crashes per 100 million VMT, and non-motorized incidents within a ¼-mile buffer of project limits. Projects associated with low crash densities (0-10 crashes per thousand AADT) receive lower points, while high-crash locations (>30 crashes per thousand AADT) that potentially achieve significant percent reductions earn top scores. Fatal crash rates and the share of commercial vehicle and vulnerable user crashes are similarly banded.

#### 12.1.2 Freight Movement and Economic Vitality

Freight and economic vitality scoring emphasizes connectivity to designated freight corridors and economic development sites. Projects with no corridor access score lowest, while those that directly link to industrial zones, rail yards, or truck parking areas receive a maximum number of points. Truck traffic proportions are scored from under 1 percent to over 10 percent of AADT, and proximity to Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development (GRAD) select sites is evaluated in distance bands, with the closest projects achieving the highest ratings.



## 12.1.3 Infrastructure Condition

Pavement and bridge condition scores derive from current Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) ratings and the National Bridge Inventory (NBI). Rehabilitation of segments in “poor” condition is prioritized with higher scores, whereas preventative maintenance on “good” condition segments is credited for deferring future rehabilitation costs. Bridge projects are evaluated by sufficiency ratings, with those nearing replacement thresholds receiving elevated scores. Roadway widening projects are assumed to result in new pavement.

## 12.1.4 System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction

Congestion and mobility benefits are quantified through existing and projected thresholds of annual average daily traffic (AADT) and level of service (LOS) ratings for both current and “do nothing” networks. Signal optimization, TSM/TDM strategies, and targeted capacity enhancements are scored based on projected roadway capacity and congestion levels, aligning with PM3 metrics for travel and reliability. Similarly, resilience measures, such as providing emergency-route redundancy in flood-prone corridors, are incorporated into the scoring framework.

## 12.1.5 Equity and Environmental Sustainability

Scores in this combined category address historic preservation, environmental impacts, and multimodal equity. Projects encroaching on historic districts or within ¼-mile of sensitive environmental resources receive lower scores, while those enhancing access to historic districts, implementing green infrastructure, or delivering transit and active-transportation improvements earn higher ratings. Connectivity to Areas of Persistent Poverty (AOPP) is also scored, with transit connections and on-site multimodal facilities receiving top points.

## 12.1.6 Project Delivery

Implementation readiness is evaluated based on TIP/STIP (statewide TIP) inclusion, alignment with the 2050 MTP, and stakeholder engagement quality. Projects already programmed in current funding plans score highest, while projects not yet under any phase of implementation score lowest. Public support is measured through stakeholder feedback, with significant positive dialogue contributing to top-tier scores.

## 12.2 Criteria Weights

To translate raw performance scores into composite rankings, individual metric scores are multiplied by weighting factors that reflect stakeholder priorities and regional objectives. Weighting is structured on two tiers: (1) Goal-level weights that allocate relative importance to each of the six MTP goal categories; and (2) Criteria-level weights that distribute the weight of each goal among its constituent performance measures. Both levels of weighting vary by project scope – (i) Highway and Bridges, (ii) ITS and Signalization, (iii) EV/AV Infrastructure, (iv) Public Transit, and (v) Active Transportation – to recognize differing emphasis across project types. For example, Safety (PM1) may carry a higher goal weight for Highway and Bridges projects, while Connectivity and Non-Car Accessibility receive greater emphasis for Active Transportation and Transit projects. Within each goal, measure-level weights further refine



priorities: the share of total crashes, fatal crashes, and vulnerable road user incidents under Safety; the split between pavement and bridge asset conditions in PM2; and the balance of congestion and traffic volume in PM3.

Goal-level weights were informed by Federal and State performance guidelines and best practices from comparable Georgia MPOs and were then reviewed and approved by Valdosta-Lowndes MPO staff, and subsequently presented to the Technical Advisory Committee, Policy Committee, and public stakeholders.

**Table 12-1** provides full tabulations of both goal- and criteria-level weights for each project scope. Final composite project scores, a sum of weighted metric contributions, generate a single ranking index, guiding the development of a fiscally constrained, performance-based implementation program. **Table 12-2** further breaks down criteria weights by project categories.

Chapter 13 further explores the recommended projects, with estimated costs and references to the available funding allocated to the short-, mid-, and long-term funding bands for implementation. The lowest priority projects with high estimated cost that do not fit into the projected revenue stream are discussed under the Aspirational Projects section.



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Table 12-1: Scoring Methodology

PERFORMANCE MEASURES			Score Points (1-3)			
			Measurement Units			
No.	Criteria	Measures	0	1	2	3
1	Safety	Total crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	0 - 10	10 - 20	20 - 30	More than 30
		Fatal crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	0 - 0.05	0.05 - 0.10	0.10 - 0.15	More than 0.15
		Percent CMV (trucks) crashes	0% - 3.5%	3.5% - 6.5%	6.5% - 10%	More than 10%
		Percent VRU (non-motorized) crashes	0% - 3.5%	3.5% - 6.5%	6.5% - 10%	More than 10%
2	Freight Mobility and Economic Vitality	Freight Designated Corridor	No Connection	Industrial Area and/or Rail Crossing	Corridor Connection including Rail Yards	On Freight Corridor or Truck Parking
		Percent Truck Traffic	0% - 1%	1% - 5%	5% - 10%	More than 10%
		Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development (GRAD) Select Sites	Outside 1 mi.	Within 1 mi.	Within 0.5 mi.	Within 0.25 mi.
3	System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction	Total Existing AADT	0 - 10,000	10,000 - 20,000	20,000 - 30,000	More than 30,000
		Serves congested corridor (Existing LOS)	A/B	C	D	E/F
		Projected LOS (Do Nothing Network)	A/B	C	D	E/F
		Total Projected AADT (2050 Needs Network)	0 - 10,000	10,000 - 20,000	20,000 - 30,000	More than 30,000
4	System Reliability and Resiliency	Provide resiliency to regional network	New Roadway or Truck Parking	Project Adding Through Lanes or Rail Crossing	Add Turn Lanes, Bike Lanes or Paths, Sidewalks, EV, or ITS	Evacuation Route, Pavement/Bridge or Transit Project
		State of Good Repair	NA	Good	Fair	Poor
5a	Environment & Quality of Life	Potential impacts to environmental resources	Obvious Negative Impact to Environment	Possible Negative Impact to Environment	No Direct Environmental Impact	Positive Impact to Environment
5b	Equity	Historic Preservation	Negative Impact to Historic Sites/Areas	Project Outside Historic Sites/Areas	Improves Access to Historic Sites/Areas	Project Potential for Area Revitalization
		Increase Connectivity and Access	No Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.	Auto Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.	Bike/Ped Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.	Transit Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.
		Develop Safe, Affordable, and Accessible Transportation Solutions for Non-Car Users	Highway Project, No Bike/Ped Amenities	Highway Project with Bike/Ped Amenities	Transit or Active Transportation Project (Outside AOPP)	Transit or Active Transportation Project (Inside AOPP)
6	Project Readiness	Implementation Pipeline	2050 MTP *NEW*	2045 MTP	TIA	TIP/STIP
		Community and Stakeholder Needs	Negative Dialogue from Public	Project Not Mentioned by Public	Some Positive Dialogue from Public	Significant Positive Dialogue Rec'd



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Table 12-2: Criteria Weights by Project Categories

EVALUATION CRITERIA & MEASURES			Project Scope			Project Scope			Project Scope			Project Scope			Project Scope		
No.	Criteria	Measures	Highway & Bridges			ITS & Signalization			EV/AV Infrastructure			Public Transit			Active Transportation		
			Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.
1	Safety	Total crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	25.0%	15%	3.8%	25.0%	25%	6.3%	25.0%	5%	1.3%	25.0%	5%	1.3%	20.0%	20%	4.0%
		Fatal crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		7.5%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%	25.0%		5.0%
		Percent CMV (trucks) crashes	20.0%		3.0%	25.0%		6.3%	20.0%		1.0%	20.0%		1.0%	15.0%		3.0%
		Percent VRU (non-motorized) crashes	25.0%		3.8%	20.0%		5.0%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		1.3%	40.0%		8.0%
2	Freight Mobility and Economic Vitality	Freight Designated Corridor	40.0%	15%	6.0%	40.0%	15%	6.0%	40.0%	15%	6.0%	40.0%	5%	2.0%	40.0%	5%	2.0%
		Percent Truck Traffic	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%
		Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development (GRAD) Select Sites	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%
3	System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction	Total Existing AADT	30.0%	15%	4.5%	30.0%	25%	7.5%	30.0%	10%	3.0%	30.0%	5%	1.5%	30.0%	5%	1.5%
		Serves congested corridor (Existing LOS)	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		7.5%	30.0%		3.0%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%
		Projected LOS (Do Nothing Network)	20.0%		3.0%	25.0%		6.3%	20.0%		2.0%	20.0%		1.0%	20.0%		1.0%
		Total Projected AADT (2050 MTP Network)	20.0%		3.0%	15.0%		3.8%	20.0%		2.0%	20.0%		1.0%	20.0%		1.0%
4	System Reliability and Resiliency	Provide resiliency to regional network	60.0%	15%	9.0%	60.0%	15%	9.0%	60.0%	25%	15.0%	60.0%	10%	6.0%	60.0%	10%	6.0%
		State of Good Repair	40.0%		6.0%	40.0%		6.0%	40.0%		10.0%	40.0%		4.0%	40.0%		4.0%
5a	Environment & Quality of Life	Potential impacts to environmental resources	25.0%	10%	2.5%	25.0%	5%	1.3%	25.0%	35%	8.8%	25.0%	45%	11.3%	25.0%	30%	7.5%
5b	Equity	Historic Preservation	25.0%		2.5%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		8.8%	25.0%		11.3%	25.0%		7.5%
		Increase Connectivity and Access	25.0%		2.5%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		8.8%	25.0%		11.3%	25.0%		7.5%
		Develop Safe, Affordable, and Accessible Transportation Solutions for Non-Car Users	25.0%		2.5%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		8.8%	25.0%		11.3%	25.0%		7.5%
6	Project Readiness	Implementation Pipeline	60.0%	30%	18.0%	60.0%	15%	9.0%	60.0%	10%	6.0%	60.0%	30%	18.0%	60.0%	30%	18.0%
		Community and Stakeholder Needs	40.0%		12.0%	40.0%		6.0%	40.0%		4.0%	40.0%		12.0%	40.0%		12.0%
				100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%



## 13 MTP WORK PROGRAM

This chapter presents the final 2050 VLMPO MTP. First, the project rankings are provided, including all transportation modes. Next, a complete listing of cost feasible projects is provided. The chapter ends with a list of aspirational (or visionary) projects that are not recommended for funding at this time. It should be noted that some projects are only partially funded, and thus, portions of these projects are found in both the cost feasible and aspirational project listings. *The MTP, as described in this chapter, is scheduled for MPO adoption on September 3, 2025. This chapter will be revised to reflect any changes made during adoption along with final 2050 model metrics for the Constrained MTP.*

### 13.1 Project Rankings

This section presents a complete ranked listing of recommended projects (**Table 13-1**) based on scores and weights previously described in Chapter 12, highlighting the very highest-scoring initiatives that deliver the greatest combined benefit per dollar invested. Transit extensions and operational safety fixes generally occupy the top slots, followed by a mix of multimodal and roadway investments that form the core of the fiscally constrained program.

Table 13-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Projects Prioritization Rank

Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
1	T-02		Route 2: East-West Connection	Public Transit	Fixed-Route Bus Route
2	T-01		Route 1: North-South Loop	Public Transit	Fixed-Route Bus Route
3	T-03		Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base	Public Transit	Fixed-Route Bus Route
4	T-07		Connected Bus Stops	Public Transit	Transit Connectivity
4	T-08		Upgraded Bus Amenities	Public Transit	Transit Infrastructure
6	R-51	0016898	SOUTH VALDOSTA TRUCK BYPASS - TIA	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
7	T-04		Expand Valdosta On-Demand Services	Public Transit	Reliability Improvements
7	T-05		Mobility Hubs	Public Transit	Transit Hub
7	T-06		Bus Super Stops	Public Transit	Transit Connectivity
7	T-09		Transit App Upgrades	Public Transit	Transit Infrastructure
11	R-25	0010296	I-75 @ CR 783/LOCH LAUREL ROAD - PHASE II	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
12	A-29		Toombs Street	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
13	I-07		ITS System Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
14	A-27		South Oak Street	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes
15	R-27		I-75 @ US 84	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
16	A-38		E-Bike/E-Scooter Program	Active Transportation	E-Bike/E-Scooter Program
17	R-65		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
18	R-70		South Patterson/Old Clyattville Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
19	R-48		North Valdosta Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
20	R-05		BAYTREE ROAD GRADE SEPARATION	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
21	A-05		Barack Obama Blvd	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
22	R-57		US 84/Hill Avenue at Fry Street	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
23	A-16		Lake Park Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
23	A-24		Old Hudson Street and/or McDougal Street	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
23	A-39		Fry Street	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
26	E-01		I-75 at Old Clyattville Rd NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
27	A-25		Park Avenue	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
28	R-52		SR 122	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
29	R-53		SR 122	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
30	R-26	0010295	I-75 @ SR 376 - PHASE II	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
31	I-01		I-75 Exit at Old Clyattville Rd New Signal	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
32	R-56		St. Augustine Rd./Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
33	A-10		Cyclist Education Program	Active Transportation	Public Outreach
33	A-14		Implement Complete Streets	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
33	R-62	0020358	WEIGH STATION @ I-75 SB IN LOWNDES COUNTY	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
36	R-01		Alden Avenue	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
37	R-14		Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
38	A-06		Bemiss Road (SR 125)	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
38	A-11		E Park Avenue	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
40	A-23		Northside Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
41	A-20		North Oak Street	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
42	A-31		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
43	A-30		U.S. Highway 84	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
43	R-61	0020359	WEIGH STATION @ I-75 NB IN LOWNDES COUNTY	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
45	A-02		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Northern Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
46	R-64		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
47	A-13		Gornto Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
48	R-02		Barack Obama Blvd	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
49	E-02		I-75 at Madison Hwy NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
50	A-17		Norman Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
51	A-37		Loch Laurel Road/SR 376	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
52	A-36		N Oak Street	Active Transportation	Bike Lane
53	R-63		West Gordon Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
54	R-32		James Beck Overpass	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
55	A-03		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Southern Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
56	R-20		Cherry Creek Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
57	A-12		Eager/Jerry Jones Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
57	R-36	0020144	LAMAR STREET @ SUGAR CREEK IN VALDOSTA	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
59	R-45		North Oak Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
60	R-49		Park Avenue	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
61	R-34	0019937	JUMPING GULLY RD @ JUMPING GULLY CREEK 6 MI SW OF LAKE PARK	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
61	R-59		Val Del Road / North Valdosta Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
63	A-35		N St Augustine Rd	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
64	R-31		Inner Perimeter Road/S. Patterson Street	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
65	R-41		N. Oak Street Ext. / Bemiss Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
66	R-07		Baytree Road/ Sherwood Drive	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
67	R-44		North Lee Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
68	R-22	0015445	SR 7 BU FROM CS 188/NORTH OAK STREET TO SR 7 ALT	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
69	A-33		Bemiss Road (SR 125)	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes
70	R-03		Baytree Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
70	R-40		N. Ashley Street / Northside Drive	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
72	R-11		Bemiss Road / Connell Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
73	R-10		Bemiss Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
74	R-42		N. Valdosta Road / Inner Perimeter Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
75	R-33		James Road Extension/Western Perimeter N	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
76	A-15		Inner Perimeter Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
76	A-26		Pineview Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
78	R-13		Bemiss Road / Skipper Bridge Rd	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
79	A-01		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Eastern Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
80	A-09		Country Club Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
81	A-04		Azalea City Trail/Sustella Trail - Western Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
82	A-28		St. Augustine Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
82	R-04		Baytree Road / Norman Drive	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
84	R-30		Inner Perimeter Rd. / Brookfield Rd. / Lake Laurie Dr. Intersection	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
85	R-17		Cat Creek Road / Pine Grove Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
86	A-32		Withlacoochee River Trail - north and south of Langdale Park	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
87	R-19		Cat Creek Road/ Radar Site Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
88	A-08		Berkley Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
88	A-19		Norman Drive at St. Augustine Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
88	R-12		Bemiss Road / Davidson Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
91	R-35		Knight Academy Road/Studstill Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
92	R-47	0020542	OAK STREET EXTENSION FM S OF MURRY RD TO CHERRY CREEK RD-TIA	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
93	R-43		North Ashley Street	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
93	R-69		Western Perimeter S	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
95	R-46		North Oak Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
96	R-29		I-75/SR 7 Connector	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
97	A-22		North Valdosta Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
98	A-34		E Park Avenue	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
99	A-07		Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
100	A-18		Norman Drive at Baytree Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
101	R-06		Baytree Road North Extension	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
101	R-58		Val Del Road / McMillan Road / Bethany Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
103	R-60		Webb Road Realignment	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
104	R-28		I-75 @ New Interchange	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
105	R-09		Bemiss Knights Academy/Old Pine Roads Intersection	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
106	A-21		North Oak Street Extension at Inner Perimeter Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
106	R-15		Boone (Dairy) Road CSX Crossing	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
108	R-50		Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
109	R-18		Cat Creek Road /State Route 122	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
110	R-23		Gornto Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
110	R-67		West Marion Avenue (SR 7)/Lakes Blvd.	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
110	R-68		West Marion Avenue / N. Gordon Street	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
113	R-37		Loch Laurel Road / Bevel Creek Bridge	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
113	R-38		Loch Laurel Road / Corinth Church Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
115	R-39		McMillan Road/Staten Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
116	R-55		SR 122/Val Del Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
117	R-54		SR 122/Skipper Bridge Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
118	R-08		Bemiss Knights Academy Road	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
119	R-66		West Magnolia Street	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
120	R-24		Hagan Bridge Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
121	R-16		Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
122	R-21		Dasher Grove Road Extension	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
123	T-10		Pedestrian and transit infrastructure upgrade	Public Transit	Transit Infrastructure
124	E-03		I-75 at Lakes Blvd NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	E-04		I-75 Bellville NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	E-05		Airport EV Infrastructure Installment	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	E-06		Valdosta Mall EV Infrastructure Installment	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	I-04		Bemiss Road Signalization Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
124	I-05		US-41 Signalization Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
124	I-06		I-75 Interchange Signalization Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization

The findings from the project prioritization process reveal information about regional needs, where benefits concentrate, and how a fiscally constrained rollout can maximize safety, mobility, equity, and state-of-good-repair outcomes.

## 13.2 Cost Feasible Projects

The 2050 constrained MTP, consisting only of projects deemed to be cost-feasible, considers the project rankings, project costs, and available transportation revenues. In order to stretch transportation dollars, a number of projects are only partially funded in the MTP. These include the following:



- Bus Routes 1, 2, and 3 (T01, T02, T03) – only funded for the purposes of a feasibility study to determine detailed capital and operating costs, equipment needs, ancillary facilities, and labor needs and costs.
- South Patterson/Old Clyattville Road Intersection (R-70) – only funded for further study, with the expectation that construction of the South Valdosta Bypass might make this project unnecessary.
- Bemiss Road 6-laning (R-10) – only funded for the purposes of a feasibility study to determine detailed right-of-way and construction costs and identify potential low cost alternatives.
- Baytree Road North Extension (R-06) – only funded for project engineering, right-of-way, and utilities, with construction pushed out to the Aspirational Plan.

**Table 13-2** provides a listing of all projects included in the draft constrained 2050 cost feasible MTP, including the above noted projects that are only partially funded. Estimated costs are provided for preliminary engineering (PE), right-of-way/utilities (ROW/UTIL), and construction (CST), including construction engineering and inspection in year-of-expenditure dollars (YOE). Project costs are further summarized into three bands for the purpose of converting 2025 dollars into YOE costs. In short, it was assumed that 2025 costs are inflated to the median year of each period/band:

- Band 1 = 2027-2030
- Band 2 = 2031-2036 (final year of TIA-2 funding)
- Band 3 = 2037-2050

GDOT Project Identification numbers (PI #) are included where readily available. During development of the 2050 MTP, it was determined that several projects were only partially funded in the TIP and/or TIA, so the previously unfunded phases of these projects are included as part of the 2050 constrained MTP. Previously funded phases of these projects are noted in **Table 13-2** as “TIP” or “TIA,” where appropriate.

**Figure 13-1** through **Figure 13-7** depict all constrained MTP projects by transportation mode. Projects that are partially funded are identified for clarity. The final section of this chapter describes projects, costs, and phases for projects that are part of the aspirational (visionary) list. *One late breaking change, reflected in the project listing and related maps, was the discovery that GDOT has fully funded construction of the Five Points Roundabout, to be implemented on North Valdosta Road, between Brookfield Road and North Oak Street. This project was not included in the TIP document, and as such, was not included in the 2050 E+C/STIP/TIP models. This change did free up funding for all phases of the Baytree Road North Extension, which was originally slated for partial funding.*



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Table 13-2: Draft Constrained Cost Feasible Plan

**Notes:**

- (i) An asterisk (\*) next to the project names indicate that earlier phases of the project have either already been completed or have already received funding under the TIP.
- (ii) Project names shown in italicized gray font indicate that the project is only partially funded under the VLMPO 2050 MTP Fiscally Constrained Plan.

PROJECT ID	PI#	Project Name	Band 1: Short Term			Band 2: Mid Term			Band 3: Long Term		
			PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)	PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)	PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)
R-01		Alden Avenue	\$1,095,888	\$3,616,432	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$12,879,161
R-02		Barack Obama Blvd	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2,399,610	\$7,918,712	\$23,996,098
R-03		Baytree Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2,265,597	\$7,476,471	\$22,655,973
R-04		Baytree Road / Norman Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$355,932	\$1,174,576	\$3,559,320
R-05		BAYTREE ROAD GRADE SEPARATION	\$4,414,486	\$14,567,804	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$51,880,171
R-06		<i>Baytree Road North Extension</i>	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2,186,986	\$7,217,054	\$-
R-07		Baytree Road/ Sherwood Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$461,697	\$1,523,600	\$4,616,971
R-08		Bemiss Knights Academy Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-09		Bemiss Knights Academy/Old Pine Roads Intersection	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$230,849	\$761,800	\$2,308,485
R-10		<i>Bemiss Road</i>	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$7,440,856	\$-	\$-
R-11		Bemiss Road / Connell Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$218,699	\$721,705	\$2,186,986
R-12		Bemiss Road / Davidson Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$131,219	\$433,023	\$1,312,192
R-13		Bemiss Road / Skipper Bridge Rd	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$49,207	\$162,384	\$492,072
R-14		Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter	\$168,516	\$556,101	\$1,685,155	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-15		Boone (Dairy) Road CSX Crossing	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$121,499	\$400,947	\$1,214,992
R-16		Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-17		Cat Creek Road / Pine Grove Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$37,057	\$122,289	\$370,573
R-18		Cat Creek Road /State Route 122	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$49,207	\$162,384	\$492,072
R-19		Cat Creek Road/ Radar Site Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$28,552	\$94,223	\$285,523
R-20		Cherry Creek Road*	TIP/TIA	TIP/TIA	\$35,150,476	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-24		Hagan Bridge Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-25	0010296	I-75 @ CR 783/LOCH LAUREL ROAD - PHASE II*	TIP/TIA	TIP/TIA	\$3,112,960	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-26	0010295	I-75 @ SR 376 - PHASE II*	TIP/TIA	TIP/TIA	\$22,850,911	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-27		I-75 @ US 84	\$3,453,017	\$11,394,957	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$40,580,743
R-30		Inner Perimeter Rd. / Brookfield Rd. / Lake Laurie Dr. Intersection	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$131,219	\$433,023	\$1,312,192
R-31		Inner Perimeter Road/S. Patterson Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$37,665	\$124,294	\$376,648
R-32		James Beck Overpass	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$131,219	\$433,023	\$1,312,192
R-33		James Road Extension/Western Perimeter N	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,385,091	\$4,570,801	\$13,850,912
R-34	0019937	JUMPING GULLY RD @ JUMPING GULLY CREEK 6 MI SW OF LAKE PARK*	TIP/TIA	TIP/TIA	\$7,625,586	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-35		Knight Academy Road/Studstill Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$71,223	\$235,035	\$712,228
R-36	0020144	LAMAR STREET @ SUGAR CREEK IN VALDOSTA*	TIP/TIA	TIP/TIA	\$746,224	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-40		N. Ashley Street / Northside Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$236,923	\$781,848	\$2,369,235
R-41		N. Oak Street Ext. / Bemiss Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$37,057	\$122,289	\$370,573
R-42		N. Valdosta Road / Inner Perimeter Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$236,923	\$781,848	\$2,369,235
R-43		North Ashley Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$419,409	\$1,384,051	\$4,194,093
R-44		North Lee Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$249,644	\$823,827	\$2,496,445
R-45		North Oak Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$279,448	\$922,179	\$2,794,482
R-46		North Oak Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$505,595	\$1,668,463	\$5,055,947



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

PROJECT ID	PI#	Project Name	Band 1: Short Term			Band 2: Mid Term			Band 3: Long Term		
			PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)	PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)	PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)
R-47	0020542	OAK STREET EXTENSION FM S OF MURRY RD TO CHERRY CREEK RD-TIA	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,214,992	\$4,616,971	\$9,535,260
R-48		North Valdosta Road	\$4,652,269	\$15,352,487	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$54,674,653
R-49		Park Avenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$852,925	\$2,814,651	\$8,529,246
R-50		<i>Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road</i>	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$170,099	\$561,326	\$-
R-51	0016898	SOUTH VALDOSTA TRUCK BYPASS – TIA*	TIP/TIA	TIP/TIA	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$205,548,725	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-52		SR 122	\$796,055	\$2,626,981	\$7,960,549	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-53		SR 122	\$1,152,729	\$3,804,005	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$13,547,164
R-56		St. Augustine Rd./Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	\$31,842	\$105,079	\$318,422	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-57		US 84/Hill Avenue at Fry Street	\$125,094	\$412,811	\$1,250,943	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-58		Val Del Road / McMillan Road / Bethany Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$37,422	\$123,492	\$374,218
R-59		Val Del Road / North Valdosta Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$168,617	\$556,435	\$1,686,166
R-60		Webb Road Realignment	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$711,864	\$2,349,151	\$7,118,640
R-61	0020359	WEIGH STATION @ I-75 NB IN LOWNDES COUNTY*	\$-	\$-	\$3,331,024	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-62	0020358	WEIGH STATION @ I-75 SB IN LOWNDES COUNTY*	\$-	\$-	\$4,406,216	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-63		West Gordon Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$852,925	\$2,814,651	\$8,529,246
R-64		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$206,801	\$682,445	\$2,068,014
R-65		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	\$209,566	\$691,568	\$2,095,661	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
R-68		West Marion Avenue / N. Gordon Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$850	\$2,807	\$8,505
R-69		Western Perimeter S	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,254,601	\$4,140,183	\$12,546,010
R-70		<i>South Patterson/Old Clyattville Road</i>	\$111,654	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$433,023	\$-
A-01		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Eastern Extension	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,214,992
A-02		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Northern Extension	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,822,488
A-03		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Southern Extension	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$607,496
A-04		Azalea City Trail/Sustella Trail - Western Extension	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,214,992
A-05		Barack Obama Blvd	\$-	\$-	\$1,033,838	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-06		Bemiss Road (SR 125)	\$-	\$-	\$1,343,989	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-07		Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$121,499
A-08		Berkley Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$364,498
A-09		Country Club Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$485,997
A-10		Cyclist Education Program	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-11		E Park Avenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$4,981,468
A-12		Eager/Jerry Jones Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$3,644,977
A-13		Gornto Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$485,997
A-14		Implement Complete Streets	\$-	\$-	\$103,384	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-15		Inner Perimeter Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,032,743
A-16		Lake Park Road	\$-	\$-	\$51,692	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-17		Norman Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,032,743
A-18		Norman Drive at Baytree Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$12,150
A-19		Norman Drive at St. Augustine Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,214,992
A-20		North Oak Street	\$-	\$-	\$310,151	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-21		North Oak Street Extension at Inner Perimeter Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$60,750
A-22		North Valdosta Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$242,998
A-23		Northside Drive	\$-	\$-	\$413,535	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-24		Old Hudson Street and/or McDougal Street	\$-	\$-	\$41,354	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-25		Park Avenue	\$-	\$-	\$1,447,373	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-26		Pineview Drive	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$971,994




# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

PROJECT ID	PI#	Project Name	Band 1: Short Term			Band 2: Mid Term			Band 3: Long Term		
			PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)	PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)	PE (YOE \$)	ROW/UTL (YOE \$)	CST (YOE \$)
A-27		South Oak Street	\$-	\$-	\$310,151	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-28		St. Augustine Road	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$425,247
A-29		Toombs Street	\$-	\$-	\$258,459	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-30		U.S. Highway 84	\$-	\$-	\$671,994	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-31		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	\$-	\$-	\$103,384	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-32		Withlacoochee River Trail - north and south of Langdale Park	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$9,719,938
A-33		Bemiss Road (SR 125)	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2,794,482
A-34		E Park Avenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$485,997
A-35		N St Augustine Rd	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$728,995
A-36		N Oak Street	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$728,995
A-37		Loch Laurel Road/SR 376	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$97,199
A-38		E-Bike/E-Scooter Program	\$-	\$-	\$41,354	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
A-39		Fry Street	\$-	\$-	\$103,384	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
T-01		Route 1: North-South Loop (Feasibility Study)	\$62,030	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
T-02		Route 2: East-West Connection (Feasibility Study)	\$62,030	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
T-03		Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base (Feasibility Study)	\$62,030	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
T-04		Expand Valdosta On-Demand Services	\$-	\$-	\$671,994	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
T-09		Transit App Upgrades	\$-	\$-	\$1,034	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
I-01		I-75 Exit at Old Clyattville Rd New Signal	\$-	\$-	\$516,919	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
I-04		Bemiss Road Signalization Enhancement	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$3,523,478
I-05		US-41 Signalization Enhancement	\$-	\$-	\$1,240,605	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
I-06		I-75 Interchange Signalization Enhancement	\$-	\$-	\$982,146	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
I-07		ITS System Enhancement	\$-	\$-	\$3,473,694	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
E-01		I-75 at Old Clyattville Rd NEVI Improvement	\$-	\$-	\$1,033,838	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
E-02		I-75 at Madison Hwy NEVI Improvement	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,214,992
E-03		I-75 at Lakes Blvd NEVI Improvement	\$-	\$-	\$1,033,838	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
E-04		I-75 Bellville NEVI Improvement	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,214,992
E-05		Airport EV Infrastructure Installment	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,214,992
E-06		Valdosta Mall EV Infrastructure Installment	\$-	\$-	\$1,033,838	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 13-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Roadway & Bridge Projects




**Note:** Projects highlighted in **Yellow** background are only Partially funded.



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 13-2: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Roadway & Bridge Projects - Inset



**Note:** Projects highlighted in   background are only Partially funded.



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 13-3: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Active Transportation Projects








Figure 13-4: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Active Transportation Projects - Inset





# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 13-5: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Public Transit Projects




*Note: Projects on this map are only funded for the purposes of a future feasibility study.*



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN


Figure 13-6: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended ITS & Signalization Projects





# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Figure 13-7: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Electric Vehicle & Alternative Fuel Projects





## 13.3 Aspirational Projects

The Aspirational Plan, also known as the Visionary Plan, includes 19 out of 132 projects proposed for the 2050 MTP as fully unfunded. There are also six projects, noted in the previous section, that are only partially funded, so the incomplete phases of these projects are also part of the Aspirational Plan. **Table 13-3** provides a listing of these projects and costs, including notations on partially funded project phases. It should be noted that transit amenities (T-05 through T-08 and T-10) are listed in the Aspirational Plan as these projects are directly tied to implementation of the three proposed routes (T-01 through T-03).

Table 13-3: Draft Aspirational Project List

PROJECT ID	PI#	Project Name	Unfunded: Aspirational		
			PE (2025 \$)	ROW/UTL (2025 \$)	CST (2025 \$)
R-06	0	Baytree Road North Extension	<i>Cost Feasible</i>	<i>Cost Feasible</i>	\$18,000,000
R-08	0	Bemiss Knights Academy Road	\$155,000	\$511,500	\$1,550,000
R-10	0	Bemiss Road	<i>Cost Feasible</i>	\$20,209,860	\$61,242,000
R-16	0	Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road	\$34,000	\$112,200	\$340,000
R-23	0	Gornto Road	\$1,200,000	\$3,960,000	\$12,000,000
R-24	0	Hagan Bridge Road	\$1,200,000	\$3,960,000	\$12,000,000
R-28	0	I-75 @ New Interchange	\$1,918,100	\$6,329,730	\$19,181,000
R-29	0	I-75/SR 7 Connector	\$415,400	\$1,370,820	\$4,154,000
R-37	0	Loch Laurel Road / Bevel Creek Bridge	\$175,000	\$577,500	\$1,750,000
R-38	0	Loch Laurel Road / Corinth Church Road	\$85,000	\$280,500	\$850,000
R-39	0	McMillan Road/Staten Road	\$31,710	\$104,643	\$317,100
R-50	0	Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road	<i>Cost Feasible</i>	<i>Cost Feasible</i>	\$1,400,000
R-54	0	SR 122/Skipper Bridge Road	\$83,286	\$274,844	\$832,860
R-55	0	SR 122/Val Del Road	\$83,286	\$274,844	\$832,860
R-66	0	West Magnolia Street	\$160,710	\$530,343	\$1,607,100
R-67	0	West Marion Avenue (SR 7)/Lakes Blvd.	\$108,000	\$356,400	\$1,080,000
R-70	0	South Patterson/Old Clyattville Road	TBD	TBD	\$1,080,000
T-01	0	Route 1: North-South Loop	\$-	\$-	TBD
T-02	0	Route 2: East-West Connection	\$-	\$-	TBD
T-03	0	Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody AFB	\$-	\$-	TBD
T-05	0	Mobility Hubs	\$-	\$-	\$1,100,000
T-06	0	Bus Super Stops	\$-	\$-	\$30,000
T-07	0	Connected Bus Stops	\$-	\$-	\$40,000
T-08	0	Upgraded Bus Amenities	\$-	\$-	\$30,000
T-10	0	Pedestrian and transit infrastructure upgrade	\$-	\$-	\$15,000



## APPENDIX A: HISTORICAL EQUITY ACTION LENS (HEAL) SUPPORT MATERIALS

---



## Transportation in Valdosta and Lowndes County: A Historical Summary

### Railroads Create and Divide Valdosta

Railroads made Valdosta. The town owes its existence to the Atlantic and Gulf Railroad, which laid tracks in Lowndes County in the late 1850s. Instead of passing through Troupville, the county seat, the railroad laid tracks four miles west, where Lowndes County residents began to settle. Just two years after the railroad passed through the county, the state legislature incorporated Valdosta and named it the county seat. For the next thirty years, Valdosta was just a stop on the Atlanta and Gulf lines.

In 1889, during an era often known as “the New South,” when young entrepreneurs sought to drive national and international investment in the region through a public relations campaign that distanced the South from the legacy of slavery and agrarianism, Valdosta began to experience a railroad boom.<sup>i</sup> The Georgia Southern and Florida line opened that year, followed by the Florida, Midland, and Gulf in the 1890s. By the 1910s, two more railroads had laid tracks through Valdosta.<sup>ii</sup> Valdosta became a major regional railway hub and grew as a result. In 1880, the town reported 1,515 residents on the decennial census; by 1910 the city had swelled to 7,656 people, a growth rate of over 400 percent.<sup>iii</sup> Dramatic growth in the region’s cotton economy fueled investment in railroads during those final decades of the nineteenth century. Once the invasive boll weevil hammered the cotton crop in the second decade of the twentieth century, farmers switched to tobacco and gave the railroads reasons to remain. At the same time, owners of pinelands to the town’s east contributed to the regional economy by harvesting pine gum (processed into turpentine) and selling timber.<sup>iv</sup>

Railroads influenced town planning and land usage. For instance, according to fire insurance maps, warehouses lined the rights of way of the railroads that passed through town—in 1905 a cotton warehouse and freight depot abutted the Georgia Southern and Florida railroad just south of downtown; the Strickland Cotton Mills was next to the same line west of town; and the Fender Lumber Company bordered the Valdosta Southern Railroad’s right of way.<sup>v</sup> Similar maps from 1922 show that industrial activity along Valdosta’s railroads increased in the intervening years.<sup>vi</sup> The railroads were thoroughfares that brought goods to market and people to town, but they also created barriers that divided the town.

Valdosta’s historic black neighborhood, Southside, grew south of downtown on the other side of the east-west Atlantic and Gulf Railroad line. Throughout the South, natural and manmade barriers became convenient markers between segregated neighborhoods. Southside’s first residents probably arrived south of the tracks around 1866, when they founded St. Paul’s African Methodist Episcopal Church; a map from 1885 indicates that Southside had been platted into blocks around the church.<sup>vii</sup> Once Valdosta became a railroad hub in the 1890s, the neighborhood grew as African Americans migrated to the booming town in search of jobs.



## Jim Crow and the New South

This New South period of industrialization and urbanization—which made Valdosta a regional rail hub—coincided with the disenfranchisement of African Americans and the legalization of racial segregation, also known as the Jim Crow Era. Most of Black life thus took place in Black neighborhoods like Southside. For instance, between 1925 and 1945 there were two hundred Black-owned businesses in the neighborhood that provided necessities like groceries, and basic services like medical care.<sup>viii</sup> The 1922 fire insurance map shows that there were really two downtowns in Valdosta: one for Black people and one for white people.<sup>ix</sup> The town built a Black school in 1922, and Southside became the site of Valdosta’s Black education system.<sup>x</sup> Always, the railroad tracks marked the physical separation between Black and white Valdosta.

White southerners upheld Jim Crow through violence and terror, often in the form of vigilante mob violence known as lynching. The 1880s through the early 1950s saw the most lynching in US history and the period is often considered the nadir of American race relations. In 1918 Lowndes County and the surrounding region became the site of a nationally notorious lynching rampage that caused the deaths of thirteen Black people, including Mary Turner and her fetus, whom the white mob cut from her uterus and killed before hanging Turner from a bridge and lighting her corpse on fire.<sup>xi</sup> Lynching was senseless but patterned. For instance, historians have noticed that lynching often followed African American migration.<sup>xii</sup> That the region experienced its largest number of lynchings as it experienced its greatest growth fits the pattern. Lynching was often political as well—meant to terrorize Black southerners to prevent them from organizing or voting—and the 1918 lynchings similarly occurred after Black farm workers conspired against their brutal white employer, murdered him in his home, and wounded his wife.<sup>xiii</sup> The white mob’s vigilante response triggered national attention and an investigation by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), which used its findings to inform its anti-lynching campaign. Valdosta became home to a local NAACP chapter shortly after the lynchings, but it quickly became inactive until after World War II.<sup>xiv</sup> Today, the Mary Turner Project keeps alive the memory of this moment in Valdosta’s history and fights for racial justice through education and community engagement.<sup>xv</sup>

Valdosta also established the region’s first fixed transit system during the Jim Crow Era. The state fair was slotted to come to the northern outskirts of Valdosta in 1900, and city leaders planned an electric streetcar system to ferry visitors from the Atlantic, Valdosta, and Western railroad depot to the fairgrounds at Pine Park, bounded by North Patterson St., East Park Ave., Williams St., and East Moore St. The initial route was a loop—the cars traveled north on Patterson St. through downtown toward the fairgrounds, then turned east to Ashley St. where they headed south to Gordon St. to make a trip west back to Patterson. Fixed transit was apparently popular enough to warrant expansion two years later, this time to satisfy regular transportation needs. The line extended to Remerton, where a large cotton mill was located. In 1906 the city planned a route in western Valdosta that began at the Strickland Cotton Mills, traveled down Hill Ave., and ended downtown at Patterson St. Though this route was never built, a stop was added in 1913 on the Remerton extension to accommodate travel to and from newly established South Georgia State



Normal College (now Valdosta State University).<sup>xvi</sup> Characteristic of the Jim Crow Era, no part of the streetcar line entered Southside; likewise, an 1891 state statute required streetcar conductors to segregate Black and white passengers.<sup>xvii</sup>

The Valdosta streetcar lasted twenty-five years. Though there is currently no research on its failure, the system closed while streetcar systems began to struggle and fail across the United States. Artificially low rates, lack of subsidies, increased costs, and increased automobile congestion—one scholar suggests that streetcars struggled to meet their schedules after just 10 percent of people began to drive—killed streetcar systems that shared rights-of-way with cars.<sup>xviii</sup> Many managed to survive into the 1950s, but it is not surprising that a small system that served a small town in rural southern Georgia was one of the first to close. Valdosta paved over the tracks in the 1930s but exhumed them during World War II to donate the metal to the war cause.<sup>xix</sup>

## World War II and the Civil Rights Movement

Economic development in Valdosta and Lowndes County continued during the mid-twentieth century despite Jim Crow. As the United States mobilized for war in the early 1940s, Valdostans lobbied for national investment in the region. Throughout the South, World War II spurred development as southern Democrats in a national government run by the Democratic Party lobbied for military spending; military bases, training camps, shipyards, and naval bases popped up throughout the region.<sup>xx</sup> Georgia's national representatives successfully attracted an air force base to Lowndes County in 1941 on land then leased by the United States Department of Agriculture.<sup>xxi</sup> What became Moody Air Force Base started as a pilot training center and developed into a full-time base, now the home of the US Air Force's 23<sup>rd</sup> Wing.

World War II also bolstered the civil rights movement. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, civil rights activists assaulted Jim Crow in education. As early as 1949, parents of students in schools in Irwin County sued the school board in the U.S. District Court in Valdosta, claiming that the “separate but equal” school system was, in fact, unequal.<sup>xxii</sup> This lawsuit paralleled others throughout the country. The movement also reinvigorated racist terrorist groups, namely the Ku Klux Klan, who began burning crosses in Lowndes County.<sup>xxiii</sup> In 1950, Black Valdostans re-created the local chapter of the NAACP in response to police killings; the 1918 lynchings had intimidated African Americans in Lowndes County, preventing them from organizing until the postwar years.<sup>xxiv</sup>

The local NAACP focused most of its energies on policing, but after the *Brown II* (1955) decision, eight of its members asked Valdosta's Board of Education to integrate the town's public schools.<sup>xxv</sup> As was the case throughout the South, local board members and state officials resisted school integration at every turn. Laws that gave the federal government powers to compel integration and enforce Black people's voting rights (the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965) tipped the scales. Only in 1969 did Valdosta's schools integrate after the Department of Justice filed lawsuits against the school board.<sup>xxvi</sup> The board's integration plan involved closing all four Black schools while keeping all eight white schools open.

As the civil rights movement and white resistance to it disrupted Valdosta and Lowndes County during the mid-twentieth century, another major transportation development brought



renewed economic prospects. During the mid-1950s, states used federal money to construct highways as part of the new interstate highway system, a measure justified as crucial to national defense during the Cold War. Beginning in 1959 contractors constructed Interstate 75 through Lowndes County, and, in 1963 celebrated the highway's connection to Florida. The highway attracted new development along its corridor—a mall, motels, service stations, restaurants, and even the state welcome center.<sup>xxvii</sup> It also marked a momentous shift in transportation: Americans would increasingly choose automobiles for long-distance travel instead of trains. In 1979, the passenger rail service to Valdosta ended.<sup>xxviii</sup>

## Population Growth, Urban Development, and Transportation Planning

Federal investment, in the form of defense spending and highway infrastructure, and postwar population growth, not to mention excising de jure Jim Crow, fueled another boom period that began in the 1960s. In 1967, Mayor James Beck expected the city's population to double in fifteen years.<sup>xxix</sup> Unlike the boom years of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, which were fueled by agricultural growth, industrialization drove Valdosta's mid-twentieth economic progress. There may be no better metaphor for the region's transition than the Azalea City Industrial Park, planned by the newly created Valdosta-Lowndes County Industrial Authority in the early 1960s on the site of a former tobacco farm.<sup>xxx</sup> Those living through the boom years also experienced one of its most annoying consequences: traffic congestion. Not only were there more people in Valdosta and Lowndes County driving more cars, but trains often blocked major thoroughfares during peak hours. Regional auto transport performance worsened as sprawl increased. The downtown bore the brunt of the consequences, at least that was local perception. In the words of a 1973 memorandum of understanding between local governments and planning entities, "The growth of the urban areas of Lowndes County . . . in both residential and industrial areas is having and will continue to have marked effects on the traffic and travel patterns of the area."<sup>xxxi</sup>

The mid-twentieth century thus saw the first attempts at studying and planning regional transport. James Beck involved himself in most of these efforts as Valdosta's mayor, chairman of the Transportation Planning Coordinating Committee (TPCC), and member of the Georgia House of Representatives. As mayor in 1971, Beck worked with the Chamber of Commerce to hire a contractor to provide an initial study for a grade separation that would bring traffic below or over the two railroad lines that marked downtown Valdosta's southern border.<sup>xxxii</sup> This study presaged a future, much more involved study from 1978 that eventually provided the adopted plan for an overpass on Patterson Street.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

In 1972, Beck commissioned a study of downtown to ease congestion and improve its attractiveness. According to a local planner, Valdosta in the 1970s was "facing problems of peripheral urbanization and growth simultaneous with equally difficult center city decline."<sup>xxxiv</sup> Valdosta experienced—at a smaller scale—trends that major urban areas in the United States had been experiencing since the 1950s: migration to towns and neighborhoods just outside cities where housing costs were cheaper, or suburbanization, and the subsequent decline of economic and social activity within city centers. With few exceptions, white Americans moved to the suburbs and forced African Americans to remain in cities through discriminatory lending practices and



restrictive racial covenants.<sup>xxxv</sup> Automobile infrastructure, like interstate highways, both caused and exacerbated suburbanization.<sup>xxxvi</sup> The Downtown Re-Development Study (1972), produced by landscape architecture students at the University of Georgia as a senior thesis, struggled with the consequences of suburbanization and greater reliance on automobile transportation in mid-twentieth-century Valdosta. They offered recommendations for improving “the appearance and usability of Valdosta’s business districts,” as well as preserving historic landmarks.<sup>xxxvii</sup> The students identified congestion and thru-traffic as major inhibitors to downtown’s attractiveness and offered several recommendations to make the area more pedestrian friendly, including the construction of a beltway that would ring the town, widening sidewalks, decreasing lanes of traffic, and removing on-street parking.<sup>xxxviii</sup>

A year after the Georgia students completed the redevelopment study, Valdosta and Lowndes County embarked on a years-long transportation plan with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) and other local entities. While GDOT did much of the legwork, a local Transportation Planning Coordinating Committee took charge of overseeing and approving the plan; Beck served as its chair.<sup>xxxix</sup> During the planning, a newly organized Central Valdosta Redevelopment Authority asked GDOT to study ways to re-route traffic around downtown and discussed how to implement the recommendations of the 1972 student study.<sup>xl</sup> By 1980, GDOT had completed the plan and the TPCC had approved a system that included two new construction projects: a grade separation at Patterson Street, based on a 1978 in-depth analysis of the grade separation idea, and a twelve-and-a-half mile two-lane highway from State Road 31 to Country Club Drive that would function as an eastern by-pass to route traffic around downtown.<sup>xli</sup> Two priorities emerged from the various planning and study documents of the 1970s: easing traffic congestion, especially through downtown, and minimizing conflicts between cars and trains.

To influential Valdostans, both priorities overlapped with the Patterson Street overpass. When the TPCC met in 1977 to discuss a list of priority projects offered by GDOT, locals’ “main objection to the listing was the [low] prioritization of item 20 which was the Patterson Street grade separation.”<sup>xlii</sup> The proposed overpass solved a safety problem and a congestion problem. There were, in the late 1970s, 25 scheduled train crossings a day on both railroad lines that conflicted with 10,000 cars that used Patterson Street and Ashley Street to enter and leave downtown.<sup>xliii</sup> When trains blocked traffic, they caused congestion in downtown that contributed to the lack of attractiveness cited in the 1972 study. Congestion and blocked train intersections also posed a safety problem, restricting the movement of ambulances, fire, and police vehicles. A 1978 story in the *Valdosta Daily Times* attributed the deaths of two women to trains blocking roads south of downtown.<sup>xliv</sup> The busy railroad crossings were also dangerous, providing ample opportunity for train-automobile collisions. Grade separation made common sense.

## **The James Beck Overpass, Historic Preservation, and Community Representation**

Prioritizing downtown revitalization mixed with the legacy of Jim Crow and influenced how the overpass affected Southside. Construction displaced Black business owners while creating a barrier that divided the neighborhood. The firm that studied the overpass project identified Patterson Street and Ashley Street as the priority routes because they were part of the federal



highway system. To their credit, they favored Patterson Street because right-of-way acquisition on Ashley Street would have required St. Paul A.M.E. and some residents to move.<sup>xlv</sup> The approved plan called for a shorter overpass than needed to bridge both railroad lines, with the hopes of moving the Seaboard Coast Line underneath the overpass at a future date. A shorter overpass also spared Valdosta's downtown. As the feasibility study stated, "Initial schematic design was directed towards developing a grade separation plan which would avoid relocating the [Seaboard Coast Line] main line tracks. However, a design for such a viaduct or underpass . . . would adversely impact the entire commercial areas along Patterson or Ashley Streets from Savannah Avenue to Central Avenue. It was therefore excluded from further considerations."<sup>xlvi</sup> Impacting downtown Valdosta was out of the question, and it was important to protect St. Paul AME because the church had "some community historical value," so the Black-owned businesses on Patterson Street had to go.<sup>xlvii</sup> Effects were wider than the businesses construction displaced. The overpass so altered the western portion of Southside that it was no longer eligible for consideration as part of the National Register of Historic Places in 2007.<sup>xlviii</sup> The overpass answered a twentieth-century problem, but its consequences stemmed from at least a century of discrimination. Two downtowns developed in Valdosta, a Black one and a white one, but in the 1970s and 1980s, only the historic white downtown was deemed worthy of preservation.

Prioritizing downtown revitalization and preservation led to the passage of a new ordinance meant to protect Valdosta's historic structures and character. The Valdosta Historic Preservation Ordinance (1980) allowed a new Historic Preservation Commission to designate historic districts in the town. The commission designated its first district in 1983, the Valdosta Commercial Historic District, which encompassed downtown Valdosta but ended at the railroad tracks that divided Southside from downtown. Southside therefore lacked historic district protections that may have staved off further incursions by departments of transportation. William Houseal, one of the first Black councilmembers of the town may have understood this in 1985, when he asked the preservation commission to extend "the boundaries of the Historic District . . . somewhat to include certain areas to the south."<sup>xlix</sup> Houseal's request went nowhere.

In recent years, Black Valdostans have created the Valdosta Black Heritage Group because of their perception that the 1980 ordinance and the 1983 historic district decision intentionally excluded Black neighborhoods from preservation.<sup>i</sup> Their claims have merit. During the 1980s, historic preservationists in Valdosta, as elsewhere, focused on wealthy white neighborhoods.<sup>ii</sup> Fairview, North Patterson Street, and the Commercial Historic District neighborhoods were all added to the National Register of Historic Places in the 1980s, with Brookwood North receiving approval in 1995. The homes of prominent Valdostans were also added to the list during the 1980s. By contrast, East End Historic District, which was home to Black and white Valdostans, received recognition in 2005, and what remained of Southside was only registered in 2007.<sup>iii</sup> Further, actions and statements made clear that businesses and buildings in Southside's section of Patterson Street merited little acclaim from local white leaders and the local press—a newspaper article on the demolition claimed that "a section of old Valdosta is passing unmourned," and that it was "filled mostly with aging warehouses and storefronts in varying degrees of dilapidation. Unremarkable in architecture, most were built during the first quarter of this [the twentieth] century." That the



unmourned section and dilapidated buildings were part of Valdosta's Black history merited no mention.<sup>liii</sup>

Valdosta approved the Patterson Street Overpass and the historic district ordinance at a time when the city's Black residents were underrepresented on the city council. During the Jim Crow Era, laws like poll taxes or literacy tests disenfranchised Georgia's Black citizens, not to mention the ever-present potential of violence and terror meted out by white terrorist groups. Even though the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act enabled the federal government to ensure equal voting rights in the South, white southerners often found ways to dilute Black voting potential. As early as 1969, Black Valdostans complained that they were unrepresented in city government. As Woodrow Harris wrote to Mayor James Beck, "Under the present system and circumstance it is . . . impossible to get Black people elected to City offices."<sup>liv</sup> Because Black people in Valdosta were a minority of the population, and Black candidates were unlikely to garner white support so soon after desegregation, it was impossible for Black candidates to win public office. Harris, acting as chair of the Bi-Racial Committee proposed that representation be organized by wards, rather than through at-large positions.

By splitting the electorate into wards, Black Valdostans stood a greater chance of electing Black candidates to office because residential segregation meant that Black and white people were unlikely to live in the same wards. Almost fifteen years later, the local chapter of the NAACP sued the city and echoed Harris's claims: "The present method of electing the Valdosta City Council, including the use of elections at-large and majority vote in run-off elections, was enacted, and is being maintained presently with the racially discriminatory purpose of diluting the voting strength of black voters."<sup>lv</sup> In 1983, as in 1969, activists favored representation by ward, rather than through at-large positions. Valdosta changed how it elected representatives to the city council in 1985, likely in reaction to the NAACP lawsuit, and three Black candidates were elected to office that year.<sup>lvi</sup> However, the damage to Southside was done—a white majority council and white mayor implemented and approved the overpass when city government elections diluted Black voting potential. Valdosta's historic Black neighborhood was severed in two and its main street demolished by people who had no experience living in the community. Further, the system of representation at the time ensured that residents of Southside had little opportunity to participate in decision-making.

Construction for the overpass on South Patterson Street began in 1980 after Beck, now a member of the Georgia House of Representatives, secured funding for its construction.<sup>lvii</sup> Crews completed the overpass in 1984, but the project was far from finished. According to the adopted plan—meant to ensure the integrity of downtown—the overpass was only long enough to lift traffic over one of the two railroad lines. At a later, unspecified date, the city and state were supposed to work with the Seaboard Coast railroad to move its tracks underneath the overpass. Until then, traffic still had to stop when a Seaboard train crossed Patterson Street. The railroad was reluctant to move its right of way, citing service disruptions and cost, but was persuaded after the city agreed to close some streets and increase the rail speed limit to forty miles per hour.<sup>lviii</sup> Relocation of the railroad track, now operated by CSX, began in 1988—four years after the completion of the



overpass. In 1990, the entire project was completed and the overpass dedicated to James Beck. From when Beck and other Valdostans began to discuss solving the problem of the railroad crossings in 1968 to completion, the project had taken over two decades.<sup>lix</sup>

## Transit Challenges

As Valdosta and Lowndes County continued to grow during the 1990s, conversations began about regional transit. In 1992, the director of the Lowndes Advocacy Resource Center, a local nonprofit that helps adults with disabilities, called for a public transit system that would help his clients access government services. The *Valdosta Daily Times* offered its tentative support, writing that “it would be a great, progressive move to have a public bus system in operation here. But let’s just be sure there is enough of a need for it and that we can afford it.”<sup>lix</sup> In the three decades that followed, Valdosta and Lowndes County made fitful progress in providing public transit.

In 1997, Nick Coachman and Jerry Robinson started the Valdosta Innercity Transit Authority to offer on-demand, low-cost transport in Valdosta. VITA began with two busses, but business was slow in the early months and the company’s future was in doubt.<sup>lxi</sup> Two years later, Lowndes County received federal funds through a program designed to fund transit in rural regions. Like VITA, the system was on-demand one but operated through county agencies and nonprofits (Department of Family and Children Services, Lowndes Advocacy Resource Center, and Lowndes Associated Ministries to People) for the people that relied on their services. It was also small, composed of only a van and two 20-person shuttles. One of the shuttles also helped students travel to Valdosta Technical Institute.<sup>lxii</sup> Lowndes County followed this initial limited system with a wider one, the Lowndes County Transit System—that included a mixture of on-demand services and fixed routes operated by MIDS Inc. The system included just three vans at first, and MIDS switched to only on-demand service because of lagging ridership on the fixed routes. In its initial days, most of the ridership was comprised of “social service riders,” people whose fares were subsidized by the government and who used the system to access government services. In 2003, the system received a fourth van due to increased ridership.<sup>lxiii</sup>

Lowndes County led the region in providing public transit, and in 2005, conversations began to include Valdosta in a robust fixed transit system. The city and county hired a consultant to produce a feasibility study for fixed transit in the area, which found that a hub-and-spoke fixed transit system would have a high probability of success.<sup>lxiv</sup> A proposed plan made public in 2009 included two bus terminals, one in downtown Valdosta and another on Pendleton Drive. The Pendleton Drive hub would service Valdosta Technical College and Moody Air Force base. Cost, however, remained a concern, and no system was ever implemented.<sup>lxv</sup> However, public transit continued to come up in public conversations about transportation in Valdosta. When the city debuted its on-demand system in 2021, national news services like Reuters and the Associated Press contextualized the new system as a culmination of two-decades of disagreement and indecision. Since 2003, Valdosta had received and returned federal money for a transit system. City Manager Mark Barber and Mayor Scott Matheson extolled on-demand transit as a good compromise between higher-cost fixed transit and no public transit at all.<sup>lxvi</sup>



## Transportation Planning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Regional growth during the 1990s necessitated a long-range transportation plan that was adopted in 2005. The 2005 plan was the first joint Valdosta-Lowndes County plan; previous Lowndes County plans from 1964 and 1991 included Valdostans in the planning but focused on county roads outside the town.<sup>lxvii</sup> Once again, railroad overpasses garnered significant public attention. The 2005 plan called for an overpass on West Hill Avenue, west of downtown, to allow traffic to pass uninhibited over the Norfolk-Southern Railroad line.<sup>lxviii</sup> A story announcing public comment for the plan touted the proposed overpasses.<sup>lxix</sup> In a 2005 story announcing that city council was moving forward with the bridge, the parallels to the Beck Overpass were clear: just as the Patterson Street concept benefited north-south traffic, the new West Hill overpass would aid east-west traffic.<sup>lxx</sup> There was another important parallel, though unstated: the West Hill overpass would again be constructed in a Black neighborhood.<sup>lxxi</sup>

The neighborhood adjacent to West Hill Avenue and the Norfolk Southern Railroad was not as old as Southside, and its history is less well documented. Sanborn insurance maps from 1905 indicate little settlement west of Varnedoe Street, but similar maps from 1922 suggest the neighborhood had expanded west to surround the railroad line. The neighborhood was predominantly residential. Insurance maps give little indication of who lived there, but institutions are the best indicators. A Black Baptist church was located on Jackson Avenue—three to four blocks north of West Hill. There was a Colored Methodist Church further north, indicating that a Black neighborhood likely began around Jackson Avenue. In 1937, two mixed-race women who passed as white established a Phyllis Wheatley reading room on West Hill. The reading room was the headquarters for Valdosta’s Phyllis Wheatley Club, a Black women’s organization that provided space and opportunity for political discussion, socialization, education, and entertainment. The club was only active until the 1970s, after which the building became home to several churches before becoming vacant in 2011.<sup>lxxii</sup> Though probably constructed in a white neighborhood, by the early 2000s the neighborhood around West Hill had become a Black neighborhood.

The Phyllis Wheatley Club House was demolished in 2020 or 2021, but its demolition had less to do with the West Hill overpass than with issues of historic preservation. Abandoned since 2011, the building had fallen into disrepair; the land around it became a junkyard. Though the new overpass appears to have displaced significantly fewer people and structures than the Beck Overpass, some preservation activists have still connected the clubhouse’s destruction to its location at the foot of the West Hill overpass.<sup>lxxiii</sup> Transportation projects can erase history without demolishing structures or displacing people.



## References

- <sup>i</sup> Edward L. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 9–13.
- <sup>ii</sup> “Railroads,” Lowndes County Historical Society Museum, Valdosta, Georgia, <https://valdostamuseum.com/exhibitions/online-exhibits-2/transportation/railroads/>.
- <sup>iii</sup> Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, United States Census Bureau; Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, United States Census Bureau.
- <sup>iv</sup> Sapelo Treanor, “The Story of Valdosta,” *The Georgia Review* 9, no. 1 (Spring 1955): 95–96; Mathew Woody, “Tobacco, Timber, Cotton, Turpentine: The First Industries of Lowndes County,” *Valdosta Daily Times*, March 30, 2014, 4A.
- <sup>v</sup> Sanborn Fire Insurance Map from Valdosta, Lowndes County, Georgia, July 1905, Geography and Map Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., [https://www.loc.gov/resource/g3924vm.g3924vm\\_g015211905/?st=gallery](https://www.loc.gov/resource/g3924vm.g3924vm_g015211905/?st=gallery).
- <sup>vi</sup> Sanborn Map Company, Valdosta, Lowndes County, Georgia, January 1922, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for Georgia Towns and Cities, 1884–1941, Map and Government Information Library, University of Georgia, [https://dlg.usg.edu/record/dlg\\_sanb\\_valdosta-1922#item](https://dlg.usg.edu/record/dlg_sanb_valdosta-1922#item).
- <sup>vii</sup> “Southside Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form” (National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, 2007), [https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/GetAsset/NRHP/07000379\\_text](https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/GetAsset/NRHP/07000379_text).
- <sup>viii</sup> “Southside Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form” (National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, 2007), p. 15, [https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/GetAsset/NRHP/07000379\\_text](https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/GetAsset/NRHP/07000379_text).
- <sup>ix</sup> Sanborn Map Company, Valdosta, Lowndes County, Georgia, January 1922, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for Georgia Towns and Cities, 1884–1941, Map and Government Information Library, University of Georgia, [https://dlg.usg.edu/record/dlg\\_sanb\\_valdosta-1922#item](https://dlg.usg.edu/record/dlg_sanb_valdosta-1922#item).
- <sup>x</sup> “Southside Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form” (National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, 2007), p. 15, [https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/GetAsset/NRHP/07000379\\_text](https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/GetAsset/NRHP/07000379_text).
- <sup>xi</sup> Christopher C. Meyers, “‘Killing Them by the Wholesale’: A Lynching Rampage in South Georgia,” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 90, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 214–35.
- <sup>xii</sup> Ayers, *The Promise of the New South*, 156–59.
- <sup>xiii</sup> Meyers, “Killing Them by the Wholesale,” 220.
- <sup>xiv</sup> Thomas Aiello, “‘Not Too Far Removed from Slavery’: Police Brutality and Rights Activism in Valdosta, Georgia, 1945–55,” *Journal of Civil and Human Rights* 5, no. 2 (October 2019): 48.
- <sup>xv</sup> “About Us,” The Mary Turner Project, [maryturner.org](http://maryturner.org).
- <sup>xvi</sup> “Streetcar System,” Lowndes County Historical Society Museum, Valdosta, Georgia, <https://valdostamuseum.com/exhibitions/online-exhibits-2/transportation/streetcar-system/>.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Casey P. Cater, “Electrifying Race Relations: Atlanta’s Streetcars and the 1906 Race Riots,” *Atlanta Studies*, May 14, 2019, <https://atlantastudies.org/2019/05/14/casey-p-cater-electrifying-race-relations-atlantas-streetcars-and-the-1906-race-riots/#:~:text=The%20Georgia%20statute%2C%20serving%20as,boarded%20through%20the%20front%20entrance>.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Joseph Stromberg, “The Real Story Behind the Demise of America’s Once-Mighty Streetcars,” *Vox*, May 7, 2015, <https://www.vox.com/2015/5/7/8562007/streetcar-history-demise>.
- <sup>xix</sup> “Streetcar System,” Lowndes County Historical Society Museum, Valdosta, Georgia, <https://valdostamuseum.com/exhibitions/online-exhibits-2/transportation/streetcar-system/>.
- <sup>xx</sup> Bruce J. Schulman, *From Cotton Belt to Sunbelt: Federal Policy, Economic Development, and the Transformation of the South, 1938–1980* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994).
- <sup>xxi</sup> “Moody Air Force Base History,” Moody Air Force Base, <https://www.moody.af.mil/About-Us/>; Diamond, Beryl. “Moody Air Force Base.” *New Georgia Encyclopedia*, last modified Jun 8, 2017, <https://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/government-politics/moody-air-force-base/>.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Thomas Aiello, “‘Not Too Far Removed from Slavery’: Police Brutality and Rights Activism in Valdosta, Georgia, 1945–55,” *Journal of Civil and Human Rights* 5, no. 2 (October 2019): 46.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Aiello, “‘Not Too Far Removed from Slavery,’” 47.



- xxiv Aiello, ““Not Too Far Removed from Slavery,”” 49. Leonard D. Davis was the leader of the NAACP in Valdosta. See Ibid., 48.
- xxv Aiello, ““Not Too Far Removed from Slavery,”” 55.
- xxvi “Civil Rights Era,” Lowndes County Historical Society Museum, Valdosta, Georgia, <https://valdostamuseum.com/exhibitions/online-exhibits-2/people/african-american-history-in-lowndes-county/civil-rights-era/>; Lashayla Water, “Desegregation in Lowndes County,” Valdosta State University Archives and Special Collections, Valdosta, GA (hereafter cited as VSU), <https://www.valdosta.edu/academics/library/depts/archives-and-special-collections/regional-history/waters01.php>; Patricia A. Moore, “A Case Study in Peacefully School Desegregation: Lowndes County, Georgia,” Ph.D., diss., Valdosta State University, Valdosta, Georgia, 1997.
- xxvii “Interstate 75” Lowndes County Historical Society Museum, Valdosta, Georgia, <https://valdostamuseum.com/exhibitions/online-exhibits-2/transportation/interstate-75-through-lowndes/>.
- xxviii “The Death of Passenger Rail Service Through South Georgia,” *A Living History of Valdosta and Lowndes County*, www.enwoven.com, accessed February 14, 2024, <https://www.enwoven.com/collections/view/15368/timeline>.
- xxix James M. Beck, “Valdosta: A Case in Point,” *Georgia Municipal Journal*, (January 1967), 7. Available in Folder 2, Box 2, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xxx Matthew Woody, “The First Industrial Park: From Farm Land to the Future,” *Valdosta Daily Times*, March 30, 2014, 6A.
- xxxi Memorandum of Understanding, 1973, Fol. 2, Box 2, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xxxii Valdosta and Lowndes County Chamber of Commerce Annual Report, 1972, Folder 2, Box 2, Beck Papers, VSU; DeLeuw, Cather, and Co., Railroad Relocation and Grade Separation Feasibility Study, Valdosta, Georgia, November 1971, Fol. 6, Box 6, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xxxiii DeLeuw, Cather, and Co., Report to the City of Valdosta, Georgia, for a Railroad Relocation and Grade Separation Feasibility Study, Final Report, May 1978, Folder 1, Box 5, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xxxiv Thomas L. Gregory to John C. Gaillard, April 22, 1975, Fol. 1, Box 14, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xxxv Page Glotzer, *How the Suburbs Were Segregated: Developers and the Business of Exclusionary Housing, 1890–1960* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2020); Richard Rothstein, *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How our Government Segregated America* (New York: Liveright, 2017); Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).
- xxxvi Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 246–71.
- xxxvii Downtown Re-Development Study: Valdosta, Georgia, 1972, p. 3, Binder 2, Box 1, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xxxviii Downtown Re-Development Study: Valdosta, Georgia, 1972, pp. 62–64, Binder 2, Box 1, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xxxix Valdosta Area Transportation Study Prospectus, June 1973, Folder 5, Box 14, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xl E. L. Tyre to Gil A. Harbin, August 15, 1975, Fol. 1, Box 14, James Beck Collection, VSU. This letter includes the GDOT study of how to re-route traffic; Minutes of the Central Valdosta Redevelopment Authority, November 25, 1975, *ibid.*; Summary: Downtown Re-Development Study, n.d., *ibid.*
- xli Valdosta–Lowndes County Transportation Study: Adopted System, System #204 (Prioritized), Folder 1, Box 14, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xlii TPCC Meeting Minutes, April 22, 1977, Fol. 1, Box 14, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xliii Thomas D. Moreland to Billy Lee Evans, June 24, 1977, Fol. 1, Box 14, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xliv “Women’s Deaths Added Impetus for Overpass,” *Valdosta Daily Times*, December 23, 1978.
- xlv DeLeuw Cather and Co., Report to the City of Valdosta, Georgia, for a Railroad Relocation and Grade Separation Feasibility Study, Final Report, pp. III-23–24, May 1978, Folder 1, Box 5, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- xlvi DeLeuw Cather and Co., Report to the City of Valdosta, Georgia, for a Railroad Relocation and Grade Separation Feasibility Study, Final Report, p. III-30, May 1978, Fol. 1, Box 5, James Beck Collection VSU.
- xlvi DeLeuw Cather and Co., Report to the City of Valdosta, Georgia, for a Railroad Relocation and Grade Separation Feasibility Study, Final Report, p. V-3, May 1978, Fol. 1, Box 5, James Beck Collection VSU.
- xlvi “Southside Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form” (National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, 2007), p. 15.
- xlvi Valdosta City Council Minutes, March 7, 1985, p. 342, Fol. 1, Box 1, Houseal Collection, VSU.



- <sup>i</sup> Gwen Sommers Redwine, "Black Communities Impacted by GDOT, City Projects," *Valdosta Daily Times*, June 17, 2023, [https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/opinion/columns/redwine-black-communities-impacted-by-gdot-city-projects/article\\_c8369284-0a1d-11ee-a6d4-9b91dc20ef7d.html](https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/opinion/columns/redwine-black-communities-impacted-by-gdot-city-projects/article_c8369284-0a1d-11ee-a6d4-9b91dc20ef7d.html); Mackenzie Petrie, "Activists Claim Discrimination against Black Community in Valdosta, \$250M in Restorations Wanted," *WALB News 10*, December 1, 2022, <https://www.walb.com/2022/12/01/activists-claim-discrimination-against-black-community-valdosta-250m-restorations-wanted/>; Malia Thomas, "Activists Demand Southside Reparations," *Valdosta Daily Times*, January 5, 2023, [https://sports.yahoo.com/activists-demand-southside-reparations-001900333.html?guccounter=1&guce\\_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce\\_referrer\\_sig=AQAAAJePsVjB33E1D6\\_Zz-S75ndqWH9k5Xx54JMiGKyYO-bweEtjHFmsbVcqn\\_CCuXcZRdA1JYhyIIV0V50f-eJrer-Sy0r7eokXuxv4M9hIAxe9E6lvSFJ3oYpcFe99ZK6qnalCSZKrUqTVn84-iPCZg7gK537XETRGRDbbu73W09fX](https://sports.yahoo.com/activists-demand-southside-reparations-001900333.html?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAJePsVjB33E1D6_Zz-S75ndqWH9k5Xx54JMiGKyYO-bweEtjHFmsbVcqn_CCuXcZRdA1JYhyIIV0V50f-eJrer-Sy0r7eokXuxv4M9hIAxe9E6lvSFJ3oYpcFe99ZK6qnalCSZKrUqTVn84-iPCZg7gK537XETRGRDbbu73W09fX). The city of Valdosta has responded to some of these concerns by reinvesting in Southside. In fall 2023 it completed improvements to Griffin Avenue and South Patterson St., which made easier pedestrian access to a new Dollar General grocery store. The city has slotted \$2 million to improve southside, which includes a housing development. These decisions coincide with a re-survey of the neighborhood's historic resources in preparation to expand the local historic district into the neighborhood. See Brittanye Blake, "Valdosta's Southside to See Long-Awaited Improvements," *WALB News 10*, October 10, 2023, <https://www.walb.com/2023/10/11/valdostas-southside-see-long-awaited-improvements/>; Kasmira Smith, "Valdosta to Survey Historic Resources in Southside," *Valdosta Daily Times*, October 23, 2023, [https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/news/local\\_news/valdosta-to-survey-historic-resources-in-southside/article\\_b45ed756-71b7-11ee-8ae4-13c7f707ee76.html](https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/news/local_news/valdosta-to-survey-historic-resources-in-southside/article_b45ed756-71b7-11ee-8ae4-13c7f707ee76.html).
- <sup>ii</sup> Cameron Logan, *Historic Capital: Preservation, Race, and Real Estate in Washington, D.C.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).
- <sup>iii</sup> National Register of Historic Places Digital Archive on NPGallery, <https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/>.
- <sup>liii</sup> Bill Prescott, "Way Being Cleared for Overpass," *Valdosta Daily Times*, January 11, 1981, B1, in SPC-A [Special Contribution] James Beck Overpass, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, Lowndes County Historical Society (hereafter cited as LCHS).
- <sup>liv</sup> Woodrow Harris to James Beck, December 1969, Folder 2, Box 1, James Beck Collection, VSU.
- <sup>lv</sup> Civil Action No. 83-108 VAL," 1983, Folder 2, Box 1, Houseal Collection, VSU. William Houseal also brought attention on the voting system in Valdosta to the Voting Rights Division of the Department of Justice. See Houseal to Patricia Ito, January 10, 1983, Folder 1, Box 1, Houseal Collection, VSU.
- <sup>lvi</sup> Terry Richards, "Vickers Passes: Remembering Valdosta's First Black Mayor," *Valdosta Daily Times*, June 17, 2022, [https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/news/local\\_news/vickers-passes-remembering-valdostas-first-black-mayor/article\\_1d5e7801-8aa5-5304-8623-596255ee8ac2.html](https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/news/local_news/vickers-passes-remembering-valdostas-first-black-mayor/article_1d5e7801-8aa5-5304-8623-596255ee8ac2.html).
- <sup>lvii</sup> Archie McKay, "Valdosta Overpass Funds Approved by Legislature," *Valdosta Daily Times*, March 8, 1980, in SPC-A [Special Contribution] James Beck Overpass, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS.
- <sup>lviii</sup> James L. Stanley to Arthur R. Daniel Jr., July 1, 1988, Fol. 6, Box 6, Beck Collection, VSU.
- <sup>lix</sup> Martin Miller, "RR Crossing Block Solution is Sought," *Valdosta Daily Times*, March 27, 1968. Newspaper clipping chronicling the lengthy history of the overpass can be found in: Fol. 5, Box 5, Beck Collection, VSU.
- <sup>lx</sup> "Let's Assess the Need," *Valdosta Daily Times*, August 30, 1992, p. 4-A, in Trans-G-1, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS.
- <sup>lxi</sup> Ben Butler, "Local Transport System Facing a Bumpy Ride," *Valdosta Daily Times*, October 22, 1997, in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS.
- <sup>lxii</sup> Suzanne Harris, "County making Plans for Public Transportation System," *Valdosta Daily Times*, March 3, 1999 in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS; Stacey Green, "Public Transport System Nears Reality in Lowndes," *Valdosta Daily Times*, March 4, 1999, in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS.
- <sup>lxiii</sup> Bill Roberts, "Public Transit Coming," *Valdosta Daily Times*, December 2, 2001, in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS; Bill Roberts, "Mass Transit Meeting Goals," *Valdosta Daily Times*, December 13, 2001, in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS; Bill Roberts, "Lowndes Public Transit Fleet Expands," *Valdosta Daily Times*, November 27, 2003, in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS.



- <sup>lxiv</sup> Valdosta-Lowndes MPO Transit Feasibility Study, December 2006,  
<https://www.sgrc.us/documents/transportation/transit/82a12ac1b5570fd8fff178f760a830d1.pdf>.
- <sup>lxv</sup> Johnna Pinholster, "Transit Transportation Plan Possible as early as 2010," *Valdosta Daily Times*, April 4, 2009, in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS; Johnna Pinholster, "Transit Hub Considered For Pendleton Drive Area," *Valdosta Daily Times*, June 8, 2009, in Trans-D Clippings from 1998-2011 and newer, Standing File Collection by Susan McKey Thomas, LCHS.
- <sup>lxvi</sup> "Valdosta Launches System After Years of Debate," Associated Press, May 2, 2021,  
<https://apnews.com/article/valdosta-business-government-and-politics-75a9e143d3a565011291dbdae9434b61>.
- <sup>lxvii</sup> Valdosta-Lowndes County Planning Commission, "Public Improvements Program: Lowndes County Georgia," 1964, <https://www.sgrc.us/documents/transportation/archives/626c7634c282c53511e9ded9e9b7b5fd.pdf> Update of the 1991 Transportation Plan for the Greater Lowndes Transportation Study, 1997,  
<https://www.sgrc.us/documents/transportation/archives/3aa8661f7094cfac51f9512b9be5fe39.pdf>.
- <sup>lxviii</sup> Valdosta-Lowndes County Metro 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan, p. 58, 2005,  
<https://www.sgrc.us/documents/transportation/archives/aa66788a19ff29027de0730571babaa2.pdf>.
- <sup>lxix</sup> Ashley Harper, "Transportation Improvements for Lowndes," *WALB News*, August 23, 2005.
- <sup>lxx</sup> Bill Roberts, "Council Moves on Overpass," *Valdosta Daily Times*, September 11, 2014,  
[https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/news/local\\_news/council-moves-on-overpass/article\\_42bdb55b-5d07-5315-a543-106b23b9d2a5.html](https://www.valdostadailytimes.com/news/local_news/council-moves-on-overpass/article_42bdb55b-5d07-5315-a543-106b23b9d2a5.html).
- <sup>lxxi</sup> Anne Price et. al., "A Report on Key Indicators for Establishing Environmental Justice in Transportation Planning in Lowndes County," p. 6, 2015," May 4, 2015, South Georgia Regional Commission,  
<https://www.sgrc.us/documents/transportation/visionplans/bc008e84cc7e7508545f6630d2c503c4.pdf>.
- <sup>lxxii</sup> Kathryn Ferrall-Graff, "Phyllis Wheatley Club," *Reflections* 11, no. 1 (December 2012), 6–7.
- <sup>lxxiii</sup> See for instance the comments of Gwen Summers Redwine to the Valdosta City Council: Minutes Regular Meeting of the Valdosta City Council, May 6, 2021, p. 14,  
<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.valdostacity.com/file/5379/download%3Ftoken%3DcFsz6OCH&ved=2ahUKEwinotH2tJeFAxVu4ckDHbVxCDeQFnoECBEQAQ&usg=AOvVaw0OhX6srviUlhYMcLzL3TK1>.



## **APPENDIX B: STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Amy	Martin	SGRC
Kimberly	Hobbs	SGRC
George	Page	Valdosta-Lowndes Parks and Recreation Authority
Jim	Galloway	Valdosta Regional Airport
Richard	Hardy	City of Valdosta
Ben	O'Dowd	City of Valdosta
Larry	Ogden	City of Valdosta Public Works
Scott	Matheson	City of Valdosta
Mike	Martin	City of Valdosta Community Development Department
Christie	Moore	Valdosta-Lowndes County Chamber of Commerce
Andrea	Schuijer	Valdosta Lowndes Development Authority
Robin	Cumbus	Lowndes County Public Works Department
Mike	Fletcher	Lowndes County
Bill	Slaughter	Lowndes County Board of Commissioners
Paige	Dukes	Lowndes County Manager
Ronald	Dean	South Georgia Medical Center
Ray	Sable	Valdosta State University
Jill	Ferrell	Valdosta State University
Shannon	McConico	Wiregrass Technical College
Brenda	Exum	Ray City
Jena	Sandlin	City of Lake Park
Mike	Terrell	City of Remerton
Bruce	Cain	City of Hahira
Patrick	Folsom	Brooks County Board of Commissioners
James	Maxwell	Brooks County Board of Commissioners
Robert	Griner	Berrien County
Alex	Lee	Lanier County
Ronald	Skrine	Fire Department
Demarcus	Marshall	Lowndes County Commissioner
Kristen	Varney	Moody Air Force Base
Craig	Lockhart	Valdosta City School District
Sandra	Wilcher	Lowndes County Schools
Leggett	Lovan	Southeastern Freight Lines
Alan	Worley	Bicycle/Pedestrian Advocate



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Phil	Hubbard	Dillards Valdosta Distribution Center
Cindy	Romero	Wild Adventures
Joseph	Longo	FHWA
Ann-Marie	Day	FHWA
Vanda	Radovic	GDOT
Scott	Chambers	GDOT
Dennis	Carter	GDOT
Jaqueline	Williams	GDOT
Ted	Hicks	GDOT
Teresa	Bolton	City of Valdosta, Contact for Mayors Council of Persons with Disabilities
James	Horton	Southern Georgia Regional Commission
John	Dillard	Lowndes County
Matt	Martin	City of Valdosta
Jonathan	Sumner	City of Hahira



## APPENDIX C: STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING NOTES

---



## Stakeholder Meeting #1 – March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

---

### Meeting Information

VLMP0 2050 MTP Update  
Stakeholder Meeting  
March 6, 2024, 1:00-2:30pm  
Southern Georgia Regional Commission  
1937 Carlton Adams Drive, Valdosta, GA 31601

### List of Attendees

- **Mary Beth Brownlee**, One Valdosta-Lowndes
- **John Dillard**, Lowndes County
- **Mike Fletcher**, Lowndes County
- **Richard Hardy**, City of Valdosta
- **Amy Martin**, SGRC
- **Matt Martin**, City of Valdosta
- **Ben O’Dowd**, City of Valdosta
- **Ray Sable**, Valdosta State University
- **Kristen Varney**, Moody Air Force Base
- **Don Williams**, Valdosta Airport
- **Sandra Tooley**, Valdosta City Council
- **Vivian Miller-Cody**, Valdosta City Council
- **Rob Schiffer**, Metro Analytics
- **Gabrielle Westcott**, Metro Analytics
- **Mary Huffstetler**, MPH and Associates
- **Vanda Radovic**, GDOT
- **Cheyenne Thompson**, GDOT
- **Joseph Longo**, FHWA

### Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Presentation of Plan Development Process and Status
3. Discussion of Draft MTP Goals and Objectives
4. Discussion of Existing Conditions and Transportation Needs
5. Next Steps



## Meeting Notes

### Discussion of Draft MTP Goals and Objectives

**Draft: Goal 1 – Safety and System Reliability:** Maintain and improve transportation system safety for all users and improve the overall resilience of the network from natural and manmade events.

Proposed changes:

- add “and accessibility” after “safety”

**Draft: Goal 2 – Infrastructure Condition:** Maintain an efficient transportation system within the Valdosta-Lowndes MPO area for residents, businesses, and visitors.

Proposed changes:

- add college and K-12 students

**Draft: Goal 3 – Congestion Reduction:** Encourage implementation of TSM and TDM to reduce traffic congestion and promote low-cost solutions to road capacity.

Proposed changes:

- no changes proposed

**Draft: Goal 4 – Freight Movement and Economic Vitality:** Ensure a financially balanced plan that works to strengthen economic development initiatives through people and freight accessibility.

Proposed changes:

- add “and movement” after “accessibility”

**Draft: Goal 5 – Environmental Sustainability:** Limit and mitigate adverse environmental impacts associated with traffic and transportation system development through facilities design and system management.

Proposed changes:

- add “natural and social” before “environment” to address equity

**Draft: Goal 6 – Reduced Project Delivery Delays:** Promote efficient system management and operation

Proposed changes:

- no changes proposed

Add new **Goal 7** focused primarily on equity.

### Discussion of Existing Conditions and Transportation Needs

#### Roadway and Rail

The combination of 2-lane roads from Valdosta to Moody Air Force Base: Val Del Road, McMillan Road, Skipper Bridge/Reed Road, River Road, Cat Creek Road is experiencing growth in development. Issues



include flooding, lack of shoulders, and lack of bicycle lanes. A proposed widening of Val Del Road is under consideration.

Bemiss Road near Moody Air Force Base has high traffic volumes and is congested. There are sidewalks but not a lot of affordable housing that is close to the base. There is not an option to get to the installation without a car. Even those living in apartments must have a car to get to the base. This is difficult for the airmen who do not have a lot of money. Transportation alternatives may be beneficial. Sidewalks and bike lanes may not be that helpful. Public transportation is needed.

Clay Road approaching US 84 is backed up when residents from the south side of town are trying to get to work and the grocery store. Additional issues include the railroad crossing causing traffic delays and damage to cars passing over the tracks. Pedestrian activity is high and there is a lack of sidewalks. Going down 84 at certain times of the day, both entering and exiting, traffic backs up. Trucks conducting business at ABM create a delay causing vehicles to have to wait for them to finish their business and unblock travel lanes. Clay Road is under consideration as a south truck bypass and there is already a conflict between trucks, vehicles, and pedestrians.

The MTP study team needs to revisit projects after May 21 TIA2 vote. Proper wording is needed to explain the program and the vote to the public so they can understand what the passage of TIA could bring to the area.

There is a general lack of east/west corridors in the area.

The roadway network is undersized creating a general capacity issue in many existing corridors. Existing 2-lane roads may need to become 4 lanes while many 4-lane roads need to be 6 or 8 lanes.

Many existing roadways may be adequate across a daily average yet peak hour traffic causes problems. These issues are noted in school zones (morning drop off, afternoon pick up), daycares, and popular coffee shops. Some drive thru restaurants are causing lines of vehicles to queue into the roadway blocking through traffic. There is a need to examine peak hour conditions as opposed to simply daily average traffic.

Railroad crossings at grade create an ongoing problem of train traffic. Train traffic volume is increasing. Major rail carriers have switching yards in the core of community causing train traffic to move slower. This results in blocked crossings for 15-30 minutes per switch. Two notable locations with this issue include St. Augustine and Clay Road. St. Augustine Road is proposed to have a grade separated overpass.

The at grade rail crossings are having an impact on commercial and industrial development land use, particularly along Clay Road.

Baytree Road, a major 4-lane road, is one of the busiest railroad crossings in the southeast. A grade separated railroad overpass is needed. It is a local street and there are environmental constraints due to the Sugar Creek crossing making funding a real obstacle. Any bridge would need to cross both stream and rail and come back to grade quickly due to two signalized intersections. When trains stop, emergency vehicles cannot get through because the overpass is filled with traffic and roadways are at a standstill with Lee Street, Church Street, Barack Obama traffic backed up. The total project cost is



estimated to be \$60-80 million. Issues involve jurisdictional conflicts and impacts to properties that lie within two cities' jurisdictions. This single project would utilize most of the TIA project budget which is not palatable. Due to TIA restrictions, any project designed with TIA funding must be constructed. If doing multiple phases, they must be completed within a certain time frame creating a danger if TIA3 does not pass.

Discussions have been had with the railroad regarding rail switching time. Many are scheduled during lunchtime and at 5pm when vehicle traffic is heaviest in some areas.

Examine proposed project slated by GDOT for two roundabouts in the Five Points area. There are concerns that these two projects may have a negative impact on adjacent intersections. The Oak Street Extension and Smithbriar Drive roundabouts in proximity will be a major project. Concerns about downstream effects on adjacent intersections to the south during peak hour. Consider Ashley St. during peak hour (4:50-5:10) heading out of town, northwest, toward N. Valdosta Road on Ashley. Similarly, heading into town on Patterson, backups may occur. If the two roundabouts have desired effect, next downstream intersection – N. Valdosta Rd. and Bemiss Road are likely to have issues. Those two roundabout installations may simply move the problem to adjacent intersections. Cherry Creek Road is already congested. Look at the potential cascading effects of the 5-points roundabouts and how they will affect the downstream signalized intersections. Design and construction documents for the two roundabouts are complete and available.

There is a need to extend Barak Obama Blvd to Bemiss Road providing access from Barack Obama to Bemiss Road. It could come down Forrest Street and connect to Barack Obama. There are a number of traffic accidents at Forrest and now a signal and a green turn arrow. Improving this area would aid in Moody Air Force Base traffic have access coming to and from on Bemiss and Barack Obama. The original scope included extending the road it all the way out to Bemiss and the scope had to be cut back the project because of funding.

Total traffic volume in terms of numbers of vehicles needs to be broken down by type. Not all types of vehicles are the same - especially truck traffic. Truck traffic needs to be analyzed separately. Two major industries have been announced on the horizon creating a need to examine the impact of truck traffic on roadways. Hundreds of trucks are proposed to use roadways where there are currently none. Also, I-75 is a major truck corridor with several existing truck stops and more new ones coming. Examine Exit 16 & 18 specifically for vehicles mixing with trucks.

Consider grade separation at some major intersections. A revisit of the data may affect design and timing. Like Inner Perimeter & US-84 has been identified for a long time. The addition of a high volume of trucks makes the design critical. Inner Perimeter & Bemiss Road should also be reconsidered.

South Patterson northbound at Griffin Ave area is building up. Truck traffic is increasing. Pedestrians are walking across the small median area by the new DG market. Tractor trailers and cars are mixing with pedestrians crossing in that area. Traffic control is needed for safety as this issue will continue to grow.

Some intersections are not at 90 degrees. Some have been rebuilt as it became a critical need, but there are others that need it. Griffin/S. Patterson is one of them. The intersection of Madison Hwy and Inner



Perimeter is another. Based on volumes there, it does not make sense any longer. It makes more sense to have Inner Perimeter Road head to the interstate and have Madison Highway feed in.

North Valdosta Road - generally, from I-75 to where it ends – the volumes are not going to go down, especially during peak hours. Long term, access management should be considered.

Look at the number of accidents at N. Valdosta Rd. and Val Del Road.

## **Transit**

A Transit Oriented Development Study is underway as a guide for the city and the county.

A Regional Transit Plan is coming soon.

The transit pilot project led to Valdosta on Demand. It is working well, showing the need for more transit. The current system does not have enough vehicles, drivers, etc. Having issues fulfilling demand. The program creates a way to get to work with VSU buses, but do not have a way to get home from work. VSU buses end at 9. If VSU to combine and work with Valdosta On Demand, that would be great. VSU – cost is a lot higher than they thought it would be when it first started. It has about 6 buses. Runs hourly now. Now only A-line and B-line – used to be more lines. Do not run on weekends. Maybe 8,000 people come to campus every day and can walk. More people are attending classes online. People want transportation away from campus to go to the mall or go out somewhere. Scheduled stops could be designed to accommodate both college students and visitors. At one time VSU had buses running to and from the mall. Now service runs only on specific days at a specific time, rather than at a frequent and recurring level.

No use of electric bikes or scooters currently.

The need for a 24-hour bank with access by vehicle in the south Valdosta was expressed.



## Public Meeting #1 – May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024

---

### Meeting Information

**VLMPo 2050 MTP Update**

**Public Meeting**

**May 9, 2024, 4:00-7:00pm**

**McMullen Southside Library**

**527 Griffin Avenue, Valdosta, GA 31601**

### List of Attendees

- **Ariel Godwin**
- **James Cagle**
- **Alesha Sparkman**
- **Sandra Tooley**
- Commissioner **Demarcus Marshall**
- Councilwoman **Vivian Miller-Cody**
- Mayor **Scott James Matheson**
- **Carlos Hundley**
- **Amy Martin**, SGRC
- **Rob Schiffer**, Metro Analytics
- **Gabrielle Westcott**, Metro Analytics
- **Mary Huffstetler**, MPH and Associates

### Meeting Design and Agenda:

A PowerPoint presentation covering the agenda outlined below was presented several times during the meeting period and was live streamed on the VLMPo Facebook Page at

<https://m.facebook.com/ValdostaLowndesMPO/videos/1395211627714520/> during the meeting. The

PowerPoint presentation and Facebook Live recording are both available on [www.sgrc.us/vlmpo.html](http://www.sgrc.us/vlmpo.html).

### PowerPoint Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Project Approach and Key Milestones
3. Updated Study Goals
4. Equity Considerations (HEAL)
5. Existing Transportation System
6. Current Demographic Conditions
7. Safety Considerations
8. Bridge and Pavement Conditions
9. Project Schedule



## 10. Next Steps

In addition to the formal presentation, two interactive breakout stations were conducted to illustrate existing transportation conditions. The first station highlighted the Historical Equity Action Lens (HEAL) element of the study. HEAL identifies where today's costs and performance deficiencies are linked to inequitable past decisions, events, and forces not considered when developing plans in the past. Historical documents and findings were available for review in hard copy and an ArcGIS StoryMaps, now available at [www.sgrc.us/vlmpo.html](http://www.sgrc.us/vlmpo.html) was presented to illustrate a historical timeline of past decisions, events, and forces. New performance measures and criteria for evaluation will be incorporated into the current plan update. The considerations include preservation of historically significant sites, increasing connectivity and access to jobs, food, medical care, retail, and recreation for residents in Areas of Persistent Poverty (AoPPs) and Historically Disadvantaged Communities (HDCs), and consideration of transportation needs of non-car users.

A second interactive breakout station included a review of the existing transportation system conditions. Topic areas included existing roadways, transit operations, bicycle-pedestrian facilities, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)/ Emerging Transportation Technology, Rail (Freight), Ancillary Truck Facilities (rail yards, warehouses, weigh stations, and truck parking), and Aviation. Current demographic conditions were discussed including household income and households without vehicles. Additional demographic data will be utilized in a transportation demand model to understand existing and future transportation system conditions. The travel demand model will be projected to the year 2050 to identify future needs. Safety data including accidents, injury rates, and fatalities for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians within the region was presented. Bridge and pavement condition data was presented. Hard copy maps were available for participants to record transportation needs.

### Next Steps:

1. Complete Existing Conditions Report
2. Forecast socioeconomic data to 2050.
3. Identify 2050 transportation needs and deficiencies.
4. The next round of stakeholder and public meetings will be held in September.

### Meeting Notes:


1. Alden Avenue new sidewalk between Jerry Jones and Baytree Drive is narrow and blocked by mailboxes. It is impossible for wheelchair users at certain points. This is an example of public funds being spent on substandard infrastructure. To address the problem, VLMPO jurisdictions should adopt and follow sidewalk design standards with a recommended clear, unobstructed width of four feet.
2. Oak Street needs sidewalks between Gornto and Valdosta Middle School. Kids want to walk to school there and there is inadequate shoulder space. It is hazardous.
3. Grant Road needs sidewalks from Oak Street to Jerry Jones Drive. This is needed not just for walking on Gornto but for connecting to neighborhoods that are cut off from other areas.
4. Berkley Drive needs sidewalks specifically because a large number of seniors walk there daily, and drivers have been observed behaving unsafely with them.
5. Edgar/Jerry Jones Drive needs sidewalks from Oak Street to Baytree Drive. This is especially important because the local streets on either side are staggered with almost no intersections



going straight across. This means that to cross Edgar/Jerry Jones at any point, it's necessary to walk along the major road for some distance. Therefore, the major road needs sidewalks.

6. Park Avenue has numerous schools. Some widening, sidewalks, and bike lanes are needed. The railroad crossing is problematic. Traffic is backing up on Park Avenue and this causes problems for emergency vehicles.
7. Country Club Drive needs sidewalks between Highway 7 and Northside.
8. Northside/Edgar needs sidewalks between Country Club Drive and Gortto.
9. Ashley Drive during PM peak northbound toward five points, the backup is long.
10. The intersection of Patterson/Ashley/Oak/Northside near the hospital is always busy and congested. Two roundabouts are planned here. Bicycle lanes are needed in this area. Citizens ride the bus and bicycling, and transit are their only means of transportation.
11. Connell Road at Ashley (north of Northside) experiences congestion and it is hard to get out onto Ashley from Connell. Julia Street by the library and Blue Pool Road, just one block north, is an easier place to get out. (2 meeting participants expressed this concern)
12. Advertise future public meetings at local libraries.
13. Why are trains on the southside longer and coming through at inconvenient times? This is hard to get around for pedestrians and cyclists. When the train comes through and stops, it prevents access to the soup kitchen located in the remaining part of Liberty Theater. People are crossing between stopped rail cars, some even carrying bicycles between stopped box cars. This is the CSX Line. It could be due to different rail companies and different schedules.
14. The southside has lots of bikers and walkers and transportation would be great.
15. Valdosta on demand is somewhat unreliable.
16. The road is often blocked by stopped trains just past Park Avenue/Barak Obama.
17. The TOD plan for transit will be complete June 30. Review this plan for the possibility of mobility hubs. Savannah and Lee should be looked at as transit hubs.
18. Look at ridership data for Valdosta on Demand
19. Funding is needed to expand transit service. The demand is there.
20. An autonomous transit demonstration project is being considered.
21. Look at transit signal preemption.
22. Add E bikes and E scooters to the technology discussion.
23. Look at the Park Avenue Corridor east of Barak Obama. Would like to mirror Barak Obama to the east. There are rail crossings and multiple schools. This project has been moved to TIA Tier 2.
24. Look at the Val del TIA funding schedule. It is in Tier 2 and needs to be moved to Tier 1.
25. Note an 80-acre Walmart dairy hub facility that will be under construction at southeast quadrant of 84/Perimeter in 2025
26. A new school and fiber optics are planned along the perimeter (84-Park)







## Stakeholder Meeting #2 – November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024

---

### Meeting Information

**VLMPD 2050 MTP Update**  
**Stakeholder Meeting**  
**November 7, 2024, 1:30-3:00pm**  
**McMullen Southside Library**  
**527 Griffin Avenue, Valdosta, GA 31601**

### List of Attendees

- **Hilda McFall**
- **Torrence Weaver**, SGRC
- **Alexandra Arzayus**, SGRC
- **Rob Schiffer**, Metro Analytics
- **Mary Huffstetler**, MPH and Associates

### Meeting Design and Agenda

#### PowerPoint Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Project Approach and Key Milestones
3. Existing Conditions Report
4. Anticipated Future Year 2050 Demographic Growth
5. Expected Traffic Growth through the year 2050
6. Revised Project Schedule
7. Next /Ongoing Steps

In addition to the formal presentation, an interactive breakout station was conducted to illustrate existing transportation conditions. The breakout station included two maps used to review the transportation system conditions.

#### Meeting Notes:

1. There should be a fixed route bus system in the area
2. Additional bicycle trails would be beneficial.
3. There is a railroad crossing near Industrial Boulevard and S. St. Augustine where the crossing is often blocked for long periods of time. Citizens are encouraged to call the City of Valdosta Engineering Department if the crossing is blocked for more than a minute or two.
4. Post future meeting notification on the Lowndes County Word of Mouth FB Page and the library FB pages..
5. It would be desirable to have a safe path to walk from Lake Park to the commercial area on Lakes Boulevard at I-75 Exit 5. Lock Laurel is not safe to walk on. There are no sidewalks.



- Pedestrians are frequently cutting through Ridge neighborhood using the cell phone tower dirt road and private residential property.
6. Getting onto SR 376 from Lock Laurel is difficult and dangerous. This is currently a 2-way stop-controlled intersection.
  7. Look into the possibility of eligibility of BIL resiliency funding for the area.



## Stakeholder Meeting #3 & Public Meeting #2 – May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025

---

### Meeting Information

**VLMPPO 2050 MTP Update**

**Stakeholder Meeting: 1:30-3:00pm**

**Public Meeting: 4:00-7:00 pm**

**May 15, 2025**

**McMullen Southside Library**

**527 Griffin Avenue, Valdosta, GA 31601**

### Stakeholder Attendees

- **Mike Fletcher**, Lowndes County Engineering
- **Larry Ogden**, Valdosta Public Works
- Valdosta Councilwoman **Sandra Tooley**
- **Ronald Skrine**, Valdosta Fire Department, VLMPPO CAC
- **Chad McLeod**, Lowndes County Engineering
- **Amy Martin**, SGRC
- **Rob Schiffer**, Metro Analytics
- **Mary Huffstetler**, MPH and Associates

### Public Attendees

- **Joyce Evans**
- Commissioner **Demarcus Marshall**
- **Carlos Hundley**

### Meeting Design and Agenda

A PowerPoint presentation covering the agenda outlined below was presented.

#### Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Project Approach and Key Milestones
3. Review of Future Year 2050 Transportation Need Projects
4. Alternate Future Development Scenarios
5. Estimated Cost of Future Year 2050 Transportation Projects
6. Anticipated Future Year 2050 Transportation Revenues
7. Evaluation Criteria Prioritizing Projects for Funding
8. Preliminary 2050 Cost Affordable Plan
9. Project Schedule and Next Steps



In addition to the formal presentation, seven boards were displayed illustrating draft project locations.

## Meeting Notes

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: Many biking and walking areas do not currently have sidewalks. A plan is needed for connecting residential areas to schools, shopping, and services. Response: The City of Valdosta has received a Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) grant from the USDOT that should identify additional locations for active transportation projects.

Bicycle Traffic: The City of Valdosta has bicycle riders. Safe facilities are needed to accommodate these riders. People are commuting to work on bicycles and children are walking to school. The draft recommendations are located north of where most residents ride bicycles. Much of the bicycle traffic occurs south of US 84. The following roadways experience bicycle traffic: Fry Street, Troup Street, South Patterson (fast cyclists are coming off the bridge), Oak Street, Toombs Street, Tillman Street, Industrial Boulevard, and Madison Highway. The Civic Center area also needs sidewalks. This area was last studied in 2009. A suggestion was made to revisit bicycle and pedestrian needs in this area. Response: The 2050 MTP includes bicycle lanes on South Oak Street, between Central Avenue and Old Clyattville Road, while sidewalks have been proposed on Toombs Street, between Crane Avenue and Old Clyattville Road, along with sidewalks on sections of Old Hudson Street and Lake Park Road. Troup Street already has dedicated bike lanes. Fry Street could be another good candidate for bike lanes in the 2050 MTP.

South Patterson/ Old Clyattville Road Intersection: Traveling north on South Patterson Avenue, log trucks turning left onto Old Clyattville Road heading to Langdale Lumber need more room for turning or a dedicated left turn lane. The logs swing out into the adjacent travel lanes. Response: Add an intersection improvement project at this location.

Fixed Route Transit: It was suggested to study similar communities for ideas for a potential fixed route transit service. MPO funding through a PL grant could potentially be used for this effort. Response: 2050 MTP includes a feasibility study for fixed route transit.

Project ID R-06 (Baytree Road North Extension/Coleman): This project proposes an extension/new roadway parallel to I-75. It is currently on the illustrative list but should be considered as a funded project. It was suggested that this roadway could accommodate a good bit of traffic. The Lowndes County Engineering Department can assist in cost estimation and the project should be considered for moving higher on the priority list. Response: 2050 MTP is being revised to include funding for the PE phase of this project.

Project ID R-28 (New I-75 Interchange): If project ID R-06 is implemented and Coleman is improved, this project would tie in to complement the functionality of the area. Response: This project is not needed unless R-29 is funded.

Project ID R-29 (I-75/SR 7 Connector): This project is expensive due to multiple river crossings. Past discussions with GDOT indicated they will not fund it due to the proximity to I-75. Response: This project is not needed unless R-28 is funded.



Roadway Paving to Support Affordable Housing: The plan should consider paving a road on the east side of Lowndes County to support the need for affordable housing development in the county. Paving a roadway connecting US 84 and SR 31 (perhaps Bergman Road, Marshall Road, or Black Road are good candidates) was suggested. Response: Moore Crossing Road is a paved roadway connecting SR 31 (US 221) and US 84 east of Inner Perimeter Road. Affordable housing and roadway paving are not typically addressed in an MTP. Roadway paving should be discussed further with Lowndes County Public Works. Affordable housing has been a priority within the city limits of Valdosta and can be part of other initiatives at the county level.

## **Next Steps:**

27. The comments received at these meetings will be addressed and incorporated prior to the June 4 Policy Committee Meeting where the draft plan will be presented.
28. MTP package was emailed to all stakeholders with a request for comment no later than May 23, 2025.
29. Draft MTP will be presented to all MPO committees during the first week of June.
30. The Draft Plan will be available during the summer for public comment with adoption anticipated in September.



## APPENDIX D: ONLINE CITIZEN SURVEY SUMMARY

---



## Survey Summary

### VLMPO 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

#### Survey Summary

June 2024

The Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO) issued a survey about transportation needs and opportunities during the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update process to reflect transportation infrastructure and policy needs through horizon year 2050. Thirty-seven (37) participants responded to the survey. Fifty-eight (58) percent of participants reported living in the City of Valdosta, thirty (30) percent in Lowndes County outside of the City of Valdosta, three (3) percent in Lanier County and nine (9) percent indicated they live outside of the VLMPO study area.

Of the respondents, seventy (70) percent commute to work in the VLMPO area and ten (10) percent commute to work outside of the VLMPO area. Twenty (20) percent of participants do not commute to work outside of their home. Of the respondents that do commute to work, ninety (90) percent commute alone by car, seven percent travel by walking and three percent commute by public transportation.

Respondents varied by age as follows: eight (8) percent were 18-24; four (4) percent were 25-34; thirty-two (32) percent were 35-44; sixteen (16) percent were 45-54; twelve (12) percent were 55-64 and twenty-four (14) percent were over age 65. Four percent of the respondents did not report their age.

For general transportation needs outside of commuting to work, ninety-two (92) percent of respondents reported driving alone as the transportation mode they use most often. Five (5) percent of respondents walk most often, and three (3) percent use public transportation.

### Transportation System

Participants were asked, “How does the current transportation system shape your daily travel habits including where you travel, when you travel, and the transportation mode you choose to get there?” The following responses were provided.

- Infrastructure is not up to capacity, with growing population especially roads such as St. Augustine, Baytree Road, and North Valdosta Road.
- Congestion on Val Del has increased my travel time to work by nearly 10 mins over the last 3 years. Alternate routes through town seem to be more dangerous as I have witnessed or almost been involved in accidents multiple times. Probably once a month or so I see accidents on N Valdosta Road, Inner Perimeter, or Bemiss Road during my commutes. The backroads are preferable, but they are only two lanes and often have slow-moving farm equipment with no turn offs. Additionally, the congestion from so many new houses on Val Del has made that even slower and less reliable.
- Too much traffic at 5 Points.
- It is too dangerous to travel any other way other than by car. no shoulders on the roads or sidewalks. I leave at 6:45 am each day to get to work, as later in the morning it takes too long with the traffic. Try to plan around high traffic times.



- Using Valdosta on Demand for clients at work is very unreliable, and it needs more options for public transit on the weekends, VOD interface is very non-user friendly.
- It is great but we need a better (public) transportation model than Valdosta on Demand. It helps just a little, but it can be hard to get rides sometimes.
- I would take public transportation if it were available.
- Valdosta is long overdue for a fixed route bus system.
- The current transit system is not reliable.
- We prefer public transit, but it is not available in our area, so we drive.
- There is no public transportation available where I live outside the city limits of Valdosta, so I drive to work. My schedule varies from day to day, so I have not considered carpooling as an alternative to driving alone.
- There is no public transportation or bike lanes, so I drive.
- Very car centric but lacking in bicycling and walking, especially in developing suburban areas of the community.
- I really wish we had more sidewalks and safer pedestrian spaces. I live very close to my kids' school and to my work. I could easily walk my kid to school and then walk to work, but instead I must drive. This is ridiculous!!! We need more and better sidewalks and pedestrian-specific infrastructure.
- The train crossings impact when and which path of travel I take. I can get caught by the train two times on my way to work otherwise. I must drive further to avoid them.
- Trains affect which way I go and when. I can get caught twice when I go to work. I must drive further out of my way to avoid train traffic.
- Need more walkable routes. More sidewalks on Park Avenue, Alden, Ashley, etc. I would walk more with more sidewalks.
- I would love to walk more (to the YMCA, Walgreens, etc.) but Gornto is too dangerous.
- There are numerous routes I cannot safely bike or walk on, so I drive to those areas though I prefer biking/walking.
- I would like to walk more but there is a lack of sidewalks. More sidewalks are needed, especially on high-traffic urban streets (Gornto, Jerry Jones, and many others). I would walk more if sidewalks offered a more pleasant pedestrian environment. Recently constructed sidewalks in the City of Valdosta have been built with subpar design, such as the sidewalk on Alden Avenue that is blocked by mailboxes at multiple points. The city should adopt and adhere to best practices for pedestrian facility design.
- Due to the longer-than-normal travel distance, I usually travel by myself in my own vehicle, as transportation would not be available otherwise.
- I need a car to get almost anywhere from my suburban location.
- The only choice I have is to drive my car to work.
- There is no public transit or bike lanes. So, I drive.
- It would only have an effect if there was a plan that routed heavy trucks from the center of town to allow a more vibrant business district and nightlife for downtown.
- Travel options depend on the traffic load.
- Retired, drive to get several bags of groceries, need car.



- My commute to work is barely one mile consisting mostly of residential streets in my neighborhood.
- The current transportation system does not affect my decision on which route I take to get into Valdosta.
- My current transportation habits are shaped by what I need to do at any given time. I always use my personal vehicle.
- It does not affect me.

## Safety

When asked, “Considering all modes of transportation (cars, trucks, cyclists, pedestrians) have you experienced any transportation safety issues in the VLMPO Area?,” twenty participants responded with fourteen indicating having experienced safety issues and six reported no safety issues. The following comments were provided.

- very congested with cars on the north side of area coming into Valdosta. Other than right downtown, there are no bike lanes or sidewalks, or even shoulders of the road to walk/bike.
- The CSX train, Norman Dr./St. Augustine Road., US84/Norman Drive.
- Inner Perimeter Road and 5 Points Area.
- N Valdosta Rd, Inner Perimeter (especially at the intersection with N Valdosta), and Bemiss Rd. Bemiss Rd is especially scary near the Forrest St Extension area.
- Corner of Oak and Central
- Baytree Road, Gornto, St Augustine, and Bemiss
- I live on Slater Street and there are no sidewalks on my street. Additionally, cars run the stop signs. In addition to sidewalks, we need something to deter running stop signs such as speed bumps.
- I am afraid of endangering cyclists and pedestrians.
- Car accident at Williams and Park. Motorcyclist once involved walking and biking accidents on Baytree Road, Bemis and Ashley
- Not enough bike lanes
- Major city streets (Ashley, Bemiss, Baytree, etc.) are unsafe for cyclists.
- Reckless driving has increased since the Pandemic. This is a documented nationwide effect. More enforcement is needed.
- Various intersections

## Sidewalks

When asked, “Within the VLMPO Area, have you experienced a lack of sidewalks or connections between sidewalk segments?,” twenty participants responded with eighteen reporting they have experienced sidewalk concerns and two reporting no sidewalk issues. The following comments were provided.

- Mostly on Inner Perimeter Road. On any given day, there are people walking along the roadside in the grass.
- Forrest Street/Obama Blvd, Park Avenue/Lakeland Hwy, River Street, and N Valdosta Road
- Slater Street, and all the streets that intersect with Slater Street.



- Inner Perimeter, St. Augustine
- There is a long stretch of Bemiss between Inner Perimeter and Northside that does not have sidewalks.
- Lack of sidewalks: - Gornto Road from Oak Street to Jerry Jones Drive - Jerry Jones Drive/Eager Road from Baytree Road to Oak Street - E Park Avenue from Patterson Street to Ashley Street - Alden Avenue from Williams Street to Jerry Jones Drive - Azalea Drive from Gornto Rd to Cranford Ave (a popular racetrack for speeders) - Berkley Drive from Eager Rd to Gornto Road (many seniors walk there and drivers often "buzz" them, passing too close)
- A lot of locations in the City of Valdosta do not have sidewalks.
- I have noticed the lack of sidewalks, but I do not often use them in the county, outside of the city limits.
- Various locations throughout the city of Valdosta
- Very much so. That is one reason I hardly ever walk.
- Some nice segments. But large sections with no sidewalks. Sidewalks should be connected more.
- Not sure there is a need for sidewalks everywhere, but the main roads of travel would be nice.
- Sidewalks are rare. I seldom see one.

## Bicycle Routes

When asked, "Within the VLMPO Area, have you experienced a lack of safe bicycle routes or connections between bikeable areas?," twenty participants responded with sixteen reporting experience related to bicycle routes or connections and four reported no concerns. The following comments were provided.

- People like to bike along Val Del/McMillan/Skipper Bridge, and it is terrifying because there are no actual bike lanes, so they just share the road, which is extremely curvy, and many areas have limited visibility.
- Crossing Ashley Street, St Augustine, and Perimeter can be challenging.
- North Valdosta Road, Inner Perimeter, Coleman Road, Ashley, Bemiss
- Major city streets (Ashley, Bemiss, Baytree, etc.) are unsafe for cyclists.
- Various locations throughout the city of Valdosta
- A lot of locations in the City of Valdosta do not have bicycle lanes.
- I would not dare ride a bicycle in this town. We do not have any bike lanes, and motorists often run stop signs on my street. I wish I could ride my bike - I would ride it every day if it were safer.
- If I were on my bike, I would be very worried.
- There are very few places to bike. Commuting on my bike is too dangerous.
- I used to be a cyclist. I am glad I do not have to be one here, now.
- There is nowhere safe to bike in the VLMPO area except small residential streets and the Azalea City Trail. We should repurpose vehicular lanes to create protected bike lanes, as has been done in Tallahassee and other cities.



## Public Transit

When asked, “Within the VLMPO Area, have you experienced a need for improved public transit routes to access personal destinations, work, or services?,” twenty participants responded with half indicating a need for improved transit options and half did not. The following comments were provided.

- That would be very helpful, e.g., a line from Five Points along Ashley or Patterson to the city center.
- Yes. Especially the side streets on Slater, where I live. Cars driving across Slater run the stop signs daily! I would also walk or ride my bike if there were sidewalks and/or bike lanes.
- I do not think there is enough ridership to justify the expense of a traditional bus system. The city ride "Uber" is a good substitute.
- Not me personally, but family members and friends have.
- Outside of VSU, transit is lacking, but there is improvement with the van share.
- Bus or tram routes across the city, more transit options outside of Valdosta proper
- I could not go to lots of places if I had no car. In London, for instance, public transport was almost everywhere.

## Railroad Crossings

When asked, “Within the VLMPO Area, have you experienced problems at railroad crossings?,” twenty participants responded with twelve indicating having experienced problems at railroad crossings and eight have not. The following comments were provided.

- S. Patterson Street, S. Ashley Street., S. Oak Street., and St. Augustine Road.
- CSX @ Boone Dairy, CSX @ St. Augustine Road.
- River Street, St. Augustine Road
- The never-ending issue with the one on St. Augustine by the RR yard. The one on Baytree/Gornto is also annoying, but not as bad as the one on St. Augustine.
- On Baytree and Gornto, traffic congestion is notable while trains switch tracks.
- Baytree
- Near boys and girls club
- As everyone in the VLMPO area knows, freight trains sometimes stop and block railroad crossings.
- They are very bumpy.

## Equity

When asked, “Have past transportation projects resulting in the existing transportation network impacted the culture, safety, aesthetics, and/or ease of accessing desired destinations in your community?,” seventeen (17) participants responded with one (1) respondent reporting yes, three (3) respondents reporting no, and thirteen (13) respondents indicating they are not sure if past transportation investments have had impacts on their community.

- Overpasses have made it easier to travel from one end to the other end of town without long waits.
- Overpasses over train tracks



- Less walkability. Large sections of the city are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Valdosta On Demand has had a good impact.
- It increased traffic of heavy trucks through downtown creating noise pollution and safety issues.
- The recently (2023) installed sidewalks on Alden Avenue from Jerry Jones Dr to Baytree Road are poorly designed with mailboxes in the middle of the pedestrian way. It is difficult for someone in a wheelchair or with a stroller.

## Traffic Congestion

When asked, “Within the VLMPO Area, have you experienced traffic congestion on roads or at intersections?,” twenty participants responded with eighteen reporting they have experienced traffic congestion, and two reported no experience with traffic congestion.

- US 84 near I-75
- US 84/St Augustine
- Norman Dr. (2 respondents)
- St. Augustine Road
- Bemiss Road
- Patterson, Ashley at 5 Points
- Gornto
- Jerry Jones (2 respondents)
- Intersection of Gornto and Jerry Jones.
- North Valdosta Road
- Bemiss Rd (North of Inner Perimeter)
- Intersection of North Valdosta and Country Club Drive
- Val Del is awful in the mornings from the new housing construction to the intersection of N Valdosta Rd. N Valdosta Rd is terrible from the bridges to Inner Perimeter. And the turn signal from Inner Perimeter left onto Bemiss is not long enough to keep the traffic from backing up.
- Congestion near schools and railroad crossings
- Baytree Road Railroad crossing.
- The 5 points areas/Oak Street Extension is one of the worst intersections I have seen in America. Roundabouts would solve these confusing and congested intersections. Please add roundabouts to solve this issue.
- Five Points (Ashley-Patterson-N. Oak St. Extension-Oak St.) especially

## Other

Participants were asked to provide input on any additional transportation needs not covered in previous survey questions and the following comments were provided.

- The flooding on Ashley Street and sometimes Patterson Street where when it rains there is too much water on the road to drive in the outside lane where it is accumulating. Connell also has the same problem sometimes.
- Confusion at meeting-point of Oak, Patterson, and Ashley.
- Difficult lane markings, Oak, Patterson at recycling station



- Lack of sidewalks - Lack of bicycle infrastructure - Reckless driving

## Priorities

When asked, “What transportation issue do you feel is most important to address in the VLMPO Area? Please describe your top priority below,” the following responses were provided. Reduce traffic accidents at the major intersections that show up every year in the traffic safety report.

- CSX issues at St. Augustine. Norfolk/Southern at Melody Ln., Baytree Rd and Gornto Rd.
- Traffic Flow at end of workdays.
- The lack of an E-W connector along north Lowndes that does not get impeded by the traffic along Val Del. Or just add a lane or two on Val Del and occasional turn offs on McMillan for farm equipment or for passing slower vehicles. Occasional turn lanes that allow for the passing of slower vehicles would be ideal. Or shoulders even. There's nothing on that route and it is becoming more traveled every day.
- Traffic congestion
- Long lights at rush hour. I can't believe I would ever say we have rush hour. North Valdosta Road at 5 pm and 7:30 am to 9:30 am is horrific.
- Better Road layouts, and upgrades to lanes and traffic intersections
- More sidewalks, something to deter motorists from running stop signs such as speed bumps.
- Walkability and bikeability.
- Lack of bike paths and sidewalks - I would like to bike to work instead of driving. Drivers being aggressive, especially on Bemiss North of Perimeter. On more than one occasion, I was waiting at the red light on Forrest St Extension to turn onto Bemiss. The driver behind me kept inching up aggressively, trying to get me to turn right onto Bemiss.
- The lack of sidewalks and bicycle lanes discourages healthy habits.
- sidewalks. We need more connection between them for more walkability.
- Lack of sidewalks/walkability, and public transit connections like bus routes.
- Narrow streets, no sidewalks, long thoroughfares, crowded with cars, high speeds. Gornto, Jerry Jones.
- Lack of sidewalks
- Walking and biking infrastructure
- Valdosta is the second poorest city in the country, and we have no bus system. How are poor people supposed to get around town without a low-cost bus system?
- Public transportation in order to provide greater equity of access for people without cars, as well as to promote environmentalism and relieve traffic congestion. Before moving to Valdosta, I lived in an area with two bus lines within a quarter mile of my house, and I happily used public transportation instead of driving my car to work almost all the time.
- Rerouting heavy truck access through the center of town, it will never thrive without the ability to increase foot traffic and noise. Mulberry Street was proactive by closing Mulberry during weekends.

When asked, “How should transportation funding be prioritized? Please indicate level of priority for each category below,” the following responses were received.



–	HIGH PRIORITY–	MEDIUM PRIORITY–	LOW PRIORITY–	TOTAL–
– <b>BUILD NEW ROADS TO ADD CAPACITY TO TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</b>	40.00% 10	20.00% 5	40.00% 10	25
– <b>WIDEN EXISTING ROADS TO ADD CAPACITY TO TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</b>	36.00% 9	36.00% 9	28.00% 7	25
– <b>REPAIR /MAINTAIN EXISTING ROADWAYS</b>	52.00% 13	32.00% 8	16.00% 4	25
– INCREASE/ IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (BUS) SERVICE	52.00% 13	24.00% 6	24.00% 6	25
– <b>SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS (LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, INTERSECTION TREATMENTS)</b>	36.00% 9	44.00% 11	20.00% 5	25
– BICYCLE FACILITIES	56.00% 14	24.00% 6	20.00% 5	25
– PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES	62.50% 15	16.67% 4	20.83% 5	24



## APPENDIX E: GROWTH SCENARIO ANALYSIS TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

---



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO

## 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

### GROWTH SCENARIO ANALYSIS TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

PREPARED FOR | SOUTHERN GEORGIA REGIONAL COMMISSION  
PREPARED BY | METRO ANALYTICS, LLC  
IN ASSOCIATION WITH | POND & COMPANY, CROY, AND MPH & ASSOCIATES



DRAFT REPORT

FEBRUARY 2025





**Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO)**  
**2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)**  
**GROWTH SCENARIO ANALYSIS TECHNICAL**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**Prepared for the**



**Prepared by**



**In association with**



**February 2025**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Scenario A: Status Quo.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Recap of 2050 Scenario A Growth Projections.....	3
2.1.1	Population Growth.....	3
2.1.2	Employment Growth.....	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Scenario B: 15-Minute City.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Scenario B Transportation Strategy.....	8
3.2	Scenario B Activity Centers.....	8
3.3	2050 Scenario B Growth Projections.....	10
3.3.1	2050 Scenario B Population Growth.....	10
3.3.2	2050 Scenario B Employment Growth.....	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Scenario B Transportation Recommendations.....</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1	Mode-Specific Concepts.....	16
4.1.1	Transit Services.....	16
4.1.2	Micromobility.....	16
4.1.3	Active Transportation.....	17
4.2	Policy Recommendations.....	17
4.3	Potential Mode Share Shifts.....	17
4.3.1	Short Vehicle Trips.....	18
4.4	Scenario B Transportation Improvement Projects.....	24
<b>5</b>	<b>Summary and Conclusions.....</b>	<b>30</b>



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Key Milestones and Project Flow .....	2
Figure 2: Growth Scenario A Population (2050) .....	4
Figure 3: Growth Scenario A: Employment (2050) .....	6
Figure 4: 15-Minute City .....	7
Figure 5: Activity Centers .....	9
Figure 6: Growth Scenario B Population (2050) .....	11
Figure 7: Change in 2050 Population Projection .....	12
Figure 8: Growth Scenario B Employment (2050) .....	14
Figure 9: Change in 2050 Employment Projection (Scenario A - Scenario B) .....	15
Figure 10: Short Vehicle Trips, 2024 .....	19
Figure 11: Short Vehicle Trips – Downtown Valdosta, 2024.....	20
Figure 12: Short-Distance Trip Destinations, 2024 .....	21
Figure 13: Home Access to Potential Active Transportation Facilities .....	23
Figure 14: City of Valdosta Active Transportation Recommendations .....	26
Figure 15: Bemiss Road Corridor Active Transportation Recommendations .....	27
Figure 16: Lake Park Active Transportation Recommendations .....	28
Figure 17: Hahira Active Transportation Recommendations.....	29

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Linear Active Transportation Improvement Projects .....	24
Table 2: Point Active Transportation Improvement Projects.....	25
Table 3: Comparative Travel Demand Metrics by Scenario .....	30



## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO) is updating its Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) with a new horizon year of 2050. One of the unique approaches to the VLMPO 2050 MTP Update is a consideration of an alternative land use growth scenario that addresses challenges related to economic resilience and growth pressures with that of rural/urban character areas. This Technical Memorandum presents an alternative 2050 land use scenario and identifies a series of active transportation projects that support development patterns outlined in this scenario.

A base 2050 land use scenario is presented in detail as part of the *VLMPO 2050 MTP Future Conditions Report*. These land use and demographic projections referred to as “Status Quo” in this report, were provided to GDOT for incorporation into the MPO travel demand forecasting model. These 2050 land use forecasts assume a similar growth trajectory from the previous VLMPO 2045 MTP.

This Technical Memorandum describes an alternate 2050 scenario referred to as the “15 Minute City” scenario that reflects a better integration of transportation planning and land use planning to improve connectivity and enhance the livability of existing and future neighborhoods. The 15 Minute City scenario is consistent with concepts found in the 2024 VLMPO report entitled *Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines*, focused on place-making/place-keeping, housing needs, right-of-way policies, and jobs/housing balance. The 15 Minute City scenario is characterized by clustered development that preserves rural areas while providing activity centers with jobs and amenities. Increased density in the activity centers should encourage small business development and promote active transportation.

Figure 1 below depicts key milestones in the 2050 MTP process. This Technical Memorandum is the third project milestone and is directly related to milestone #2 on identifying future transportation needs.



Figure 1: Key Milestones and Project Flow

Assess Existing Conditions

Identify Future Transportation Needs

Analyze Future Scenarios

Identify Fiscal Constraints

Preferred Investments and Strategies

Adoption and Plan Document



## 2 SCENARIO A: STATUS QUO

The Status Quo growth scenario outlined in the *VLMPO 2050 MTP Future Conditions Report* reflects the expected outcome if development occurs in a similar pattern to current development within the MPO area. The resulting 2050 socioeconomic forecasts for this scenario are consistent with recent trends, previously estimated 2045 growth trajectories, and population growth totals from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budgeting. This scenario assumes a significant amount of suburban development, as agricultural and rural land is lost and is developed for low-density residential areas. This growth scenario also predicts continued reliance on personal vehicles for transportation. Residents must continue traveling longer distances to reach goods and services as residences move further from existing commercial areas and employment centers. As travel distances increase, travel time and congestion on the road network are expected to increase, minimizing opportunities for alternative modes of transportation, such as walking and biking, to reach destinations.

### 2.1 Recap of 2050 Scenario A Growth Projections


The 2050 Scenario A growth projections found in this section of the report are consistent with recent trends and population growth estimates from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budgeting. The implications of continued growth in population and employment in these patterns are described below.

#### 2.1.1 Population Growth

The population projection for 2050 for Growth Scenario A is shown in Figure 2. Large concentrations of population are shown north of Valdosta, east of Remerton, and in the southern portion of the MPO near Lake Park and Dasher. Nearby areas are currently characterized as agricultural and rural land uses. As such, development stemming from this population growth could negatively impact the natural environment and contribute to continued sprawling development. Areas with existing density, such as downtown Valdosta and Remerton, show little population growth in this scenario.



Figure 2: Growth Scenario A Population (2050)






## 2.1.2 Employment Growth

Scenario A employment projections for 2050 are shown in Figure 3. Significant employment is shown outside the cities of Valdosta and Remerton, and along major corridors like I-75 and Bemiss Road near Moody Air Force Base. This suggests that employment opportunities will be more widespread as development moves into agricultural and rural areas, requiring significant travel to reach these destinations.

Section 4.3 of this Technical Memorandum identifies short-distance vehicle trips that could result in a mode shift under the 15-Minute City scenario, while a series of “highway only” travel demand metrics are presented in Section 5 that compare the two 2050 scenarios, along with the base year 2020 model.



Figure 3: Growth Scenario A: Employment (2050)






## 3 SCENARIO B: 15-MINUTE CITY

Recent development patterns in the Valdosta area can largely be characterized as urban sprawl, leading to congestion being experienced in suburbanizing areas outside the Valdosta urban core. The VLMPO desires to understand how an alternative land use pattern could impact travel behavior and provide additional opportunities for active transportation facilities.

The alternative forecast, Growth Scenario B, was developed to consider the densification of commercial and residential development. In this scenario, growth is concentrated within identified activity centers. This development pattern is described as a 15-minute city, whereby residents across the MPO can access services within 15 minutes of travel. More dense development patterns can improve opportunities for active modes of transportation, small business development, and preservation of natural space. Figure 4 below is a theoretical representation of a 15-minute city, as defined by the Congress of New Urbanism (CNU).

Figure 4: 15-Minute City



Source: [Defining the 15-minute city | CNU](#)



### 3.1 Scenario B Transportation Strategy

To understand where investment and active transportation infrastructure should be focused, a “walkshed” of .75 miles was identified to represent a 15-minute walk, and a “bike shed” of 3 miles was identified to represent a 15-minute bike trip. These radii around each activity center can be used to focus development density within each activity center. Density should be focused most heavily within the walkshed, slightly less development allowed in the bike shed, and less dense land uses outside of the bike shed. This allows for development that can be reached by active modes and reduces sprawling development that can impact natural spaces.


### 3.2 Scenario B Activity Centers

As previously described, commercial and residential growth in this scenario is concentrated in proximity to activity centers. The following activity centers, depicted in Figure 5, can evolve into development nodes, where land uses could be densified:

- Downtown Valdosta
- St Augustine Rd/Valdosta Mall Area
- Bemiss Road Corridor
- Valdosta State University
- South Georgia Medical Center
- Hahira
- Lake Park
- Five Points Area
- Moody Air Force Base



Figure 5: Activity Centers



Data Sources:  
GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMPO & City of Valdosta



### 3.3 2050 Scenario B Growth Projections

Along with increased density of land use patterns near activity centers, population and employment are expected to grow near certain identified activity centers in what is being referred to as Growth Scenario B. Total population and employment in the MPO area remains the same in this scenario as the original growth scenario; however, population and employment are redistributed into different traffic analysis zones (TAZs).


#### 3.3.1 2050 Scenario B Population Growth

Activity centers located outside the Valdosta and Remerton city limits are expected to experience a growth in population of about 15% by 2050. As activity centers within Valdosta and Remerton already exhibit a dense land use pattern, increased population growth in these areas is not expected with Scenario B. Based on this population projection, approximately 47,000 residents could be located within the activity center walk shed by 2050, greatly improving access to active transportation modes and activity centers. Population growth projections within the bike shed show an additional 120,000 residents with increased active transportation access by 2050. Figure 6 depicts 2050 population growth projections for Growth Scenario B, along with “walk sheds” and “bike sheds” for each activity center.

The difference in projected population between Growth Scenario A and Growth Scenario B is depicted in Figure 7. This map shows the change in projected population in 2050 between the two scenarios. Compared to Scenario A, a decreased population is seen in Growth Scenario B in many areas outside of the identified activity center bike sheds. Instead, a greater increase in population is shifted to areas closer to activity centers due to the increased commercial and residential density suggested in Growth Scenario B.




Figure 6: Growth Scenario B Population (2050)



Data Sources:  
VLMPO 2050 MTP



Figure 7: Change in 2050 Population Projection



Data Sources:  
VLMPD 2050 MTP



### 3.3.2 2050 Scenario B Employment Growth


Similarly, employment growth is expected near each activity center in Growth Scenario B. Employment is estimated to grow by 10% within activity center walk sheds located outside of the Valdosta city limits where much of the densification could occur. An employment growth rate of 5% is projected near activity centers within Valdosta and Remerton, as the existing land use pattern is relatively dense. Development and densification around these activity centers could potentially support nearly 37,000 total employees within the walkshed, providing significant access to active transportation facilities and activity centers. Additionally, nearly 58,000 projected employees within the bike shed would gain access to activity centers in this growth scenario. Figure 8 depicts projected employment growth for 2050 in Growth Scenario B, along with walk sheds for each activity center.

The difference in 2050 employment projections between Growth Scenario A and Growth Scenario B is depicted in Figure 9 by TAZ. As commercial density is recommended in Scenario B, the greatest increase in employment when compared to Scenario A is seen within activity center walk sheds. While Scenario A depicts increased employment in areas that are currently rural, such as directly outside of Valdosta and Remerton, the change between scenarios shows a decrease in projected employment in these areas for Scenario B.

As noted earlier, Section 4.3 of this Technical Memorandum identifies short-distance vehicle trips that could result in a mode shift under the 15-Minute City scenario, while a series of “highway only” travel demand metrics are presented in Section 5 that compare the two 2050 scenarios, along with the base year 2020 model.




Figure 8: Growth Scenario B Employment (2050)



Data Sources:  
VLMPD 2050 MTP



Figure 9: Change in 2050 Employment Projection (Scenario A - Scenario B)





## **4 SCENARIO B TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

Transportation improvements can support access to and between identified activity centers. The following recommendations should generally be applied to Scenario B in order to adequately serve those traveling in the Valdosta-Lowndes MPO area. This discussion first identifies a series of mode-specific “concepts” that reflect Scenario B land use forecasts. Next is a description of policy recommendations that could be helpful in making this scenario a reality. This section continues with a discussion of potential mode shifts and concludes with a series of specific transportation projects to coincide with the 15-Minute City scenario.

Specific recommended transportation projects for this alternative land use scenario are described under Section 4.4, including a series of tables and maps. These projects are above and beyond those described in the 2050 MTP Future Conditions Report.

### **4.1 Mode-Specific Concepts**

Guidance is provided below on how transit services, micromobility, and active transportation concepts can be incorporated into a 15-minute city land use scenario. Later sections include specific transportation project recommendations.

#### **4.1.1 Transit Services**

Transit services should support activity centers. Fixed transit routes should provide service between activity centers, allowing residents and visitors to travel throughout the region and access activity centers without the need for a personal vehicle. On-demand transit should be available within the bike shed of each activity center, allowing for convenient transportation within each area.

#### **4.1.2 Micromobility**

Micromobility hubs should be located in each activity center in order to provide convenient ways for residents and visitors to travel throughout the three-mile bike shed of each area. These hubs should have bike parking and options for docked bike stations and electric scooters should be explored. Micromobility hubs should be located near transit services and existing bike facilities. Hubs can also be focused on areas where there is existing active transportation demand, such as the Valdosta State University campus and downtown Valdosta.



### 4.1.3 Active Transportation

Adequate active transportation facilities are important to ensure safe connectivity throughout activity centers. Recommendations for active transportation in Scenario B are consistent with those recommended in the VLMPO *Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines*. Each activity center walk shed should have a complete sidewalk system. Greenways can be implemented in more rural areas in order to connect activity centers and create options for walking and biking to different centers. A unified wayfinding strategy should be developed to aid in travel within and between activity centers. Each transit-oriented development area should adopt standards for complete streets that accommodate all modes of transportation in order to meet the specific active transportation needs of each area.

## 4.2 Policy Recommendations

Certain policies can be implemented to support higher-density development. To improve active transportation options, facility requirements can be established in development proposals. This can include requirements for the construction of active transportation facilities or the dedication of space for future active transportation facilities as development occurs in strategic areas. Downtown streetscape policies can be developed to enhance commercial areas in ways that attract and support local businesses. Policies to protect natural areas throughout the MPO area can be established, such as an open space and agricultural preservation program. This can encourage dense development and reduce the impact on the natural environment as development occurs.

## 4.3 Potential Mode Share Shifts

In Scenario B, an increase in land use density and active transportation facilities could increase opportunities for residents to use active modes for daily travel instead of personal motorized vehicles. Unfortunately, the current 2020/2050 GDOT travel demand model does not include the capability of simulating non-vehicular modes of transportation. This is to be expected in an area such as Valdosta that does not presently have fixed-route transit, necessary for calibration purposes. Thus, Replica<sup>1</sup> passive origin-destination data were used to best simulate potential travel patterns in and around previously described activity centers under a 15-minute City land use scenario. Using Replica data, and to a lesser extent modeled trip data, the study team can estimate the potential shift that could be seen with improvements to active transportation facilities.

Using three miles as a distance representing a 15-minute bike trip, private vehicle and passenger trips of three miles or less were mapped to understand where residents are

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.replicahq.com/platform>



presently taking short car trips and where new active transportation infrastructure could be implemented to give residents the opportunity to bike or walk for these same trips. Figure 10 below is a map providing a visual of activity centers where short trips are already occurring and where development and infrastructure could potentially be focused to establish a higher-density land use pattern. A more detailed map of short trips in Downtown Valdosta is shown in Figure 11.

#### 4.3.1 Short Vehicle Trips

**Short-Distance Trip Destinations:** An analysis of short vehicle trips provides an estimate of how many trips could be made using active transportation instead of a private vehicle if safe infrastructure was available. Looking at the number of short vehicle trips ending in each census tract provides an understanding of the possible mode shift or the number of vehicle trips that could become active trips with improved infrastructure. Investment within a three-mile radius of each activity center could create the potential opportunity for upwards of 102,792 short vehicle trips per day to be replaced by active transportation trips. Figure 12 provides an estimate of short-distance trip destinations using Replica data and identified activity centers.



Figure 10: Short Vehicle Trips, 2024







Figure 11: Short Vehicle Trips – Downtown Valdosta, 2024





Figure 12: Short-Distance Trip Destinations, 2024





**Home Access:** Investments in active transportation infrastructure within a 3-mile radius around each identified activity center could provide convenient access to select census tracts throughout the VLMPO study area. Based on the number of residents within each census tract, we can estimate the number of residents that could have access to active transportation options and the potential to replace vehicle trips with trips using active transportation modes. Census tracts with 32,141 total homes throughout the VLMPO area could have access to active transportation facilities. Figure 13 depicts the number of homes that could potentially have access to active transportation for short-distance trips.



A map of Lowndes County, Georgia, and its surrounding areas. The map shows the county's irregular border in black. Major roads are depicted as grey lines with route numbers in shields: 122, 125, 133, 135, 175, 31, 38, 75, 84, 221, 94, 41, 376, and 7. Airports are marked with airplane icons and labels: Moody AFB, Valdosta Regional Airport, and several smaller, unlabeled airports. Other locations marked include Hahira, Remerton, Valdosta, Dasher, and Lake Park. Surrounding counties are labeled: COOK COUNTY, BERRIEN COUNTY, LANIER COUNTY, BROOKS COUNTY, and ECHOLS COUNTY. The state boundaries with COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, and FLORIDA are also shown. A scale bar (0 to 5 miles) and a north arrow are located in the top right corner.





## 4.4 Scenario B Transportation Improvement Projects

Assuming the densification of land uses near the identified activity centers, a series of additional active transportation projects were identified for this potential land use scenario and depicted in a series of maps. While the Future Conditions Report provides projects to improve transportation mobility assuming a continuation of current development patterns, additional active transportation projects are recommended in this report as long-term endeavors that could serve each activity center should land use density be increased.

*Table 1: Linear Active Transportation Improvement Projects*

ID	Facility Type	Street	From Street	To Street
F-1	Side path	Highway 122/Main St	Woodbend Trail	Lemaka Dr
F-2	Side path	N Church St	Hagan Bridge Rd	McNeal Rd
F-3	Side path	Hall St	W Main St	Hillcrest Dr
F-4	Sidewalk	S Nelson St	E Coleman Dr	E Lawson St
F-5	Sidewalk	E Grace St	School	S Hall St
F-6	Side path	Old US 41	Union Rd	N Valdosta Rd
F-7	Side path	N Valdosta Rd/Shiloh Rd	Golden Oaks Dr	Val del Rd
F-8	Side path	Studstill Rd	Bemiss Rd	Spring Creek Blvd W
F-9	Side path	Bemiss Knights Academy Rd/ Old Bemiss Rd/Old Pine Rd Ext	Studstill Rd	Bemiss Rd
F-10	Side path	Old Pine Rd	Bemiss Rd	Skipper Bridge Rd
F-11	Side path	Car Creek Rd	Bemiss Rd	Buckhead Dr
F-12	Side path	N Valdosta Rd	Inner Perimeter Rd	E Park Ave
F-13	Side path	N Valdosta Rd	Inner Perimeter Rd	Val del Rd
F-14	Side path	N Ashley St	E Park Ave	E Hill Ave
F-15	Side path	US Highway 84/W Hill Ave	Rocky Ford Rd	S Ashley St
F-16	Side path	S Patterson St	Hill Ave	Gil Harbin Industrial Blvd
F-17	Side path	Lakes Blvd	W Marion Ave	Loch Laurel Rd
F-18	Side path	Loch Laurel Rd	Lakes Blvd	Grassy Pong Rd
F-19	Side path	US Highway 84/W Marion Ave	Park Dr SE	N East St
F-20	Side path	Lake Park Bellville Rd/S Main St	W Marion Ave	Campground Cir
F-21	Protected Bike Lane	N Barack Obama Blvd	E Hill Ave	E Park Ave
F-22	Side path	Bemiss Rd	Mitchell Blvd	Brayden Way
F-23	Side path	Baytree Rd	Gornto Rd	N Oak St
F-24	Side path	N Saint Augustine Rd	Twin St	Proposed trail
F-25	Sidewalk	N Oak St	E Alden Ave	Roosevelt Dr
F-26	Sidewalk	N Oak St Ext	N Valdosta Rd	Jennifer Cir
F-27	Sidewalk	Coleman Rd N	Stewart Cir	N Valdosta Rd
F-28	Sidewalk	Stewart Cir	Old US 41 N	Old US 41 N
F-29	Sidewalk	Pine Grove Rd	Bemiss Rd	Cat Creek Rd
F-30	Bike Lane	N Oak St	W Central Ave	Baytree Rd
F-31	Sidewalk	Briggs St	N Oak St	N Patterson St
F-32	Sidewalk	N Patterson St	N Ashley St	E Northside Dr



Table 1 is a complete listing of the linear projects depicted on these maps while Table 2 provides a series of “point” projects with detailed intersection improvements at locations shown on the maps. Figure 14 is a map that depicts proposed active transportation projects in the City of Valdosta. The map shown in Figure 15 depicts potential active transportation projects along the Bemiss Road corridor between the City of Valdosta and Moody Air Force Base. Finally, Figure 16 and Figure 17 depict potential projects in maps of Lake Park and Hahira, respectively

*Table 2: Point Active Transportation Improvement Projects*

ID	Facility Type	Street Name	Cross Street
F-34	Intersection Improvement	Lakes Blvd	W Marion Ave
F-36	Intersection Improvements	Bemiss Rd	Old Pine Rd
F-33	Intersection Improvement	E Central Ave	E Hill Ave
F-37	Intersection Improvement	N Valdosta Rd	Old US Highway 41
F-35	Intersection Improvement	N Barack Obama Blvd	E Park Ave
F-38	Intersection Improvement	N Ashley St	N Oak St Ext



Figure 14: City of Valdosta Active Transportation Recommendations






Figure 15: Bemiss Road Corridor Active Transportation Recommendations







Figure 16: Lake Park Active Transportation Recommendations




## Transportation Improvement Projects

- |                                      |                   |                    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Recommended Intersection Improvement | VLMPO Extents     | Interstate         |
| Recommended Multi-Use Facility       | County Boundaries | Principal Arterial |
| Existing Sidewalk                    | City Boundaries   | Minor Arterial     |
|                                      | Lakes and Ponds   | Major Collector    |
|                                      | School            | Railroads          |
|                                      | Park              |                    |

Data Sources:  
 GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMPO & City of Valdosta



Figure 17: Hahira Active Transportation Recommendations



## Transportation Improvement Projects

- |                                 |                 |                    |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Recommended Multi-Use Facility  | School          | Interstate         |
| Recommended Pedestrian Facility | Park            | Principal Arterial |
| Existing Sidewalk               | City Boundaries | Minor Arterial     |
|                                 |                 | Major Collector    |
|                                 |                 | Railroads          |

Data Sources:  
 GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMPO & City of Valdosta



## 5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This Technical Memorandum provides an alternative 2050 land use scenario that redirects growth into areas surrounding defined activity centers in the VLMPO study area. Each activity center is depicted with walkshed and bike shed concentric rings based on an estimate of 15 minutes of travel time using each mode. This 15-Minute City Scenario B is compared against the Status Quo Scenario A in terms of population and employment. Scenario B is further described in terms of transportation and policy strategies, potential maximum mode shifts, and specific active transportation projects that could become viable under these increased land use densities.

Socioeconomic forecasts for the 15-minute city scenario were converted into a format usable in the 2050 GDOT VLMPO travel demand forecasting model. This scenario was run through the model, with key travel demand metrics summarized and compared against base year 2020 and 2050 conditions. This information is summarized in Table 3. A comparative assessment and limitations are described below.

*Table 3: Comparative Travel Demand Metrics by Scenario*

Indicators	2020 Base (Existing Conditions)	2050 Scenario A (Status Quo)	2050 Scenario B (15- Minute City)	Interpretation/Implications for this the MTP
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	4,261,863	5,273,643	5,269,642	2050 VMT is lower under Scenario B, reflecting shorter travel times
Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)	114,465	145,772	146,319	2050 VHT is higher under Scenario B, reflecting more urban congestion
Vehicle Hours of Delay (VDT)	4,086	4,985	5,202	2050 VDT is higher under Scenario B, reflecting more urban congestion
Congested Travel Speed	27.04	25.40	25.29	2050 speed is lower under Scenario B, reflecting more urban congestion
Volume/Capacity (V/C) Ratio	0.37	0.46	0.46	V/C is no different for the two 2050 Scenarios, due to some similarities

As expected, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle hours traveled (VHT), vehicle hours of delay (VHD), and volume/capacity (V/C) ratio increase between the model base year 2020 and the horizon year 2050, while congested speeds drop as population and congestion increase in the absence of significant roadway capacity expansion. While 2050 VMT is lower in Scenario B than in Scenario A, other metrics are higher or unchanged under Scenario B. A more integrated land use mix and increased densities help decrease trip lengths, benefiting VMT, while greater congestion in the urban core is reflected by increased VHT, VDT, and V/C due to more development in these areas.



There are limitations to this travel demand assessment, as this is a “highway only” model without transit networks and no mode choice component. The GDOT model is not capable of simulating transit ridership or active transportation modes. Furthermore, while land use shifts were made at the TAZ level, total population, employment, and ancillary totals were maintained for the total VLMPO study area. In the absence of a multi-modal travel demand model, the Replica analysis described in Section 4.3 provides insights into where short-distance trips exist and the maximum potential for mode split with a higher-density land use pattern.

Despite these limitations, this alternative land use strategy should be presented to the MPO and its committees for further consideration keeping in mind that implementation of an alternative land use strategy would require public hearings and subsequent action on the part of County Commissioners and City Council Members. Despite regulatory decisions that lie beyond the context of this study, it is recommended that components of the 15-Minute City Scenario be included in future land development proposals, where feasible. At the discretion of the Valdosta-Lowndes MPO, further discussions at the City and County government levels could potentially move the needle further in the direction of land use densification.



## APPENDIX F: REVENUE PROJECTIONS AND PROJECT COSTS TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

---



## VLMPO 2050 MTP FINANCIAL PLAN: TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

### Introduction

This technical memo provides the foundation for development of a cost feasible work program for the VLMPO 2050 MTP Update. It provides a set of potential funding sources and cost estimates for proposed projects at the federal, state, and local levels. The document evaluates various federal grant programs available as part of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) passed in 2021, state level funding programs from the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), and local funding programs available to Lowndes County and its incorporated municipalities.

In addition to evaluating potential funding resources, this technical memo also provides an estimate of projected revenues available at the state and local levels for proposed projects. Finally, this memo provides projected cost estimates for potential projects included in the VLMPO 2050 MTP Update. Updated cost estimates are provided for remaining projects from the VLMPO MTP 2045 Update that will be carried forward in the 2050 MTP as well as anticipated new projects to be included in the VLMPO 2050 MTP Update.

### Funding

This chapter overviews potential funding sources at the federal, state, and local level that could be utilized for transportation infrastructure improvements in the VLMPO region. Regional stakeholders should be able to use the information in this chapter to pair transportation improvement projects with available funding opportunities.

#### Federal Grant Programs and Sources of Revenue for Transportation Projects

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) authorized \$550 billion to be put toward investment in the nation's infrastructure, with \$350 billion going towards investment in highway facilities and programs over fiscal years 2022 through 2026. The \$350 billion goes towards financing over a dozen new highway programs, with a focus on safety, resilience, carbon reduction, bridges, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, reconnecting communities, and wildlife crossings.<sup>1</sup>

Additionally, the BIL made changes to existing programs and created new programs related to highway development and funding, including:

- **National Highway Freight Program:** Managed by state DOTs, this program allocates funds to states by formula, with the objective of enhancing the efficient movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). It now allows states to use up to 30% of funds on intermodal freight or rail projects, instead of the previous standard of 10%. It also includes the rehabilitation of lock and dam and marine highway corridors that are part of the national

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/docs/BIL\\_overview\\_update\\_2022-11-8b.pdf](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/docs/BIL_overview_update_2022-11-8b.pdf)



highway freight network as eligible projects for funding. I-75 is the only highway in the VLMPO region that is included in the NHFN.

- **National Highway System (NHS) Funds:** These funds are closely tied to GDOT's performance targets for the statewide NHS network. Consequently, these funds are often directed towards major interstate facilities. In addition to I-75, NHS facilities in the VLMPO area include US 84, and segments of US 41, SR 133, and SR 31.
- **The National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)** provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS), for the construction of new facilities on the NHS, and to ensure that investments in Federal-aid funds for highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a state's asset management plan for the NHS.<sup>2</sup>
- **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP):** This program allows for non-infrastructure safety projects such as those related to emergency services and safe routes to schools for funding and expands the definition of safety improvements to encompass rail- highway grade crossing separations, traffic control devices to pedestrians, and roadway improvements that separate vehicles from pedestrians and cyclists.
- **Railway Highway Crossing Program** clarifies that funds are eligible for reducing pedestrian injuries and fatalities from trespassing at crossings. Funds for this are set aside from the HSIP; the nationwide annual set-aside will be \$245 million from FY 2022 through FY 2026.<sup>3</sup>
- **Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Funds - Urban:** This federal program offers substantial flexibility, allowing for the preservation and improvement of conditions and performance on Federal-aid highways and bridges. Eligible projects encompass non- motorized transportation facilities, transit capital projects, and public bus terminals and facilities.
- **STBG - Transportation Alternatives Program:** Within the broader STBG program, funds are set aside specifically for smaller-scale transportation projects, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, recreational trails, and safe routes to school initiatives.
- **Metropolitan Planning Program (MPP):** Formerly known as Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds, the MPP provides planning assistance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to GDOT, which then channels these funds to MPOs for planning programs.
- **National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program (NEVI):** The NEVI Program was introduced as part of the IIJA Act in 2021, with the intent to create a nationwide network of fast-charging electric vehicle (EV) stations along national corridors. This program was canceled in February of 2025. As such, the VLMPO cannot expect to rely on NEVI funding for its EV projects for the time, but re-instatement of the program is a possibility in future administrations and is worth monitoring during the lifetime of the MTP.

Additionally, the BIL retained existing discretionary grant programs and introduced new ones, offering further opportunities for federal funding:

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/nhpp/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://highways.dot.gov/safety/hsip/xings/railway-highway-crossing-program-overview>



- **Safe Streets for All (SS4A):** Makes \$5 billion available for local initiatives that prevent transportation-related deaths and injuries on roadways. MPOs and local and tribal governments are eligible to receive these funds for developing safety action plans; planning, designing, and developing activities for infrastructure projects; or executing the projects in safety action plans.
- **Local and Regional Project Assistance Grants (Formerly RAISE):** These discretionary grants have been recently updated and awarded based on merit criteria that encompass safety, environmental sustainability, quality of life, economic competitiveness, state of good repair, innovation, and partnership. Projects falling within the range of \$5 million to a maximum of \$25 million are eligible for RAISE funding.
- **Nationally Significant Multimodal Freight and Highway Projects (Formerly INFRA):** This program awards competitive grants for multimodal freight and highway projects of national or regional significance. The objective is to enhance the safety, efficiency, and reliability of freight and passenger movement across rural and urban areas. Projects that promise to eliminate freight bottlenecks and enhance critical freight movements are prioritized.
- **National Infrastructure Project Assistance or "Megaprojects":** This program, sometimes referred to as the "Megaprojects program" or MEGA, offers grants to support multijurisdictional or regional projects of significance that cut across multiple transportation modes. These grants assist communities in completing large-scale projects that would otherwise be challenging to accomplish independently. Eligible projects include improvements on the National Multimodal Freight Network, National Highway Freight Network, National Highway System, and rail-highway grade separations.
- **Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation (PROTECT) - Discretionary:** This discretionary program, akin to the formula counterpart, is aimed at funding projects that promote system resilience.
- **Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvement (CRISI) Grants:** Administered by the Federal Railway Administration (FRA), this program funds projects that enhance the safety, efficiency, and reliability of intercity passenger and freight rail. Eligible projects span a wide spectrum, including capital investments in freight and passenger rail, safety technology deployment, planning, environmental analyses, research, workforce development, training, and locomotive emission reduction initiatives.
- **Railroad Crossing Elimination Grant:** Also administered by the FRA, this program finances rail crossing improvements, with a focus on enhancing safety and freight mobility. Eligible projects encompass grade separated rail crossings, including planning, environmental review, and design components.

## State Grant Programs and Sources of Revenue for Transportation Projects

Federal level grants and programs are not the only potential source of funding for projects in the VLMPO region. The state of Georgia also features numerous opportunities for the VLMPO to pursue funding for transportation infrastructure projects. Potential state revenue sources, competitive GDOT funding programs, and relevant policies are listed below.



- **Transportation Investment Act of 2010 (TIA):** Allows its economic regions to impose a one percent sales tax to fund multimodal transportation projects. All counties within the Southern Georgia Regional Commission (SGRC) boundaries, including the VLMPO study area, participate in a funded TIA program. This is discussed further under “Local Funding Sources.”
- **Transportation Funding Act (HB 170) Funds:** This program represents a cornerstone of state funding, supporting a wide array of initiatives aimed at repairing, enhancing, and expanding Georgia's transportation network. These funds can be harnessed for both routine maintenance and capital improvement projects.
- **Quick Response Projects:** Designed for efficiency and cost-effectiveness, the Quick Response Projects program targets lower-cost operational endeavors that can be executed rapidly, typically within one year, and with budgets under \$200,000. These projects encompass critical tasks such as restriping, intersection improvements, and the addition or extension of turn lanes.
- **Local Maintenance & Improvement Grant (LMIG):** The LMIG program operates on an allocation model based on the total centerline road miles within each local road system and the population of counties or cities in comparison to statewide figures. This approach ensures equitable distribution of resources. Eligible projects for LMIG funding are diverse, encompassing preliminary engineering, construction supervision and inspection, utility adjustments or replacement, roadway maintenance and resurfacing, grading, drainage, base and paving of existing or new roads, storm drainpipe or culvert replacement, intersection improvements, turn lanes, bridge repair or replacement, sidewalk construction within the right of way, roadway signage, striping, guardrail installation, and signal installation or improvement. Due to the passage of TIA the LMIG match went from 30% to 10%.
- **Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank (GTIB):** Administered by the State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA), GTIB presents an opportunity for grant and loan funding for projects with budgets of up to \$10 million, which provides grants and low interest loans for state, local, and regional entities for transportation infrastructure improvements. When pursuing GTIB support, key considerations include demonstrating economic development potential, project readiness, and feasibility. Over the fiscal year of 2023, GTIB had awarded \$3.36 million in grant amounts and \$13.9 million in loan amounts, with an investment amount of \$199 million since 2010 assisting in producing projects that total over \$1.1 billion.
- **GDOT Freight Operations Program:** Tailored to address freight-specific operational challenges, the GDOT Freight Operations Program is responsive to the needs of communities grappling with issues related to truck and freight rail activity. The program targets solutions such as improving turn lanes and enhancing signal timing at key intersections along freight-heavy routes. The program offers awards of up to \$2 million.

## Local Funding Sources

Local funds come from several different sources, including sales and property taxes, vehicle fees, general revenues, and are put toward matching requirements for federal grants. Lowndes County passed its first one cent Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) in November of 2019 that will raise roughly \$134 million over six years. The dedicated project list includes road and bridge



transportation projects for the County and each incorporated city within. Lowndes County is also part of the Southern Georgia Region that, utilizing the Transportation Investment Act (TIA), passed a Transportation-SPLOST (T-SPLOST) of 1 percent over 10 years for dedicated transportation projects. This TIA cycle is expected to bring in \$513 million for the Southern Georgia region, which is made up of 18 counties, including Lowndes. In addition, Lowndes County has enacted a Local Option Sales Tax, which is general purpose, goes to the general fund, and can be used to support a wide variety of projects.

## Projected Federal, State, and Local Revenues

Current federal regulations require that a metropolitan transportation plan be fiscally constrained, demonstrating that the total estimated costs for transportation projects and improvements in the plan do not exceed reasonably expected revenue from federal, state, and local funding sources.

To forecast the expected revenues and achieve fiscal constraint for the 2050 MTP, a financial plan was developed that reviewed past transportation-related expenditures by state and local governments to anticipate future revenues in accordance with 23 CFR 450.322. This document identifies revenue resources for the operation, maintenance, and construction of the MPO's highway projects and provides planning-level cost estimates for identified projects to keep the plan fiscally constrained. Revenue estimates for transit capital and operations, and highway operations and maintenance were also identified and separated from the revenue estimates for highway capacity projects. Transit revenue estimates are described later.

Pursuant to federal regulation CFR 23 450.324, "revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use inflation rate(s) to reflect 'year of expenditure dollars.'" It is estimated that the available Year of Expenditure (YOE) revenues for funding transportation improvements through the 2025-2050 planning period will total over \$1 billion dollars.

Revenues for 2025 to 2050 were estimated based on the past five years of funding allocated for projects in the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). The funding allocation amounts were gathered from the FY18-21 through FY21-24 Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) and the FY18-21 and FY21-24 GDOT State TIPs. The revenues were averaged from the 2020-2024 five-year period and the average served as the 2025 first year assumption. The base year amount was then forecast to grow at an inflation rate of 2% for the final year of IJJA/BIL and 1% after 2026. It should be noted that all funding in the Transit category was allocated towards existing on-demand service in the area, and additional transit projects should assume additional funding necessary. Based on these assumptions, it is estimated, within reason, that the available funding from Federal, State and Transit revenue will total nearly \$1.2 billion. Yearly totals by category are provided in Table 1, along with annual inflation assumptions.



Table 1: Projected Federal and State Funding Revenue

Fiscal Year:	Federal Highway	State Highway	Federal and State Transit	Total Federal and State Funding	Inflation
2025	\$ 24,582,904.47	\$ 9,642,349.00	\$ 5,232,962.15	\$ 39,458,215.62	Baseline
2026	\$ 25,074,562.56	\$ 9,835,195.98	\$ 5,337,621.39	\$ 40,247,379.93	2%
2027	\$ 25,325,308.18	\$ 9,933,547.94	\$ 5,390,997.61	\$ 40,649,853.73	1%
2028	\$ 25,578,561.27	\$ 10,032,883.42	\$ 5,444,907.58	\$ 41,056,352.27	1%
2029	\$ 25,834,346.88	\$ 10,133,212.25	\$ 5,499,356.66	\$ 41,466,915.79	1%
2030	\$ 26,092,690.35	\$ 10,234,544.38	\$ 5,554,350.23	\$ 41,881,584.95	1%
2031	\$ 26,353,617.25	\$ 10,336,889.82	\$ 5,609,893.73	\$ 42,300,400.80	1%
2032	\$ 26,617,153.42	\$ 10,440,258.72	\$ 5,665,992.66	\$ 42,723,404.81	1%
2033	\$ 26,883,324.96	\$ 10,544,661.31	\$ 5,722,652.59	\$ 43,150,638.86	1%
2034	\$ 27,152,158.21	\$ 10,650,107.92	\$ 5,779,879.12	\$ 43,582,145.24	1%
2035	\$ 27,423,679.79	\$ 10,756,609.00	\$ 5,837,677.91	\$ 44,017,966.70	1%
2036	\$ 27,697,916.59	\$ 10,864,175.09	\$ 5,896,054.69	\$ 44,458,146.36	1%
2037	\$ 27,974,895.75	\$ 10,972,816.84	\$ 5,955,015.23	\$ 44,902,727.83	1%
2038	\$ 28,254,644.71	\$ 11,082,545.01	\$ 6,014,565.39	\$ 45,351,755.11	1%
2039	\$ 28,537,191.16	\$ 11,193,370.46	\$ 6,074,711.04	\$ 45,805,272.66	1%
2040	\$ 28,822,563.07	\$ 11,305,304.16	\$ 6,135,458.15	\$ 46,263,325.38	1%
2041	\$ 29,110,788.70	\$ 11,418,357.20	\$ 6,196,812.73	\$ 46,725,958.64	1%
2042	\$ 29,401,896.59	\$ 11,532,540.77	\$ 6,258,780.86	\$ 47,193,218.22	1%
2043	\$ 29,695,915.55	\$ 11,647,866.18	\$ 6,321,368.67	\$ 47,665,150.41	1%
2044	\$ 29,992,874.71	\$ 11,764,344.84	\$ 6,384,582.36	\$ 48,141,801.91	1%
2045	\$ 30,292,803.46	\$ 11,881,988.29	\$ 6,448,428.18	\$ 48,623,219.93	1%
2046	\$ 30,595,731.49	\$ 12,000,808.18	\$ 6,512,912.46	\$ 49,109,452.13	1%
2047	\$ 30,901,688.81	\$ 12,120,816.26	\$ 6,578,041.59	\$ 49,600,546.65	1%
2048	\$ 31,210,705.69	\$ 12,242,024.42	\$ 6,643,822.00	\$ 50,096,552.12	1%
2049	\$ 31,522,812.75	\$ 12,364,444.66	\$ 6,710,260.22	\$ 50,597,517.64	1%
2050	\$ 31,838,040.88	\$ 12,488,089.11	\$ 6,777,362.82	\$ 51,103,492.81	1%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 732,768,777.25</b>	<b>\$ 287,419,751.20</b>	<b>\$ 155,984,468.02</b>	<b>\$ 1,176,172,996.47</b>	



Also included are some local level funding dollars through the Transportation Investment Act (TIA), or Transportation Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (TSPLOST). The previously enacted TSPLOST is not included because funding has already been programmed, and thus no projections are necessary. A second round of TSPLOST dollars was approved on May 21, 2024, via referendum for another cycle of funding. Although, like the first TSPLOST, most funding is earmarked for specific projects, there is a discretionary fund available that can be used to fund projects in the 2050 MTP. The total expected to be collected is 820 million regionally. The FY27-36 TSPLOST discretionary fund projections are included in the revenue forecast as noted in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Projected Local Funding Revenue

Fiscal Year	Total TIA Funding	Inflation	Discretionary Only
2027	\$14,443,098.47	Baseline	\$2,327,086.47
2028	\$15,041,042.75	2%	\$2,423,427.85
2029	\$15,663,741.92	2%	\$2,523,757.76
2030	\$16,312,220.83	2%	\$2,628,241.33
2031	\$16,987,546.78	2%	\$2,737,050.52
2032	\$17,690,831.21	2%	\$2,850,364.42
2033	\$18,423,231.63	2%	\$2,968,369.50
2034	\$19,185,953.42	2%	\$3,091,260.00
2035	\$19,980,251.89	2%	\$3,219,238.16
2036	\$20,807,434.32	2%	\$3,352,514.62
<b>Total:</b>	\$174,535,353.21		\$28,121,310.65

## Project Cost Estimates

This section documents the estimated costs of projects, along with assumptions and sources. MTP projects are divided into 5 categories: highway/roads and bridges, EV, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), active transportation, and transit. Specific assumptions made for cost estimates will follow each sub-category's cost estimate table; in general, these are planning-level estimates made with the best planning-level data available at the time of estimation. Similar to the previous 2045 MTP, it was assumed that locally funded projects can be completed for a lower cost than those with federal funds. This assumption was reflected in lower contingency costs for locally funded projects.

As required by federal regulations, all cost estimates must be in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. While cost estimates in this technical memorandum are in 2025 dollars, subsequent work ensured that financially constrained project cost estimates reflected YOE based on priority selection scores and ranking.



TIA projects already committed to funding are not included in the state and federal constrained list of projects; however, many TIA projects will be completed within the same band over the next ten years. These dollars have already been committed to specific projects and phases of projects. Some projects are only partially funded by TIA, in which case, project completion will require other state and Federal revenues, outlined earlier in Table 1.

## Highway, Roads and Bridges

To maintain consistency with the previously adopted 2045 MTP, the same percentage breakdowns for project engineering (PE), right-of-way (ROW), and utilities have been applied for the 2050 MTP. Existing 2045 MTP Projects have received a 35% increase in cost for the 2050 MTP, which is a planning-level rate of inflation based on industry trends since 2020. New 2050 projects use planning-level cost estimates. All updated cost estimates for previous 2045 projects were reviewed by an in-house roadway engineer, and new 2050 project cost estimations developed by a roadway engineer, ensuring costs are accurate and account for the latest industry trends and information available. Table 3 provides project costs, by category, for all roadway and bridge projects in the 2050 MTP.



Table 3: Highway/Roads and Bridges Project Cost Estimates

	Project	From	To	Improvement	PE	Row	Util	Cst	Total
R-1	Alden Avenue	N Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 1,060,020	\$ 1,378,026	\$ 2,120,040	\$ 10,600,200	\$ 15,158,286
R-2	Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Center Turn Lane	\$ 1,975,000	\$ 2,567,500	\$ 3,950,000	\$ 19,750,000	\$ 28,242,500
R-3	Baytree Road	Norman Dr	N Oak St	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 1,864,701	\$ 2,424,111	\$ 3,729,402	\$ 18,647,010	\$ 26,665,224
R-4	Baytree Road / Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Norman Drive	Intersection Improvement	\$ 292,950	\$ 380,835	\$ 585,900	\$ 2,929,500	\$ 4,189,185
R-5	BAYTREE ROAD GRADE SEPARATION	NS Railroad	NS Railroad	Grade Separation	\$ 4,270,000	\$ 5,551,000	\$ 8,540,000	\$ 42,700,000	\$ 61,061,000
R-6	Baytree Road North Extension	Baytree Road	Coleman Road	Extend existing roadway	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,340,000	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 18,000,000	\$ 25,740,000
R-7	Baytree Road/ Sherwood Drive	Baytree Road	Sherwood Drive	Intersection Improvement	\$ 380,000	\$ 494,000	\$ 760,000	\$ 3,800,000	\$ 5,434,000
R-8	Bemiss Knights Academy Road	Studstill Road	Old Bemiss Road	Turn lanes at terminus points	\$ 155,000	\$ 201,500	\$ 310,000	\$ 1,550,000	\$ 2,216,500
R-9	Bemiss Knights Academy/Old Pine Road	Old Bemiss Road	Bemiss Road/Old Pine Rd Ex	Intersection Realignment	\$ 190,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 380,000	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 2,717,000
R-10	Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Moody AFB	Widen from 4 lanes to 6	\$ 6,124,200	\$ 7,961,460	\$ 12,248,400	\$ 61,242,000	\$ 87,576,060
R-11	Bemiss Road / Connell Road	Bemiss Road	Connell Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 180,000	\$ 234,000	\$ 360,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,574,000
R-12	Bemiss Road / Davidson Road	Bemiss Road	Davidson Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-13	Bemiss Road / Skipper Bridge Rd	Bemiss Road	Skipper Bridge Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 40,500	\$ 52,650	\$ 81,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 579,150
R-14	Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter	Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 163,000	\$ 211,900	\$ 326,000	\$ 1,630,000	\$ 2,330,900
R-15	Boone (Dairy) Road CSX Crossing			Potential safety improvement	\$ 100,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,430,000
R-16	Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 34,000	\$ 44,200	\$ 68,000	\$ 340,000	\$ 486,200
R-17	Cat Creek Road / Pine Grove Road	Cat Creek Road	Pine Grove Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,500	\$ 39,650	\$ 61,000	\$ 305,000	\$ 436,150
R-18	Cat Creek Road / State Route 122	Cat Creek Road	SR 122	Intersection Improvement	\$ 40,500	\$ 52,650	\$ 81,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 579,150
R-19	Cat Creek Road/ Radar Site Road	Cat Creek Road	Radar Site Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 23,500	\$ 30,550	\$ 47,000	\$ 235,000	\$ 336,050
R-20	Cherry Creek Road	Oak Street Ext.	Orr Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 3,400,000	\$ 4,420,000	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 34,000,000	\$ 48,620,000
R-21	Dasher Grove Road Extension	Dasher Grove Road	Val Del Road	New Road	\$ 268,700	\$ 349,310	\$ 537,400	\$ 2,687,000	\$ 3,842,410
R-22	Five Points Roundabout	Northside Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	New roadway reconfiguration	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,105,000	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 8,500,000	\$ 12,155,000
R-23	Gornto Road	NS Railroad	NS Railroad	Grade Separation	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,560,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 17,160,000
R-24	Hagan Bridge Road	E Coleman Dr	SR 122	Intersection Improvements	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,560,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 17,160,000
R-25	I-75 @ CR 783/LOCH LAUREL ROAD - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement	\$ 1,563,000	\$ 2,031,900	\$ 3,126,000	\$ 15,630,000	\$ 22,350,900
R-26	I-75 @ SR 376 - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement	\$ 2,509,200	\$ 3,261,960	\$ 5,018,400	\$ 25,092,000	\$ 35,881,560
R-27	I-75 @ US 84	Exit 16	Exit 16	Interchange Improvement	\$ 3,340,000	\$ 4,342,000	\$ 6,516,000	\$ 33,400,000	\$ 47,762,000
R-28	I-75 @ New Interchange	Between SR 133	and SR 7 interchanges	New Interchange	\$ 1,918,100	\$ 2,493,530	\$ 3,836,200	\$ 19,181,000	\$ 27,428,830
R-29	I-75/SR 7 Connector	New I-75 Interchange	SR 7 near Country Club Road	New Road	\$ 415,400	\$ 540,020	\$ 830,800	\$ 4,154,000	\$ 5,940,220
R-30	Inner Perimeter Rd. / Brookfield Rd. / Lake Laurie Dr. Intersection			Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-31	Inner Perimeter Road/S. Patterson Street	Inner Perimeter	South Patterson	Intersection Improvement	\$ 31,000	\$ 40,300	\$ 62,000	\$ 310,000	\$ 443,300
R-32	James Beck Overpass	S. Ashley St/E. Savannah Ave.	Intersection	Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-33	James Road Extension/Western Perimeter	James Road	Indian Ford Road	New Road	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 1,482,000	\$ 2,280,000	\$ 11,400,000	\$ 16,302,000
R-34	Jumping Gully Road @ Bevel Creek 6 Mi SW of Lake Park			Bridge Replacement	\$ 737,600	\$ 958,880	\$ 1,475,200	\$ 7,376,000	\$ 10,547,680
R-35	Knight Academy Road/Studstill Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 58,620	\$ 76,206	\$ 117,240	\$ 586,200	\$ 838,266
R-36	Lamar Street @ Sugar Creek in Valdosta			Bridge Replacement	\$ 72,180	\$ 93,834	\$ 144,360	\$ 721,800	\$ 1,032,174
R-37	Loch Laurel Road / Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bridge Replacement	\$ 175,000	\$ 227,500	\$ 350,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 2,502,500
R-38	Loch Laurel Road / Corinth Church Road	Loch Laurel Road	Corinth Church Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 85,000	\$ 110,500	\$ 170,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,215,500
R-39	McMillan Road/Staten Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 31,710	\$ 41,223	\$ 63,420	\$ 317,100	\$ 453,453
R-40	N. Ashley Street / Northside Drive	North Ashley Street	Northside Drive	Intersection Improvement	\$ 195,000	\$ 253,500	\$ 390,000	\$ 1,950,000	\$ 2,788,500
R-41	N. Oak Street Ext. / Bemiss Road	N. Oak Street Ext.	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,500	\$ 39,650	\$ 61,000	\$ 305,000	\$ 436,150
R-42	N. Valdosta Road / Inner Perimeter Road	N. Valdosta Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 195,000	\$ 253,500	\$ 390,000	\$ 1,950,000	\$ 2,788,500
R-43	North Ashley Street	Vallotton Drive	Bemiss Road	Additional SB Lane	\$ 345,195	\$ 448,754	\$ 690,390	\$ 3,451,950	\$ 4,936,289
R-44	North Lee Street	Vallotton Drive	East Park Avenue	Center Turn Lane	\$ 205,470	\$ 267,111	\$ 410,940	\$ 2,054,700	\$ 2,938,221
R-45	North Oak Street	Baytree Road	W. Moore Street	One-way to Two-way	\$ 230,000	\$ 299,000	\$ 460,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 3,289,000
R-46	North Oak Street	W. Alden Avenue	Canna Drive	Center Turn Lane	\$ 416,130	\$ 540,969	\$ 832,260	\$ 4,161,300	\$ 5,950,659
R-47	North Oak Street Extension	Five Points Roundabout	Cherry Creek Road	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	\$ 815,760	\$ 1,060,488	\$ 1,631,520	\$ 8,157,600	\$ 11,665,368
R-48	North Valdosta Road	US 41/Five Points	I-75	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 5,850,000	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ 64,350,000
R-49	Park Avenue	Ashley Street	N. Patterson Street	Center Turn Lane	\$ 702,000	\$ 912,600	\$ 1,404,000	\$ 7,020,000	\$ 10,038,600
R-50	Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road	Prewitte Street	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 140,000	\$ 182,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 2,002,000
R-51	South Valdosta Truck Bypass	St. Augustine Road	US 84/Clay Road	New Construction	\$ 18,700,000	\$ 24,310,000	\$ 37,400,000	\$ 187,000,000	\$ 267,410,000
R-52	SR 122	I-75	Union Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 770,000	\$ 1,001,000	\$ 1,540,000	\$ 7,700,000	\$ 11,011,000
R-53	SR 122	I-75	Morven Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 1,115,000	\$ 1,449,500	\$ 2,230,000	\$ 11,150,000	\$ 15,944,500
R-54	SR 122/Skipper Bridge Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 83,286	\$ 108,272	\$ 166,572	\$ 832,860	\$ 1,190,990
R-55	SR 122/Val Del Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 83,286	\$ 108,272	\$ 166,572	\$ 832,860	\$ 1,190,990
R-56	St. Augustine Rd./Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	St. Augustine Road	Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,800	\$ 40,040	\$ 61,600	\$ 308,000	\$ 440,440
R-57	US 84/Hill Avenue at Fry Street	US 84/Hill Avenue	Fry Street	Intersection Improvement	\$ 121,000	\$ 157,300	\$ 242,000	\$ 1,210,000	\$ 1,730,300
R-58	Val Del Road / Mcmillan Road /	Val Del Road	McMillan Road/Bethany Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,800	\$ 40,040	\$ 61,600	\$ 308,000	\$ 440,440
R-59	Val Del Road / North Valdosta Road	Val Del Road	North Valdosta Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 138,780	\$ 180,414	\$ 277,560	\$ 1,387,800	\$ 1,984,554
R-60	Webb Road Realignment	SR 122	Webb Road	Realignment, Roundabout	\$ 585,900	\$ 761,670	\$ 1,171,800	\$ 5,859,000	\$ 8,378,370
R-61	Weigh Station @ I-75 NB in Lowndes County			Truck parking	\$ 287,100	\$ 373,230	\$ 574,200	\$ 2,871,000	\$ 4,105,530
R-62	Weigh Station @ I-75 SB in Lowndes County			Truck parking	\$ 234,690	\$ 305,097	\$ 469,380	\$ 2,346,900	\$ 3,356,067
R-63	West Gordon Street	N. Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Center Turn Lane	\$ 702,000	\$ 912,600	\$ 1,404,000	\$ 7,020,000	\$ 10,038,600
R-64	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Widen from 4 lanes to 6	\$ 170,208	\$ 221,270	\$ 340,416	\$ 1,702,080	\$ 2,433,974
R-65	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Norman Drive		Intersection Improvement	\$ 202,707	\$ 263,519	\$ 405,414	\$ 2,027,070	\$ 2,898,710
R-66	West Magnolia Street	Orange Street	Lamar Street	New Road	\$ 160,710	\$ 208,923	\$ 321,420	\$ 1,607,100	\$ 2,298,153
R-67	West Marion Avenue (SR 7)/Lakes Blvd.	West Marion Avenue	Lake Blvd.	Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-68	West Marion Avenue / N. Gordon Street	West Marion Avenue	N. Gordon Street	Intersection Improvement	\$ 700	\$ 910	\$ 1,400	\$ 7,000	\$ 10,010
R-69	Western Perimeter S	SR 31/Madison Hwy.	Old Clyattville Road	New Road	\$ 1,032,600	\$ 1,342,380	\$ 2,065,200	\$ 10,326,000	\$ 14,766,180
				<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 71,106,517</b>	<b>\$ 92,438,472</b>	<b>\$ 142,213,034</b>	<b>\$ 711,065,168</b>	<b>\$ 1,016,823,190</b>



## Electric Vehicles

The cost of EV charging stations, at \$1 million per site of 4 ports each, are based upon GDOT's *Georgia EV Development Plan* figures for 4 existing sites along the I-75 corridor. Thus, the total cost estimate for the 6 EV sites included in the 2050 MTP is \$6 million.

## Active Transportation

Active transportation projects were priced using the *Costs for Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements* prepared by the University of North Carolina (UNC) Highway Safety Research Center for the FHWA and applying an inflationary adjustment using the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index (CPI) calculator. Distance estimates were rounded up to the nearest 100 feet for linear feet measurements and up the nearest .25 mile for mileage measurements. Project A-14, Implement Complete Streets, is a unit-cost estimate of per linear mile. Project costs were rounded up to the nearest \$10,000 for projects under \$100,000 and to the nearest \$50,000 for projects over \$100,000. The estimates are at a planning-level and depicted in Table 4.

## Transit

Transit cost estimates are sketch level, as no transit studies have been conducted to design routes, number of stops, or level of infrastructure necessary. Projects T-1 through T-3 assume two busses in operation during peak hours, one additional bus in reserve, 10 transit stops with shelters, benches, a trash receptacle, a bus stop sign, street lighting, a striped crosswalk on the street, and a shade tree. The cost also includes liability insurance, 3 full time CDL (commercial driver licensed) drivers, and one transit manager.

Projects T-5 through T8, T-10, and T-11 are all priced in unit cost. *Costs for Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements* were used to develop unit costs for some infrastructure, applying an inflationary adjustment using the Bureau of Labor Statistics' CPI calculator. These planning-level cost estimates are presented in Table 5.



Table 4: Active Transportation Project Cost Estimates

VLMP ID	Project Name	From	To	Improvement	Notes	Cost
A-1	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Eastern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Valdosta High School	Multi-Use Path	Connects Valdosta Youth Complex to Valdosta High School. Project could be part of sidewalk infill along Park Avenue.	\$ 1,000,000
A-2	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Northern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Freedom Park	Multi-Use Path	Connects northern residential neighborhoods and parks, offering residents in this area a safe route for commuting or recreational use. This would connect two recreation areas and could tie into potential connections with Bemiss Road's own bike and pedestrian infrastructure improvements.	\$ 1,500,000
A-3	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Southern Extension	Sustella Trail	John W. Saunders Memorial Park	Multi-Use Path	Connects VSU and Mall to John Saunders Park and surrounding residential neighborhoods, offering a direct route for recreational use and expanding the reach of the trail to the outer parts of Valdosta.	\$ 500,000
A-4	Azalea City Trail/Sustella Trail - Western Extension	Wainwright Drive	Valdosta Mall	Multi-Use Path	Provides students and residents with direct access to both the university and the nearby commercial district, linking education and shopping facilities to the trail.	\$ 1,000,000
A-5	Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Infill sidewalks, bike lanes		\$ 1,000,000
A-6	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Knight Academy Road	Fill sidewalk gaps and consider bike lanes north of Inner Perimeter Road	Where missing, add 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalks on both sides to accommodate pedestrian traffic. In areas with heavy pedestrian traffic, such as around shopping centers, widen sidewalks to 8 feet or create multi-use paths to support both pedestrians and cyclists. Install protected bike lanes from Northside Drive to Moody Air Force Base. Enhance pedestrian crossings at key intersections: Northside Drive, Guest Road, Knights Academy Road.	\$ 1,300,000
A-7	Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements	Pedestrian refuge islands: Add at this wide intersection to allow pedestrians a safe area to stop halfway through the crossing. Crossing signal adjustments: Ensure crossing signals allow sufficient time for pedestrians to cross the wide intersection safely.	\$ 100,000
A-8	Berkley Drive	Gormto Road	Eager Rd	Install 5-foot-wide sidewalks, benches, and rest areas	Build 5-foot-wide sidewalks to accommodate seniors who frequently walk in the area, ensuring they are ADA-compliant and easily accessible for those with mobility aids. Install benches and rest areas at intervals along the sidewalks for elderly pedestrians who may need breaks while walking.	\$ 300,000
A-9	Country Club Drive	Highway 7/US 41	Jerry Jones Drive	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings	Build sidewalks along both sides of Country Club Drive, from US 41 to Northside Drive. Add crosswalks at key intersections along the route, particularly at Country Club Drive & US 41 and Country Club Drive & Jerry Jones Drive.	\$ 400,000
A-10	Cyclist Education Program			Public Outreach / Education	Initiate public campaigns and school programs on safe cycling practices, emphasizing helmet use, hand signals, and cyclist rights. Partner with local cycling groups to promote and encourage community engagement in bike safety awareness campaigns.	Staff Time
A-11	E Park Avenue	N Ashley Street	Inner Perimeter Road	Install bike lanes, construct sidewalks where gaps exist	Near Valdosta High School and Valdosta Middle School, add raised crossings at intersections and along mid-block crossings to slow traffic and give cyclists and pedestrians priority.	\$ 4,100,000
A-12	Eager/Jerry Jones Drive	Oak Street	Baytree Drive	Construct sidewalks for pedestrian safety, install protected bike lanes	Include with TIA project to add center turn lane. Construct sidewalks on both sides of Edgar/Jerry Jones Drive where feasible, include ramps at street corners and driveways for seamless transitions, and install Mid-Block Crossings.	\$ 3,000,000
A-13	Gormto Road	North Oak Street	Jerry Jones Drive	Construct sidewalks on both sides	Install high-visibility crosswalks and pedestrian signals, fill existing sidewalk gaps	\$ 400,000
A-14	Implement Complete Streets			Improve Connectivity and Sidewalk Infrastructure	Implement Complete Streets principles in TOD areas, ensuring roads accommodate all users—pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders. Design street projects with bike lanes, wide sidewalks, and traffic calming measures, where applicable, to enhance safety and comfort. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Prioritize Complete Streets improvements around key transit corridors like Ashley Street, Patterson Street, and areas near Valdosta State University, which are critical for the city's transit network.</li> <li>o Enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety at high-traffic intersections, such as those near Valdosta Mall, Downtown Valdosta, and Valdosta High School.</li> <li>o Integrate Complete Streets designs with mixed-use developments near transit nodes to ensure that new commercial and residential developments are walkable and transit-friendly.</li> </ul>	\$ 100,000
A-15	Inner Perimeter Road	Valdosta Road	Forrest Street Extension	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings	Install high-visibility crosswalks at key intersections and high-crash zones, including Inner Perimeter Road at Valdosta Road and Bemiss Road, near shopping centers and schools.	\$ 850,000
A-16	Lake Park Road	Holiday Street	South Street	Fill sidewalk system gap	Install protected bike lanes; Fill in sidewalk gaps by adding sidewalks where missing. Focus on building wide sidewalks (8-10 feet) near commercial areas such as Valdosta Mall to handle higher pedestrian volumes and provide space for benches and trees.	\$ 50,000
A-17	Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Hill Avenue	Fill sidewalk gaps, install protected bike lanes	Add high-visibility crosswalks at this large intersection to improve pedestrian safety. Improve signal timing to prioritize pedestrian	\$ 850,000
A-18	Norman Drive at Baytree Road			Intersection Improvements	Install raised crosswalks and curb extensions to reduce crossing distances for pedestrians and slow down turning vehicles. Install pedestrian refuge islands in the middle of the intersection to provide a safe waiting area for pedestrians crossing multiple lanes. Ensure that pedestrian countdown signals are visible and provide sufficient time for crossing the intersection. Add LED pedestrian crossing	\$ 10,000
A-19	Norman Drive at St. Augustine Road			Intersection Improvements	Add mid-block crosswalks near Valdosta Middle School	\$ 1,000,000
A-20	North Oak Street	Gormto Road	Valdosta Middle School	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides		\$ 300,000
A-21	North Oak Street Extension at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements	Install pedestrian refuge islands and improve signal timing to prioritize pedestrian crossing safety.	\$ 50,000
A-22	North Valdosta Road	Country Club Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	Improve pedestrian sidewalk connectivity	Connect suburban development with commercial centers and public services	\$ 200,000
A-23	Northside Drive	North Oak Street	Bemiss Road	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure	Fill in sidewalk gaps to connect commercial and residential areas by constructing sidewalks on both sides of Northside Drive where needed and include ramps at street corners and driveways for seamless transitions	\$ 400,000
A-24	Old Hudson Street and/or McDougal Street	Lake Park	Fry Street	Construct sidewalks	Connect Lake Park Road to Mildred Hunter Community Center	\$ 40,000
A-25	Park Avenue	N Patterson Street	N Ashley Street	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes on both sides, install 2-3 foot green buffers, and	Install sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes with buffers for safety	\$ 1,400,000
A-26	Pineview Drive	Bemiss Road	E Park Avenue	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure	Fill in sidewalk gaps to connect residential areas by constructing sidewalks on both sides of Pineview Drive where needed and include ramps at street corners and driveways for seamless transitions	\$ 800,000
A-27	South Oak Street	W Central Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Add clearly marked bicycle lanes, signage, and road markings indicating priority for cyclists	Connect sidewalks, where missing on S Oak Street from Savannah Avenue to Old Clyattville Road, including RR Xings. Enhance intersections by installing bike boxes and dedicated signal phases for cyclists at key intersections,	\$ 300,000
A-28	St. Augustine Road	Harmon Drive	Twin Street	Fill sidewalk system gap	Widen existing sidewalks to 8-10 feet and repair damaged sections to improve pedestrian safety and accessibility. Consider bus stops with shelters, seating, and lighting along the corridor to make transit more accessible in the future. Add mid-block crossings with signalized pedestrian lights in areas where intersections are spaced far apart	\$ 350,000
A-29	Toombs Street	W Crane Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Install sidewalks	Connect sidewalks, where missing, including RR Xings.	\$ 250,000
A-30	U.S. Highway 84	RR Xing	Blanchard St.	Install sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, buffers, benches, and bike-friendly intersections	6-foot-wide concrete sidewalks to accommodate higher foot traffic, with ADA-compliant curb ramps at intersections. Enhance pedestrian crossings at key intersections. Where space allows, add a 2-3 foot landscaped buffer zone between the sidewalk and the roadway to improve pedestrian safety by separating foot traffic from vehicles. Add protected bike lanes.	\$ 650,000
A-31	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Consider adding sidewalks and bike lanes		\$ 100,000
A-32	Withlacoochee River Trail - north and south of Langdale Park	Cherry Lake	Sugar Creek Landing	Multi-Use Path	Develop a multi-use path along the Withlacoochee River, linking parks, recreational facilities, and historical landmarks. Provide a scenic route for cyclists and pedestrians, connecting them to a wide range of outdoor activities and natural settings. Complement to kayaking along the river.	\$ 8,000,000
A-33	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Moody Air Force Base	Install protected bike lanes	Where missing, add 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalks on both sides to accommodate pedestrian traffic. In areas with heavy pedestrian traffic, such as around shopping centers, widen sidewalks to 8 feet or create multi-use paths to support both pedestrians and cyclists. Install protected bike lanes from Northside Drive to Moody Air Force Base. Enhance pedestrian crossings at key intersections: Northside Drive, Guest Road, Knights Academy Road.	\$ 2,300,000
A-34	E Park Avenue	Pineview Dr	Inner Perimeter Road	Install new sidewalk and fill gaps in existing sidewalks	Build 5 foot sidewalk to provide connection to schools.	\$ 400,000
A-35	N St Augustine Rd	Twin St	River St	Multi-Use Path	Install wide multi-use path for bicycle and pedestrian traffic connecting to destinations such as Valdosta Mall.	\$ 600,000
A-36	N Oak Street	Northside Dr	Baytree Drive	Install bike facility	Install bike facility to connect to destinations such as VSU.	\$ 600,000
A-37	Loch Laurel Road/SR 376			Study sidewalk needs	study need/feasibility for sidewalks on Loch Laurel Road and SR 376 west of I-75	\$ 80,000
A-38	E-Bike/E-Scooter Program				Study need/feasibility for an E-bike and/or E-scooter program	\$ 40,000
Active Transportation Projects Total Cost						\$ 34,320,000



Table 5: Transit Project Cost Estimates

VLMPO ID	Project Name	Improvement	Notes	Cost
T-1	Route 1: North-South Loop	Fixed-Route Bus Route	• This route connects North Valdosta, Freedom Park, Downtown Valdosta, and the Southside community, utilizing Ashley Street for northbound travel and Patterson Street for southbound travel. It passes through key intersections like Bemiss Road and Baytree	\$2,400,000
T-2	Route 2: East-West Connection	Fixed-Route Bus Route	• This route connects residential areas in the East (Inner Perimeter Road) to West Valdosta, following key corridors like Baytree Road, Oak Street, and Park Avenue, providing a direct connection between the eastern and western parts of the city.	\$2,400,000
T-3	Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base	Fixed-Route Bus Route	• This route serves Moody Air Force Base and surrounding neighborhoods, providing service for military personnel and civilians commuting to the base. It connects the base with nearby residential areas and commercial centers in Valdosta. • A southern terminus with a park-and-ride lot at Perimeter Road or Ashley Street could	\$2,400,000
To encourage ridership, frequent service should be provided during peak commuting hours (e.g., early mornings and late afternoons), with buses running every 20-30 minutes during these times. Peak Hours (6:00 AM - 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM - 7:00 PM): Higher frequency along major routes, particularly those serving workers commuting to downtown, industrial parks, and educational institutions. Off-Peak Service (Midday): Buses every 40-60 minutes during non-peak hours to ensure coverage, but at a reduced frequency. Evening and				
T-4	Expand Valdosta On-Demand Services	Reliability Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the current fleet of 9 minivans by adding at least 6 more vehicles (with a focus on adding both standard and wheelchair-accessible vehicles) for On-Demand services.</li> <li>• Allocate additional vehicles to areas with higher demand, such as around Valdosta State University, Downtown Valdosta, and South Georgia Medical Center. These areas experience peak usage during specific hours and increasing the fleet size will reduce wait times for riders.</li> <li>• Consider adding electric vehicles to the fleet for a more sustainable and cost-effective operation, in line with regional and national environmental goals.</li> <li>• Expand and optimize the number of virtual bus stops to improve the convenience of pickup locations, especially in underserved communities.</li> <li>• Ensure virtual stops are strategically placed to minimize walking distances for riders, particularly for the elderly and people with disabilities. Consider placing stops closer to major building entrances in shopping malls, healthcare facilities, and universities.</li> <li>• Where possible, install shelters or designated waiting areas at frequently used pickup locations to improve rider comfort while waiting.</li> <li>• Expand Valdosta On-Demand service hours to include evenings and weekends, which are currently underserved.</li> <li>• Add late-night service (e.g., until 11:00 PM or midnight) to accommodate riders who</li> </ul>	\$ 650,000
T-5	Mobility Hubs	Develop Transit Hubs and Mobility Hubs	Create strategically placed mobility hubs that integrate multiple modes of transportation, such as bike-share programs, scooter stations, electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, and bus stops. These hubs should be placed in areas of high activity such as downtown Valdosta, Valdosta Mall, and North Valdosta. These mobility hubs can be independent of fixed route bus services or in addition to adding fixed route service.	\$1,100,000
T-6	Bus Super Stops	Provide Transit Connectivity, Reliability and Amenities	Design "super stops" with enhanced amenities like shelters, benches, and wayfinding signage. These should be located at locations where proposed routes intersect, and included as part of fixed route services.	\$ 30,000
T-7	Connected Bus Stops	Improve Sidewalk Infrastructure and Connectivity to Proposed Transit Services	Ensure that all bus stops are connected to well-maintained sidewalks and have crosswalks for safe pedestrian access. Improve walkability by filling in gaps in the sidewalk network, especially near potential transit stops.	\$ 40,000
T-8	Upgraded Bus Amenities	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Ensure all proposed bus stops along key routes have shelters with seating, lighting, and trash bins.	\$ 30,000
T-9	Transit App Upgrades	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Provide real-time bus tracking through apps and at major stops using digital signage. This will make public transit more reliable and reduce uncertainty for riders	\$ 1,000
T-10	Pedestrian and transit infrastructure upgrade	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Install bus bulbs at Valdosta Mall, downtown Valdosta, and other high-demand areas to	\$ 15,000
T-11	Bicycle infrastructure upgrade	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Place bike racks or bike sharing stations near future transit hubs and major destinations like Valdosta State University, South Georgia Medical Center, and Valdosta Mall to encourage cycling as a last-mile solution	\$ 2,250
<b>Total Transit Project Cost</b>				<b>\$9,113,250</b>



## APPENDIX G: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

---



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO

# 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

## PREFERRED INVESTMENTS AND STRATEGY REPORT

PREPARED FOR | SOUTHERN GEORGIA REGIONAL COMMISSION  
PREPARED BY | METRO ANALYTICS, LLC  
IN ASSOCIATION WITH | POND & COMPANY, CROY, AND MPH & ASSOCIATES



DRAFT REPORT

MAY 2025





Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO)  
**2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)**  
**Preferred Investments and Strategy Report**

Prepared for the



Prepared by



In association with



July 2025



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents .....	i
List of Figures.....	iii
List of Tables .....	iv
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Planning Process Overview.....	1
1.2 Scope and Purpose of the Report.....	1
<b>2 Strategic Investment .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Unconstrained Needs .....	3
2.1.1 Roadway Needs .....	3
2.1.2 Public Transportation Needs .....	9
2.1.3 Active Transportation Needs .....	9
2.1.4 ITS and Signalization Needs.....	16
2.1.5 Electric Vehicle Needs .....	18
2.2 Cost of Unconstrained Needs .....	20
2.3 Summary of Financial Plan and Revenue Projection .....	23
2.3.1 Federal and State Revenue.....	24
2.3.2 Local Revenue.....	25
<b>3 Project Ranking .....</b>	<b>27</b>
3.1 Overview of MTP Goals .....	27
3.2 Performance Indicators .....	28
3.3 Scoring Methodology .....	28
3.3.1 Safety.....	28
3.3.2 Freight Movement and Economic Vitality.....	29
3.3.3 Infrastructure Condition.....	29
3.3.4 System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction.....	29
3.3.5 Equity and Environmental Sustainability.....	29
3.3.6 Project Delivery .....	29
3.4 Weighting of Criteria.....	30
<b>4 Performance-Based Planning .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
4.1 Project Prioritization Results .....	iv



4.2 Key Findings from Project Prioritization ..... viii

4.3 Project Performance and Return on Investment ..... ix

**5 Conclusion and Next Steps .....xi**

5.1 Summary of Key Findings ..... xi

5.2 Critical Reflections on the Prioritization Process ..... xi

5.3 Fiscal Realities and the Need for Constrained Planning ..... xii

5.4 Next Steps..... xii



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects ..... 7

Figure 2-2: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects in Urban Core ..... 8

Figure 2-3: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Fixed Route Bus Routes ..... 10

Figure 2-4: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Focused Projects..... 12

Figure 2-5: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Bicycle Focused Projects..... 13

Figure 2-6: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Intersection Safety Project Locations ..... 14

Figure 2-7: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Multi-Use Paths and Recreational Trails ..... 15

Figure 2-8: Future ITS/Signalization Needs ..... 17

Figure 2-9: Electric Vehicle Existing Status and Future Needs ..... 19



LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects ..... 4

Table 2-2: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Transit Projects ..... 9

Table 2-3: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Active Transportation Projects ..... 11

Table 2-4: Future ITS/Signalization Needs..... 16

Table 2-5: Electric Vehicle Future Needs..... 18

Table 2-6: Highway/Roads and Bridges Project Cost Estimates ..... 21

Table 2-7: Active Transportation Project Cost Estimates ..... 22

Table 2-8: Transit Project Cost Estimates ..... 23

Table 2-9: Projected Federal and State Funding Revenue ..... 24

Table 2-10: Projected Local Funding Revenue ..... 25

Table 3-1: Scoring Methodology ..... 31

Table 3-2: Criteria Weights by Project Categories..... 32

Table 4-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Projects - Prioritization Rank ..... iv



# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Planning Process Overview

The Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Organization (VLMPO) initiated the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) process to establish a data-driven, performance-based framework for addressing the region's transportation needs through the horizon year 2050. This multi-phased effort has proceeded through a series of analytical and engagement activities designed to assess existing conditions, anticipate future demands, and evaluate alternative strategies.

- **Milestone #1: Baseline Conditions Analysis:** An inventory of the existing transportation network, including roads, transit, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and freight corridors, was compiled and evaluated. System performance metrics and infrastructure condition assessments provided a clear picture of current operational strengths, deficiencies, and maintenance needs within the study area.
- **Milestone #2: Future Needs Analysis:** Building upon baseline findings, travel demand forecasts were projected using the latest socioeconomic data to identify capacity shortfalls and congestion hotspots on the Existing + Committed network. Preliminary project concepts were screened for network efficiency improvements, while stakeholder and public outreach yielded community-supported priorities and context-sensitive solutions.
- **Milestone #3: Scenario Analysis:** In collaboration with local governments, economic development agencies, and civic organizations, alternative land use and growth scenarios were modeled to test network resilience under varying development patterns. Scenario outcomes informed strategies to enhance connectivity, support economic vitality, and preserve the character of established neighborhoods.
- **Milestone #4: Fiscal Constraints Assessment:** A comprehensive financial forecast evaluated anticipated revenues from federal, state, and local sources through 2050. Planning-level cost estimates, encompassing preliminary engineering, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction, were developed for each candidate project. These cost data set the stage for a performance-based prioritization process aligned with realistic funding availability.

The findings from these first four milestones have laid the groundwork for a structured, performance-based prioritization process and the development of a fiscally constrained program.

## 1.2 Scope and Purpose of the Report

This **Preferred Investment and Strategies report (Milestone #5)** presents the methodology, analysis, and outcomes of the project prioritization process for the Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 MTP. The primary objectives of this report are to:

- Define a clear, transparent prioritization framework that aligns with the goals and objectives of the 2050 MTP, as established through ongoing stakeholder engagement.
- Evaluate the anticipated benefits and impacts of each recommended transportation project, including performance improvements, community outcomes, and cost considerations.



- Rank and score projects in accordance with the prioritization framework to establish an ordered list of investments.
- Develop a fiscally constrained, cost-feasible work program that sequences project implementation based on anticipated revenue streams and strategic importance.

By establishing a prioritized, performance-based investment strategy, this report provides the actionable foundation for the subsequent preparation of the final MTP document (Milestone #6) and the ongoing system performance monitoring framework. This approach ensures that the Valdosta-Lowndes region pursues the most effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation investments through 2050.



## 2 STRATEGIC INVESTMENT

---

### 2.1 Unconstrained Needs

This section outlines the comprehensive transportation infrastructure needs identified for the Valdosta-Lowndes Metropolitan Planning Area through the year 2050, independent of fiscal constraints. These recommendations stem from technical analyses, stakeholder engagement, equity-driven outreach, and public input, and are fully detailed in the Future Needs Report of the Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 MTP. The following subsections summarize needs by major transportation categories.

For full project descriptions, sources, and detailed maps, please refer to the **Future Needs Report** of the Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 MTP.

#### 2.1.1 Roadway Needs

The Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 MTP includes a comprehensive set of 69 unconstrained roadway improvements aimed at completing partially funded commitments and addressing additional deficiencies identified through updated 2050 travel demand forecasts, along with stakeholder and public outreach. These projects are designed to relieve future congestion, enhance safety, and improve network connectivity – particularly along corridors expected to experience high traffic volumes in 2050. The unconstrained roadway package retains nearly all illustrative projects from the 2045 MTP, updating project descriptions as needed for revised termini or lane configurations, and introduces 20 entirely new capacity, safety, and geometric improvements. New roadway projects range from intersection improvements to roadway extensions, realignments, center turn lanes, and additional through-lane capacity. Refer to Table 2-1 and Figure 2-1 & Figure 2-2 for the full project listings and maps.



Table 2-1: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects

MTP ID	Project	From	To	Improvement	Project Category	Existing Lanes	Future Lanes	Source List
R-1	Alden Avenue	N Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	3	Illustrative List
R-2	Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Center Turn Lane	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	3	New Road Projects
R-3	Baytree Road	Norman Dr	N Oak St	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	Illustrative List
R-4	Baytree Road / Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Norman Drive	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-5	BAYTREE ROAD GRADE SEPARATION	NS Railroad	NS Railroad	Grade Separation	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-6	Baytree Road North Extension	Baytree Road	Coleman Road	Extend existing roadway	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	New Road Projects
R-7	Baytree Road/ Sherwood Drive	Baytree Road	Sherwood Drive	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-8	Bemiss Knights Academy Road	Studstill Road	Old Bemiss Road	Turn lanes at terminus points	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-9	Bemiss Knights Academy/Old Pine Roads Intersection	Old Bemiss Road	Bemiss Road/ Old Pine Rd Ext	Intersection Realignment	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	New Road Projects
R-10	Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Moody AFB	Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	New Road Projects
R-11	Bemiss Road / Connell Road	Bemiss Road	Connell Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-12	Bemiss Road / Davidson Road	Bemiss Road	Davidson Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-13	Bemiss Road / Skipper Bridge Rd	Bemiss Road	Skipper Bridge Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-14	Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter	Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-15	Boone (Dairy) Road CSX Crossing			Potential safety improvements	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-16	Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-17	Cat Creek Road / Pine Grove Road	Cat Creek Road	Pine Grove Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-18	Cat Creek Road /State Route 122	Cat Creek Road	SR 122	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-19	Cat Creek Road/ Radar Site Road	Cat Creek Road	Radar Site Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-20	Cherry Creek Road	Oak Street Ext.	Orr Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	4	Fed-State Draft Const List
R-21	Dasher Grove Road Extension	Dasher Grove Road	Val Del Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	Developer Funded
R-22	Five Points Roundabout	Northside Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	New roadway reconfigurations	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-23	Gornto Road	N/S Railroad	N/S Railroad	Grade Separation	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-24	Hagan Bridge Road	E Coleman Dr	SR 122	Intersection Improvements	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-25	I-75 @ CR 783/LOCH LAUREL ROAD - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance



# VALDOSTA-LOWNDES MPO 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

MTP ID	Project	From	To	Improvement	Project Category	Existing Lanes	Future Lanes	Source List
R-26	I-75 @ SR 376 - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance
R-27	I-75 @ US 84	Exit 16	Exit 16	Interchange Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	1	2	Illustrative List
R-28	I-75 @ New Interchange	Between SR 133	and SR 7 interchanges	New Interchange	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	0	New Road Projects
R-29	I-75/SR 7 Connector	New I-75 Interchange	SR 7 near Country Club Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	New Road Projects
R-30	Inner Perimeter Rd./ Brookfield Rd./Lake Laurie Dr.			Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-31	Inner Perimeter Road/S. Patterson Street	Inner Perimeter	South Patterson	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-32	James Beck Overpass	S. Ashley St/E. Savannah Ave. intersection		Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-33	James Road Extension/ Western Perimeter N	James Road	Indian Ford Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-34	Jumping Gulley Road at Bevel Creek			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance
R-35	Knight Academy Road/Studstill Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-36	Lamar Street at Sugar Creek in Valdosta			Bridge Replacement				Funding Continuance
R-37	Loch Laurel Road / Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bridge Replacement	Roadway and Bridge Maintenance	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-38	Loch Laurel Road / Corinth Church Road	Loch Laurel Road	Corinth Church Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-39	McMillan Road/Staten Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-40	N. Ashley Street / Northside Drive	North Ashley Street	Northside Drive	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-41	N. Oak Street Ext. / Bemiss Road	N. Oak Street Ext.	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-42	N. Valdosta Road / Inner Perimeter Road	N. Valdosta Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-43	North Ashley Street	Vallotton Drive	Bemiss Road	Additional SB Lane	Roadway Capacity and Widening	3	4	New Road Projects
R-44	North Lee Street	Vallotton Drive	East Park Avenue	Center Turn Lane	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	3	New Road Projects
R-45	North Oak Street	Baytree Road	W. Moore Street	One-way to Two-way	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	2	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-46	North Oak Street	W. Alden Avenue	Canna Drive	Center Turn Lane	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	3	New Road Projects
R-47	North Oak Street Extension	Five Points Roundabout	Cherry Creek Road	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	4	New Road Projects
R-48	North Valdosta Road	US 41/Five Points	I-75	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-49	Park Avenue	Ashley Street	N. Patterson Street	Center Turn Lane	Roadway Capacity and Widening	2	3	Illustrative List
R-50	Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road	Prewitte Street	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-51	South Valdosta Truck Bypass	St. Augustine Road	US 84/Clay Road	New Construction	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	4	Fed-State Draft Const List



MTP ID	Project	From	To	Improvement	Project Category	Existing Lanes	Future Lanes	Source List
R-52	SR 122	I-75	Union Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	3, 4	4	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-53	SR 122	I-75	Morven Road	Added Travel Lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	3, 4	4	Local-TIA Draft Const List
R-54	SR 122/Skipper Bridge Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-55	SR 122/Val Del Road			Intersection improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	New Road Projects
R-56	St. Augustine Rd./Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	St. Augustine Road	Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-57	US 84/Hill Avenue at Fry Street	US 84/Hill Avenue	Fry Street	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-58	Val Del Road / McMillan Road / Bethany Road	Val Del Road	McMillan Road/ Bethany Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-59	Val Del Road / North Valdosta Road	Val Del Road	North Valdosta Road	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-60	Webb Road Realignment	SR 122	Webb Road	Realignment, Roundabout	Intersection & Interchange Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-61	Weigh Station at I-75 NB in Lowndes County			Truck parking				Funding Continuance
R-62	Weigh Station at I-75 SB in Lowndes County			Truck parking				Funding Continuance
R-63	West Gordon Street	N. Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Center Turn Lane	Operation & Safety Improvements	2	3	Illustrative List
R-64	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	Roadway Capacity and Widening	4	6	New Road Projects
R-65	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Norman Drive		Intersection Improvement	Operation & Safety Improvements	N/A	N/A	Illustrative List
R-66	West Magnolia Street	Orange Street	Lamar Street	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening	0	2	Illustrative List
R-67	West Marion Avenue (SR 7)/ Lakes Blvd.	West Marion Avenue	Lake Blvd.	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements		N/A	Illustrative List
R-68	West Marion Avenue / N. Gordon Street	West Marion Avenue	N. Gordon Street	Intersection Improvement	Intersection & Interchange Improvements		N/A	Illustrative List
R-69	Western Perimeter S	SR 31/Madison Hwy.	Old Clyattville Road	New Road	Roadway Capacity and Widening		2	Illustrative List



Figure 2-1: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects







Figure 2-2: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Roadway Projects in Urban Core





## 2.1.2 Public Transportation Needs

To expand fixed-route coverage and enhance on-demand services, the unconstrained needs package includes a three-route fixed-bus network, major amenity upgrades, mobility hubs, and complementary pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure. Route 1 (North–South Loop), Route 2 (East–West Connection), and Route 3 (Moody AFB Commuter) form the backbone of the system, with headways as frequent as 20–30 minutes during peak periods. On-demand services are bolstered by additional vehicles (including electric and wheelchair-accessible units), extended hours (evenings and weekends), and improved virtual stops and shelters. Strategic mobility hubs, “super stops,” real-time signage, and integration with complete-streets enhancements further support reliability and rider comfort. (See Table 2-2 and Figure 2-3.)

Table 2-2: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Transit Projects

MTP ID	Project Name	Improvement
T-1	Route 1: North-South Loop	Fixed-Route Bus Route
T-2	Route 2: East-West Connection	Fixed-Route Bus Route
T-3	Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base	Fixed-Route Bus Route
T-4	Expand Valdosta On-Demand Services	Reliability Improvements
T-5	Mobility Hubs	Develop Transit Hubs and Mobility Hubs
T-6	Bus Super Stops	Provide Transit Connectivity, Reliability and Amenities
T-7	Connected Bus Stops	Improve Sidewalk Infrastructure and Connectivity to Proposed Transit Services
T-8	Upgraded Bus Amenities	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure
T-9	Transit App Upgrades	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure


Please refer to Figure 2-3 on the next page for map showing the location of these projects.

## 2.1.3 Active Transportation Needs

A holistic “active transportation” network is recommended, covering sidewalk infill, protected and conventional bike lanes, intersection safety improvements, multi-use paths, and a regionwide cyclist education program. Projects emphasize connecting neighborhoods to schools, commercial centers, parks, and transit hubs. Multi-use paths along high-speed corridors (e.g., Bemiss Road) and recreational trails along the Withlacoochee River foster both mobility and leisure. (See Table 2-3 and Figure 2-4 - Figure 2-7)



Figure 2-3: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Fixed Route Bus Routes



## Fixed Route Transit Recommendations

- Route 1: North-South Loop
- Route 2: East-West Connection
- Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base
- VLMPO Extents
- County Boundaries
- City Boundaries
- Park
- School
- Interstate
- Principal Arterial
- Minor Arterial
- Major Collector
- Lakes and Ponds
- Railroads
- ✈ Aviation Facilities

Data Sources:  
GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMPO & City of Valdosta



Table 2-3: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Active Transportation Projects

MTP ID	Project Name	From	To	Improvement
A-1	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Eastern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Valdosta High School	Multi-Use Path
A-2	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Northern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Freedom Park	Multi-Use Path
A-3	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Southern Extension	Sustella Trail	John W. Saunders Memorial Park	Multi-Use Path
A-4	Azalea City Trail/Sustella Trail - Western Extension	Wainwright Drive	Valdosta Mall	Multi-Use Path
A-5	Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Infill sidewalks, bike lanes
A-6	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Knight Academy Road	Fill sidewalk gaps and consider bike lanes north of Inner Perimeter Road
A-7	Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements
A-8	Berkley Drive	Gornto Road	Eager Rd	Install 5-foot-wide sidewalks, benches, and rest areas
A-9	Country Club Drive	Highway 7/US 41	Jerry Jones Drive	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings
A-10	Cyclist Education Program			Public Outreach / Education
A-11	E Park Avenue	N Ashley Street	Inner Perimeter Road	Install bike lanes, construct sidewalks where gaps exist
A-12	Eager/Jerry Jones Drive	Oak Street	Baytree Drive	Construct sidewalks for pedestrian safety, Install protected bike lanes
A-13	Gornto Road	North Oak Street	Jerry Jones Drive	Construct sidewalks on both sides
A-14	Implement Complete Streets			Improve Connectivity and Sidewalk Infrastructure
A-15	Inner Perimeter Road	Valdosta Road	Forrest Street Extension	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings
A-16	Lake Park Road	Holiday Street	South Street	Fill sidewalk system gap
A-17	Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Hill Avenue	Fill sidewalk gaps, install protected bike lanes
A-18	Norman Drive at Baytree Road			Intersection Improvements
A-19	Norman Drive at St. Augustine Road			Intersection Improvements
A-20	North Oak Street	Gornto Road	Valdosta Middle School	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides
A-21	North Oak Street Extension at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements
A-22	North Valdosta Road	Country Club Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	Improve pedestrian sidewalk connectivity
A-23	Northside Drive	North Oak Street	Bemiss Road	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure
A-24	Old Hudson Street and/or McDougal Street	Lake Park	Fry Street	Construct sidewalks
A-25	Park Avenue	N Patterson Street	N Ashley Street	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes on both sides, install 2-3 foot green buffers, and protected or buffered bike lanes
A-26	Pineview Drive	Bemiss Road	E Park Avenue	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure
A-27	South Oak Street	W Central Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Add clearly marked bicycle lanes, signage, and road markings indicating priority for cyclists
A-28	St. Augustine Road	Harmon Drive	Twin Street	Fill sidewalk system gap
A-29	Toombs Street	W Crane Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Install sidewalks
A-30	U.S. Highway 84	RR Xing	Blanchard St.	Install sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, buffers, benches, and bike-friendly intersections
A-31	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Consider adding sidewalks and bike lanes
A-32	Withlacoochee River Trail - north and south of Langdale Park	Cherry Lake	Sugar Creek Landing	Multi-Use Path
A-33	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Moody Air Force Base	Install protected bike lanes
A-34	E Park Avenue	Pineview Dr	Inner Perimeter Road	Install new sidewalk and fill gaps in existing sidewalks
A-35	N St Augustine Rd	Twin St	River St	Multi-Use Path
A-36	N Oak Street	Northside Dr	Baytree Drive	Install bike facility



Figure 2-4: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Focused Projects






Figure 2-5: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Bicycle Focused Projects






Figure 2-6: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Pedestrian Intersection Safety Project Locations







Figure 2-7: Recommended 2050 VLMPO Multi-Use Paths and Recreational Trails



### Multi-Use Recommendations

- |                                |                   |                     |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Recommended Multi-Use Facility | County Boundaries | Interstate          |
| Existing Bike Lane             | City Boundaries   | Principal Arterial  |
| Existing Sidewalk              | Lakes and Ponds   | Minor Arterial      |
| Existing Trail                 | Park              | Major Collector     |
| VLMPO Extents                  | School            | Railroads           |
|                                |                   | Aviation Facilities |

Data Sources:  
GDOT, GARC, SGRC, VLMPO & City of Valdosta



## 2.1.4 ITS and Signalization Needs


To achieve a more connected, efficient, and safe network, the unconstrained ITS package calls for a regionally integrated signal system and targeted signal installations/enhancements. All existing signals would be upgraded to Valdosta's central-control standard, or a compatible county system to enable real-time coordination. Corridor-wide signal optimization projects are identified based on crash data and 2050 traffic projections. These measures support FHWA's safety, efficiency, and communications goals, including potential deployment of dynamic speed warning, work-zone alerts, and incident-management technologies. (See Table 2-4 and Figure 2-8.)

Table 2-4: Future ITS/Signalization Needs

MTP ID	Project Name	From	To	Improvement
I-04	Bemiss Road Signalization Enhancement	US-41	GA-122	Optimize signalization along route to support future volumes, level of service; ITS Priority Route
I-05	US-41 Signalization Enhancement	I-75	Bemiss Road	Optimize signalization along route to support future volumes, level of service; ITS Priority Route
I-06	I-75 Interchange Signalization Enhancement	US-41	US-84	Optimize signalization along route to support future volumes, level of service; ITS Priority Route
I-07	ITS System Enhancement			Integrate non-Valdosta traffic signals to City of Valdosta ITS Smart System, OR; create complementary integrated County operated ITS system



Figure 2-8: Future ITS/Signalization Needs



Data Sources: USDOT, GDOT, GARC, VLMPO, & City of Valdosta



## 2.1.5 Electric Vehicle Needs


Supporting Georgia's NEVI goals, six charging-infrastructure projects are recommended along the I-75 Alternative Fuel Corridor (pending segments at Old Clyattville Rd, Madison Hwy, Lakes Blvd, and Bellville Rd) and at two major regional destinations (Valdosta Mall and Valdosta Regional Airport). Each I-75 NEVI station is envisioned with four CCS ports delivering at least 150 kW per port, spaced no more than 50 miles apart and within 0.5 miles of freeway exits. Non-NEVI installations are designed to NEVI specifications to ensure consistency and futureproofing. (See Table 2-5 and Figure 2-9.)

Table 2-5: Electric Vehicle Future Needs

MTP ID	Project Name	Improvement	Notes
E-01	I-75 at Old Clyattville Rd NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-02	I-75 at Madison Hwy NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-03	I-75 at Lakes Blvd NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-04	I-75 Bellville NEVI Improvement	Install NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure along the <i>in-progress</i> Alternative Fuel Corridor within one mile of the I-75 exit	
E-05	Airport EV Infrastructure Installment	Install charging infrastructure at the Valdosta Regional Airport	This project does not qualify for NEVI, but the project should recommend NEVI consistent infrastructure as a standard
E-06	Valdosta Mall EV Infrastructure Installment	Install charging infrastructure at the Valdosta Mall	This project does not qualify for NEVI, but the project should recommend NEVI consistent infrastructure as a standard



Figure 2-9: Electric Vehicle Existing Status and Future Needs





## 2.2 Cost of Unconstrained Needs

The unconstrained needs assessment aggregates planning-level cost estimates for all projects proposed in the VLMPO 2050 MTP across five major categories: highway/roads & bridges; electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure; active transportation; transit; and intelligent transportation systems. These projects reflect planning-level cost estimates in year-of-expenditure (YOE) dollars and represent an unconstrained “needs” list prior to applying fiscal constraints. Collectively, the total cost of these unconstrained needs is estimated at just over \$1.1 billion in 2025 dollars, exclusive of contingency and year-of-expenditure (YOE) adjustments (see **Appendix F: Revenue Projections and Project Costs Technical Memorandum** for detailed tables).

- The largest share, approximately \$1.017 billion, is attributable to **roadway and bridge projects**, reflecting capacity expansions, intersection improvements, grade separations, and safety enhancements on both interstate and local corridors. These cost estimates incorporate engineering (PE), right-of-way (ROW), utilities, and construction phases, and have been updated from the 2045 MTP with a 35 percent inflation adjustment for carried-forward projects and new planning-level estimates for emerging needs.
- **Active transportation improvements**, including multi-use paths, sidewalks, protected bike lanes, intersection safety measures, and complete streets elements, total roughly \$34.3 million, derived from unit costs prepared by the University of North Carolina (UNC) Highway Safety Research Center for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and adjusted via CPI.
- **Transit capital and service expansion projects**, including three new fixed routes, an on-demand fleet expansion, mobility hubs, super-stops, and passenger amenities, sum to approximately \$9.1 million. These sketch-level estimates encompass rolling stock, shelters, signage, operations support, and technology upgrades.
- **Electric vehicle charging infrastructure** is estimated at \$6 million, based on \$1 million per site for six new fast-charging locations along I-75, consistent with GDOT’s EV Development Plan.
- Although not quantified here, **ITS deployments** (e.g., traffic management centers, signal optimization) are also included in the unconstrained list; refer to Appendix F for full line-item costs.

Taken together, these cost estimates define the full price of project needs through 2050. Further details on cost assumptions, categorical breakdowns, and project-specific notes can be found in **Appendix F: Revenue Projections and Project Costs Technical Memorandum**. Table 2-6 through Table 2-8 illustrate the planning-level cost estimates for each highway and bridges, active transportation, and public transit projects respectively.

The prioritization and financial constraint process will determine which projects can be funded within the revenue forecast described in **Section 2.3** of this report.



Table 2-6: Highway/Roads and Bridges Project Cost Estimates

Project	From	To	Improvement	PE	Row	Util	Cst	Total
R-1 Alden Avenue	N Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 1,060,020	\$ 1,378,026	\$ 2,120,040	\$ 10,600,200	\$ 15,158,286
R-2 Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Center Turn Lane	\$ 1,975,000	\$ 2,567,500	\$ 3,950,000	\$ 19,750,000	\$ 28,242,500
R-3 Baytree Road	Norman Dr	N Oak St	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 1,864,701	\$ 2,424,111	\$ 3,729,402	\$ 18,647,010	\$ 26,665,224
R-4 Baytree Road / Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Norman Drive	Intersection Improvement	\$ 292,950	\$ 380,835	\$ 585,900	\$ 2,929,500	\$ 4,189,185
R-5 BAYTREE ROAD GRADE SEPARATION	NS Railroad	NS Railroad	Grade Separation	\$ 4,270,000	\$ 5,551,000	\$ 8,540,000	\$ 42,700,000	\$ 61,061,000
R-6 Baytree Road North Extension	Baytree Road	Coleman Road	Extend existing roadway	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,340,000	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 18,000,000	\$ 25,740,000
R-7 Baytree Road/ Sherwood Drive	Baytree Road	Sherwood Drive	Intersection Improvement	\$ 380,000	\$ 494,000	\$ 760,000	\$ 3,800,000	\$ 5,434,000
R-8 Bemiss Knights Academy Road	Studstill Road	Old Bemiss Road	Turn lanes at terminus points	\$ 155,000	\$ 201,500	\$ 310,000	\$ 1,550,000	\$ 2,216,500
R-9 Bemiss Knights Academy/Old Pine Road	Old Bemiss Road	Bemiss Road/Old Pine Rd Ex	Intersection Realignment	\$ 190,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 380,000	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 2,717,000
R-10 Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Moody AFB	Widen from 4 lanes to 6	\$ 6,124,200	\$ 7,961,460	\$ 12,248,400	\$ 61,242,000	\$ 87,576,060
R-11 Bemiss Road / Connell Road	Bemiss Road	Connell Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 180,000	\$ 234,000	\$ 360,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,574,000
R-12 Bemiss Road / Davidson Road	Bemiss Road	Davidson Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-13 Bemiss Road / Skipper Bridge Rd	Bemiss Road	Skipper Bridge Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 40,500	\$ 52,650	\$ 81,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 579,150
R-14 Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter	Bemiss Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 163,000	\$ 211,900	\$ 326,000	\$ 1,630,000	\$ 2,330,900
R-15 Boone (Dairy) Road CSX Crossing			Potential safety improvement	\$ 100,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,430,000
R-16 Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 34,000	\$ 44,200	\$ 68,000	\$ 340,000	\$ 486,200
R-17 Cat Creek Road / Pine Grove Road	Cat Creek Road	Pine Grove Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,500	\$ 39,650	\$ 61,000	\$ 305,000	\$ 436,150
R-18 Cat Creek Road /State Route 122	Cat Creek Road	SR 122	Intersection Improvement	\$ 40,500	\$ 52,650	\$ 81,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 579,150
R-19 Cat Creek Road/ Radar Site Road	Cat Creek Road	Radar Site Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 23,500	\$ 30,550	\$ 47,000	\$ 235,000	\$ 336,050
R-20 Cherry Creek Road	Oak Street Ext.	Orr Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 3,400,000	\$ 4,420,000	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 34,000,000	\$ 48,620,000
R-21 Dasher Grove Road Extension	Dasher Grove Road	Val Del Road	New Road	\$ 268,700	\$ 349,310	\$ 537,400	\$ 2,687,000	\$ 3,842,410
R-22 Five Points Roundabout	Northside Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	New roadway reconfiguration	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,105,000	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 8,500,000	\$ 12,155,000
R-23 Gornto Road	NS Railroad	NS Railroad	Grade Separation	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,560,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 17,160,000
R-24 Hagan Bridge Road	E Coleman Dr	SR 122	Intersection Improvements	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,560,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 17,160,000
R-25 I-75 @ CR 783/LOCH LAUREL ROAD - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement	\$ 1,563,000	\$ 2,031,900	\$ 3,126,000	\$ 15,630,000	\$ 22,350,900
R-26 I-75 @ SR 376 - PHASE II			Bridge Replacement	\$ 2,509,200	\$ 3,261,960	\$ 5,018,400	\$ 25,092,000	\$ 35,881,560
R-27 I-75 @ US 84	Exit 16	Exit 16	Interchange Improvement	\$ 3,340,000	\$ 4,342,000	\$ 6,680,000	\$ 33,400,000	\$ 47,762,000
R-28 I-75 @ New Interchange	Between SR 133	and SR 7 interchanges	New Interchange	\$ 1,918,100	\$ 2,493,530	\$ 3,836,200	\$ 19,181,000	\$ 27,428,830
R-29 I-75/SR 7 Connector	New I-75 Interchange	SR 7 near Country Club Road	New Road	\$ 415,400	\$ 540,020	\$ 830,800	\$ 4,154,000	\$ 5,940,220
R-30 Inner Perimeter Rd. / Brookfield Rd. / Lake Laurie Dr. Intersection			Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-31 Inner Perimeter Road/S. Patterson Street	Inner Perimeter	South Patterson	Intersection Improvement	\$ 31,000	\$ 40,300	\$ 62,000	\$ 310,000	\$ 443,300
R-32 James Beck Overpass	S. Ashley St/E. Savannah Ave.	Intersection	Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-33 James Road Extension/Western Perimeter	James Road	Indian Ford Road	New Road	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 1,482,000	\$ 2,280,000	\$ 11,400,000	\$ 16,302,000
R-34 Jumping Gulley Road @ Bevel Creek 6 Mi SW of Lake Park			Bridge Replacement	\$ 737,600	\$ 958,880	\$ 1,475,200	\$ 7,376,000	\$ 10,547,680
R-35 Knight Academy Road/Studstill Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 58,620	\$ 76,206	\$ 117,240	\$ 586,200	\$ 838,266
R-36 Lamar Street @ Sugar Creek in Valdosta			Bridge Replacement	\$ 72,180	\$ 93,834	\$ 144,360	\$ 721,800	\$ 1,032,174
R-37 Loch Laurel Road / Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bevel Creek Bridge	Bridge Replacement	\$ 175,000	\$ 227,500	\$ 350,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 2,502,500
R-38 Loch Laurel Road / Corinth Church Road	Loch Laurel Road	Corinth Church Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 85,000	\$ 110,500	\$ 170,000	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,215,500
R-39 McMillan Road/Staten Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 31,710	\$ 41,223	\$ 63,420	\$ 317,100	\$ 453,453
R-40 N. Ashley Street / Northside Drive	North Ashley Street	Northside Drive	Intersection Improvement	\$ 195,000	\$ 253,500	\$ 390,000	\$ 1,950,000	\$ 2,788,500
R-41 N. Oak Street Ext. / Bemiss Road	N. Oak Street Ext.	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,500	\$ 39,650	\$ 61,000	\$ 305,000	\$ 436,150
R-42 N. Valdosta Road / Inner Perimeter Road	N. Valdosta Road	Inner Perimeter Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 195,000	\$ 253,500	\$ 390,000	\$ 1,950,000	\$ 2,788,500
R-43 North Ashley Street	Vallotton Drive	Bemiss Road	Additional SB Lane	\$ 345,195	\$ 448,754	\$ 690,390	\$ 3,451,950	\$ 4,936,289
R-44 North Lee Street	Vallotton Drive	East Park Avenue	Center Turn Lane	\$ 205,470	\$ 267,111	\$ 410,940	\$ 2,054,700	\$ 2,938,221
R-45 North Oak Street	Baytree Road	W. Moore Street	One-way to Two-way	\$ 230,000	\$ 299,000	\$ 460,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 3,289,000
R-46 North Oak Street	W. Alden Avenue	Canna Drive	Center Turn Lane	\$ 416,130	\$ 540,969	\$ 832,260	\$ 4,161,300	\$ 5,950,659
R-47 North Oak Street Extension	Five Points Roundabout	Cherry Creek Road	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	\$ 815,760	\$ 1,060,488	\$ 1,631,520	\$ 8,157,600	\$ 11,665,368
R-48 North Valdosta Road	US 41/Five Points	I-75	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 5,850,000	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ 64,350,000
R-49 Park Avenue	Ashley Street	N. Patterson Street	Center Turn Lane	\$ 702,000	\$ 912,600	\$ 1,404,000	\$ 7,020,000	\$ 10,038,600
R-50 Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road	Prewitte Street	Bemiss Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 140,000	\$ 182,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 2,002,000
R-51 South Valdosta Truck Bypass	St. Augustine Road	US 84/Clay Road	New Construction	\$ 18,700,000	\$ 24,310,000	\$ 37,400,000	\$ 187,000,000	\$ 267,410,000
R-52 SR 122	I-75	Union Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 770,000	\$ 1,001,000	\$ 1,540,000	\$ 7,700,000	\$ 11,011,000
R-53 SR 122	I-75	Morven Road	Added Travel Lanes	\$ 1,115,000	\$ 1,449,500	\$ 2,230,000	\$ 11,150,000	\$ 15,944,500
R-54 SR 122/Skipper Bridge Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 83,286	\$ 108,272	\$ 166,572	\$ 832,860	\$ 1,190,990
R-55 SR 122/Val Del Road			Intersection improvement	\$ 83,286	\$ 108,272	\$ 166,572	\$ 832,860	\$ 1,190,990
R-56 St. Augustine Rd./Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr	St. Augustine Road	Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,800	\$ 40,040	\$ 61,600	\$ 308,000	\$ 440,440
R-57 US 84/Hill Avenue at Fry Street	US 84/Hill Avenue	Fry Street	Intersection Improvement	\$ 121,000	\$ 157,300	\$ 242,000	\$ 1,210,000	\$ 1,730,300
R-58 Val Del Road / Mcmillan Road /	Val Del Road	McMillan Road/Bethany Roa	Intersection Improvement	\$ 30,800	\$ 40,040	\$ 61,600	\$ 308,000	\$ 440,440
R-59 Val Del Road / North Valdosta Road	Val Del Road	North Valdosta Road	Intersection Improvement	\$ 138,780	\$ 180,414	\$ 277,560	\$ 1,387,800	\$ 1,984,554
R-60 Webb Road Realignment	SR 122	Webb Road	Realignment, Roundabout	\$ 585,900	\$ 761,670	\$ 1,171,800	\$ 5,859,000	\$ 8,378,370
R-61 Weigh Station @ I-75 NB in Lowndes County			Truck parking	\$ 287,100	\$ 373,230	\$ 574,200	\$ 2,871,000	\$ 4,105,530
R-62 Weigh Station @ I-75 SB in Lowndes County			Truck parking	\$ 234,690	\$ 305,097	\$ 469,380	\$ 2,346,900	\$ 3,356,067
R-63 West Gordon Street	N. Patterson Street	Baytree Road	Center Turn Lane	\$ 702,000	\$ 912,600	\$ 1,404,000	\$ 7,020,000	\$ 10,038,600
R-64 West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Widen from 4 lanes to 6	\$ 170,208	\$ 221,270	\$ 340,416	\$ 1,702,080	\$ 2,433,974
R-65 West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Norman Drive		Intersection Improvement	\$ 202,707	\$ 263,519	\$ 405,414	\$ 2,027,070	\$ 2,898,710
R-66 West Magnolia Street	Orange Street	Lamar Street	New Road	\$ 160,710	\$ 208,923	\$ 321,420	\$ 1,607,100	\$ 2,298,153
R-67 West Marion Avenue (SR 7)/Lakes Blvd.	West Marion Avenue	Lake Blvd.	Intersection Improvement	\$ 108,000	\$ 140,400	\$ 216,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,544,400
R-68 West Marion Avenue / N. Gordon Street	West Marion Avenue	N. Gordon Street	Intersection Improvement	\$ 700	\$ 910	\$ 1,400	\$ 7,000	\$ 10,010
R-69 Western Perimeter S	SR 31/Madison Hwy.	Old Ciyattville Road	New Road	\$ 1,032,600	\$ 1,342,380	\$ 2,065,200	\$ 10,326,000	\$ 14,766,180
			<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 71,106,517</b>	<b>\$ 92,438,472</b>	<b>\$ 142,213,034</b>	<b>\$ 711,065,168</b>	<b>\$ 1,016,823,190</b>



Table 2-7: Active Transportation Project Cost Estimates

VLMPO ID	Project Name	From	To	Improvement	Notes	COST
A-1	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Eastern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Valdosta High School	Multi-Use Path	Connects Valdosta Youth Complex to Valdosta High School. Project could be part of sidewalk infill along Park Avenue.	\$ 1,000,000
A-2	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Northern Extension	Valdosta Youth Complex	Freedom Park	Multi-Use Path	Connects northern residential neighborhoods and parks, offering residents in this area a safe route for commuting or recreational use. This would connect two recreation areas and could tie into potential connections with Bemiss Road's own bike and pedestrian infrastructure improvements.	\$ 1,500,000
A-3	Azalea City Trail Expansion - Southern Extension	Sustella Trail	John W. Saunders Memorial Park	Multi-Use Path	Connects VSU and Mall to John Saunders Park and surrounding residential neighborhoods, offering a direct route for recreational use and expanding the reach of the trail to the outer parts of Valdosta.	\$ 500,000
A-4	Azalea City Trail/Sustella Trail - Western Extension	Wainwright Drive	Valdosta Mall	Multi-Use Path	Provides students and residents with direct access to both the university and the nearby commercial district, linking education and shopping facilities to the trail.	\$ 1,000,000
A-5	Barack Obama Blvd	East Hill Avenue	Northside Drive	Infill sidewalks, bike lanes		\$ 1,000,000
A-6	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Knight Academy Road	Fill sidewalk gaps and consider bike lanes north of Inner Perimeter Road	Where missing, add 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalks on both sides to accommodate pedestrian traffic. In areas with heavy pedestrian traffic, such as around shopping centers, widen sidewalks to 8 feet or create multi-use paths to support both pedestrians and cyclists. Install protected bike lanes from Northside Drive to Moody Air Force Base. Enhance pedestrian crossings at key intersections: Northside Drive, Guest Road, Knights Academy Road.	\$ 1,300,000
A-7	Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements	Pedestrian refuge islands: Add at this wide intersection to allow pedestrians a safe area to stop halfway through the crossing. Crossing signal adjustments: Ensure crossing signals allow sufficient time for pedestrians to cross the wide intersection safely.	\$ 100,000
A-8	Berkley Drive	Gomto Road	Eager Rd	Install 5-foot-wide sidewalks, benches, and rest areas	Build 5-foot-wide sidewalks to accommodate seniors who frequently walk in the area, ensuring they are ADA-compliant and easily accessible for those with mobility aids. Install benches and rest areas at intervals along the sidewalks for elderly pedestrians who may need breaks while walking.	\$ 300,000
A-9	Country Club Drive	Highway 7/US 41	Jerry Jones Drive	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings	Build sidewalks along both sides of Country Club Drive, from US 41 to Northside Drive. Add crosswalks at key intersections along the route, particularly at Country Club Drive & US 41 and Country Club Drive & Jerry Jones Drive.	\$ 400,000
A-10	Cyclist Education Program			Public Outreach / Education	Initiate public campaigns and school programs on safe cycling practices, emphasizing helmet use, hand signals, and cyclist rights. Partner with local cycling groups to promote and encourage community engagement in bike safety awareness campaigns.	Staff Time
A-11	E Park Avenue	N Ashley Street	Inner Perimeter Road	Install bike lanes, construct sidewalks where gaps exist	Near Valdosta High School and Valdosta Middle School, add raised crosswalks at intersections and along mid-block crossings to slow traffic and give cyclists and pedestrians priority.	\$ 4,100,000
A-12	Eager/Jerry Jones Drive	Oak Street	Baytree Drive	Construct sidewalks for pedestrian safety, install protected bike lanes	Include with TIA project to add center turn lane. Construct sidewalks on both sides of Eager/Jerry Jones Drive where feasible, include ramps at street corners and driveways for seamless transitions, and install Mid-Block Crossings.	\$ 3,000,000
A-13	Gomto Road	North Oak Street	Jerry Jones Drive	Construct sidewalks on both sides	Install high-visibility crosswalks and pedestrian signals, fill existing sidewalk gaps	\$ 400,000
A-14	Implement Complete Streets			Improve Connectivity and Sidewalk Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement Complete Streets principles in TOD areas, ensuring roads accommodate all users—pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders. Design street projects with bike lanes, wide sidewalks, and traffic calming measures, where applicable, to enhance safety and comfort.</li> <li>Prioritize Complete Streets improvements around key transit corridors like Ashley Street, Patterson Street, and areas near Valdosta State University, which are critical for the city's transit network.</li> <li>Enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety at high-traffic intersections, such as those near Valdosta Mall, Downtown Valdosta, and Valdosta High School.</li> <li>Integrate Complete Streets designs with mixed-use developments near transit nodes to ensure that new commercial and residential developments are walkable and transit-friendly.</li> </ul>	\$ 100,000
A-15	Inner Perimeter Road	Valdosta Road	Forrest Street Extension	Install sidewalks and pedestrian crossings	Install high-visibility crosswalks at key intersections and high-crash zones, including Inner Perimeter Road at Valdosta Road and Bemiss Road, near shopping centers and schools.	\$ 850,000
A-16	Lake Park Road	Holiday Street	South Street	Fill sidewalk system gap	Install sidewalks in underserved community to improve connectivity	\$ 50,000
A-17	Norman Drive	Baytree Road	Hill Avenue	Fill sidewalk gaps, install protected bike lanes	Install protected bike lanes; Fill in sidewalk gaps by adding sidewalks where missing. Focus on building wide sidewalks (8-10 feet) near commercial areas such as Valdosta Mall to handle higher pedestrian volumes and provide space for benches and trees.	\$ 850,000
A-18	Norman Drive at Baytree Road			Intersection Improvements	Add high-visibility crosswalks at this large intersection to improve pedestrian safety. Improve signal timing to prioritize pedestrian crossings at street corners and driveways for seamless transitions	\$ 10,000
A-19	Norman Drive at St. Augustine Road			Intersection Improvements	Install raised crosswalks and curb extensions to reduce crossing distances for pedestrians and slow down turning vehicles. Install pedestrian refuge islands in the middle of the intersection to provide a safe waiting area for pedestrians crossing multiple lanes. Ensure that pedestrian countdown signals are visible and provide sufficient time for crossing the intersection. Add LED pedestrian crossing	\$ 1,000,000
A-20	North Oak Street	Gomto Road	Valdosta Middle School	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides	Add mid-block crosswalks near Valdosta Middle School	\$ 300,000
A-21	North Oak Street Extension at Inner Perimeter Road			Intersection Improvements	Install pedestrian refuge islands and improve signal timing to prioritize pedestrian crossing safety.	\$ 50,000
A-22	North Valdosta Road	Country Club Drive	Inner Perimeter Road	Improve pedestrian sidewalk connectivity	Connect suburban development with commercial centers and public services	\$ 200,000
A-23	Northside Drive	North Oak Street	Bemiss Road	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure	Fill in sidewalk gaps to connect commercial and residential areas by constructing sidewalks on both sides of Northside Drive where needed and include ramps at street corners and driveways for seamless transitions	\$ 400,000
A-24	Old Hudson Street and/or McDougal Street	Lake Park	Fry Street	Construct sidewalks	Connect Lake Park Road to Mildred Hunter Community Center	\$ 40,000
A-25	Park Avenue	N Patterson Street	N Ashley Street	Install 6-foot-wide sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes on both sides, install 2-3 foot green buffers, and	Install sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes with buffers for safety	\$ 1,400,000
A-26	Pineview Drive	Bemiss Road	E Park Avenue	Install sidewalks and improve pedestrian infrastructure	Fill in sidewalk gaps to connect residential areas by constructing sidewalks on both sides of Pineview Drive where needed and include ramps at street corners and driveways for seamless transitions	\$ 800,000
A-27	South Oak Street	W Central Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Add clearly marked bicycle lanes, signage, and road markings indicating priority for cyclists	Connect sidewalks, where missing on S Oak Street from Savannah Avenue to Old Clyattville Road, including RR Xings. Enhance intersections by installing bike boxes and dedicated signal phases for cyclists at key intersections.	\$ 300,000
A-28	St. Augustine Road	Harmon Drive	Twin Street	Fill sidewalk system gap	Widen existing sidewalks to 8-10 feet and repair damaged sections to improve pedestrian safety and accessibility. Consider bus stops with shelters, seating, and lighting along the corridor to make transit more accessible in the future. Add mid-block crossings with signalized pedestrian lights in areas where intersections are spaced far apart	\$ 350,000
A-29	Toombs Street	W Crane Avenue	Old Clyattville Road	Install sidewalks	Connect sidewalks, where missing, including RR Xings.	\$ 250,000
A-30	U.S. Highway 84	RR Xing	Blanchard St.	Install sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, buffers, benches, and bike-friendly intersections	6-foot-wide concrete sidewalks to accommodate higher foot traffic, with ADA-compliant curb ramps at intersections. Enhance pedestrian crossings at key intersections. Where space allows, add a 2-3 foot landscaped buffer zone between the sidewalk and the roadway to improve pedestrian safety by separating foot traffic from vehicles. Add protected bike lanes.	\$ 650,000
A-31	West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	I-75	E of Norman Drive	Consider adding sidewalks and bike lanes		\$ 100,000
A-32	Withlacoochee River Trail - north and south of Langdale Park	Cherry Lake	Sugar Creek Landing	Multi-Use Path	Develop a multi-use path along the Withlacoochee River, linking parks, recreational facilities, and historical landmarks. Provide a scenic route for cyclists and pedestrians, connecting them to a wide range of outdoor activities and natural settings. Complement to kayaking along the river.	\$ 8,000,000
A-33	Bemiss Road (SR 125)	N Ashley Street	Moody Air Force Base	Install protected bike lanes	Where missing, add 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalks on both sides to accommodate pedestrian traffic. In areas with heavy pedestrian traffic, such as around shopping centers, widen sidewalks to 8 feet or create multi-use paths to support both pedestrians and cyclists. Install protected bike lanes from Northside Drive to Moody Air Force Base. Enhance pedestrian crossings at key intersections: Northside Drive, Guest Road, Knights Academy Road.	\$ 2,300,000
A-34	E Park Avenue	Pineview Dr	Inner Perimeter Road	Install new sidewalk and fill gaps in existing sidewalks	Build 5 foot sidewalk to provide connection to schools.	\$ 400,000
A-35	N St. Augustine Rd	Twin St	River St	Multi-Use Path	Install wide multi-use path for bicycle and pedestrian traffic connecting to destinations such as Valdosta Mall.	\$ 600,000
A-36	N Oak Street	Northside Dr	Baytree Drive	Install bike facility	Install bike facility to connect to destinations such as VSU.	\$ 600,000
A-37	Loch Laurel Road/SR 376			Study sidewalk needs	Study need/feasibility for sidewalks on Loch Laurel Road and SR 376 west of I-75	\$ 80,000
A-38	E-Bike/E-Scooter Program				Study need/feasibility for an E-Bike and/or E-Scooter program	\$ 40,000
Active Transportation Projects Total Cost						\$ 34,320,000



Table 2-8: Transit Project Cost Estimates

VLMP ID	Project Name	Improvement	Notes	Cost
T-1	Route 1: North-South Loop	Fixed-Route Bus Route	•This route connects North Valdosta, Freedom Park, Downtown Valdosta, and the Southside community, utilizing Ashley Street for northbound travel and Patterson Street for southbound travel. It passes through key intersections like Bemiss Road and Baytree	\$ 2,400,000
T-2	Route 2: East-West Connection	Fixed-Route Bus Route	•This route connects residential areas in the East (Inner Perimeter Road) to West Valdosta, following key corridors like Baytree Road, Oak Street, and Park Avenue, providing a direct connection between the eastern and western parts of the city.	\$ 2,400,000
T-3	Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base	Fixed-Route Bus Route	•This route serves Moody Air Force Base and surrounding neighborhoods, providing service for military personnel and civilians commuting to the base. It connects the base with nearby residential areas and commercial centers in Valdosta. •A southern terminus with a park-and-ride lot at Perimeter Road or Ashley Street could	\$ 2,400,000
<i>To encourage ridership, frequent service should be provided during peak commuting hours (e.g., early mornings and late afternoons), with buses running every 20-30 minutes during these times. Peak Hours (6:00 AM - 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM - 7:00 PM): Higher frequency along major routes, particularly those serving workers commuting to downtown, industrial parks, and educational institutions. Off-Peak Service (Midday): Buses every 40-60 minutes during non-peak hours to ensure coverage, but at a reduced frequency. Evening and</i>				
T-4	Expand Valdosta On-Demand Services	Reliability Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Expand the current fleet of 9 minivans by adding at least 6 more vehicles (with a focus on adding both standard and wheelchair-accessible vehicles) for On-Demand services.</li> <li>•Allocate additional vehicles to areas with higher demand, such as around Valdosta State University, Downtown Valdosta, and South Georgia Medical Center. These areas experience peak usage during specific hours and increasing the fleet size will reduce wait times for riders.</li> <li>•Consider adding electric vehicles to the fleet for a more sustainable and cost-effective operation, in line with regional and national environmental goals.</li> <li>•Expand and optimize the number of virtual bus stops to improve the convenience of pickup locations, especially in underserved communities.</li> <li>•Ensure virtual stops are strategically placed to minimize walking distances for riders, particularly for the elderly and people with disabilities. Consider placing stops closer to major building entrances in shopping malls, healthcare facilities, and universities.</li> <li>•Where possible, install shelters or designated waiting areas at frequently used pickup locations to improve rider comfort while waiting.</li> <li>•Expand Valdosta On-Demand service hours to include evenings and weekends, which are currently underserved.</li> <li>•Add late-night service (e.g., until 11:00 PM or midnight) to accommodate riders who</li> </ul>	\$ 650,000
T-5	Mobility Hubs	Develop Transit Hubs and Mobility Hubs	Create strategically placed mobility hubs that integrate multiple modes of transportation, such as bike-share programs, scooter stations, electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, and bus stops. These hubs should be placed in areas of high activity such as downtown Valdosta, Valdosta Mall, and North Valdosta. These mobility hubs can be independent of fixed route bus services or in addition to adding fixed route service.	\$ 1,100,000
T-6	Bus Super Stops	Provide Transit Connectivity, Reliability and Amenities	Design "super stops" with enhanced amenities like shelters, benches, and wayfinding signage. These should be located at locations where proposed routes intersect, and included as part of fixed route services.	\$ 30,000
T-7	Connected Bus Stops	Improve Sidewalk Infrastructure and Connectivity to Proposed Transit Services	Ensure that all bus stops are connected to well-maintained sidewalks and have crosswalks for safe pedestrian access. Improve walkability by filling in gaps in the sidewalk network, especially near potential transit stops.	\$ 40,000
T-8	Upgraded Bus Amenities	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Ensure all proposed bus stops along key routes have shelters with seating, lighting, and trash bins.	\$ 30,000
T-9	Transit App Upgrades	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Provide real-time bus tracking through apps and at major stops using digital signage. This will make public transit more reliable and reduce uncertainty for riders	\$ 1,000
T-10	Pedestrian and transit infrastructure upgrade	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Install bus bulbs at Valdosta Mall, downtown Valdosta, and other high-demand areas to	\$ 15,000
T-11	Bicycle infrastructure upgrade	Improve Public Transit Infrastructure	Place bike racks or bike sharing stations near future transit hubs and major destinations like Valdosta State University, South Georgia Medical Center, and Valdosta Mall to encourage cycling as a last-mile solution	\$ 2,250
<b>Total Transit Project Cost</b>				<b>\$9,113,250</b>

## 2.3 Summary of Financial Plan and Revenue Projection

To ensure federal fiscal-constraint requirements under 23 CFR § 450.322, the Financial Plan includes estimates of federal, state, and local revenue forecasts for the 2025-2050 planning horizon, reflecting year-of-expenditure dollars. Revenues were projected by averaging historical allocations (FY 2020-2024 Transportation Improvement Programs or TIPs) for federal-aid and state programs, then growing those amounts by 2 percent in 2026 and 1 percent annually thereafter. Transit revenues (federal/state) were assumed to support the continuation of on-demand services and are separated from highway funding.



The financial plan identifies the following principal funding sources:

## 2.3.1 Federal and State Revenue

The federal and state fund estimates were derived from:

### 1. Federal Formula and Discretionary Programs

- Highway programs under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), including the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), National Highway Freight Program, and Metropolitan Planning Program (MPP).

### 2. State Funding

- GDOT core revenues from the Transportation Funding Act (HB 170) and the Transportation Investment Act (TIA), including Local Maintenance & Improvement Grants (LMIG), Quick Response Projects, the Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank (GTIB), and the GDOT Freight Operations Program.

Yearly combined federal highway, state highway, and federal/state transit revenues are forecast to total \$1.176 billion over 2025–2050. The first-year baseline (2025) funding is estimated at \$39.46 million, rising to \$51.10 million by 2050 under the assumed inflation profile.

Table 2-9: Projected Federal and State Funding Revenue

Fiscal Year	Federal Highway	State Highway	Federal and State Transit	Total Federal and State Funding	Inflation
2025	\$24,582,904.47	\$ 9,642,349.00	\$ 5,232,962.15	\$39,458,215.62	Baseline
2026	\$25,074,562.56	\$ 9,835,195.98	\$ 5,337,621.39	\$40,247,379.93	2%
2027	\$25,325,308.18	\$ 9,933,547.94	\$ 5,390,997.61	\$40,649,853.73	1%
2028	\$25,578,561.27	\$10,032,883.42	\$ 5,444,907.58	\$41,056,352.27	1%
2029	\$25,834,346.88	\$10,133,212.25	\$ 5,499,356.66	\$41,466,915.79	1%
2030	\$26,092,690.35	\$10,234,544.38	\$ 5,554,350.23	\$41,881,584.95	1%
2031	\$26,353,617.25	\$10,336,889.82	\$ 5,609,893.73	\$42,300,400.80	1%
2032	\$26,617,153.42	\$10,440,258.72	\$ 5,665,992.66	\$42,723,404.81	1%
2033	\$26,883,324.96	\$10,544,661.31	\$ 5,722,652.59	\$43,150,638.86	1%
2034	\$27,152,158.21	\$10,650,107.92	\$ 5,779,879.12	\$43,582,145.24	1%
2035	\$27,423,679.79	\$10,756,609.00	\$ 5,837,677.91	\$44,017,966.70	1%
2036	\$27,697,916.59	\$10,864,175.09	\$ 5,896,054.69	\$44,458,146.36	1%
2037	\$27,974,895.75	\$10,972,816.84	\$ 5,955,015.23	\$44,902,727.83	1%
2038	\$28,254,644.71	\$11,082,545.01	\$ 6,014,565.39	\$45,351,755.11	1%
2039	\$28,537,191.16	\$11,193,370.46	\$ 6,074,711.04	\$45,805,272.66	1%



Fiscal Year	Federal Highway	State Highway	Federal and State Transit	Total Federal and State Funding	Inflation
2040	\$28,822,563.07	\$11,305,304.16	\$ 6,135,458.15	\$46,263,325.38	1%
2041	\$29,110,788.70	\$11,418,357.20	\$ 6,196,812.73	\$46,725,958.64	1%
2042	\$29,401,896.59	\$11,532,540.77	\$ 6,258,780.86	\$47,193,218.22	1%
2043	\$29,695,915.55	\$11,647,866.18	\$ 6,321,368.67	\$47,665,150.41	1%
2044	\$29,992,874.71	\$11,764,344.84	\$ 6,384,582.36	\$48,141,801.91	1%
2045	\$30,292,803.46	\$11,881,988.29	\$ 6,448,428.18	\$48,623,219.93	1%
2046	\$30,595,731.49	\$12,000,808.18	\$ 6,512,912.46	\$49,109,452.13	1%
2047	\$30,901,688.81	\$12,120,816.26	\$ 6,578,041.59	\$49,600,546.65	1%
2048	\$31,210,705.69	\$12,242,024.42	\$ 6,643,822.00	\$50,096,552.12	1%
2049	\$31,522,812.75	\$12,364,444.66	\$ 6,710,260.22	\$50,597,517.64	1%
2050	\$31,838,040.88	\$12,488,089.11	\$ 6,777,362.82	\$51,103,492.81	1%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$ 732,768,777.25</b>	<b>\$ 287,419,751.20</b>	<b>\$ 155,984,468.02</b>	<b>\$1,176,172,996.47</b>	

## 2.3.2 Local Revenue

Local funding projections encompass the Lowndes County and municipal SPLOST, Transportation Investment Act (TIA)—SPLOST discretionary, Local Option Sales Tax, and general fund allocations. A significant portion of local sales tax proceeds is pre-committed to specific projects; only the discretionary component feeds the MTP financial plan.

A second T-SPLOST referendum approved May 21, 2024, is expected to generate \$820 million regionally over FY 2027–2036, of which a discretionary share, projected at \$174.5 million total (inflation-adjusted), is available for MTP projects. The annual discretionary amount begins at \$2.33 million in FY 2027 and grows 2 percent per year.

Table 2-10: Projected Local Funding Revenue

Fiscal Year	Total TIA Funding	Inflation	Discretionary Only
2027	\$14,443,098.47	Baseline	\$2,327,086.47
2028	\$15,041,042.75	2%	\$2,423,427.85
2029	\$15,663,741.92	2%	\$2,523,757.76
2030	\$16,312,220.83	2%	\$2,628,241.33
2031	\$16,987,546.78	2%	\$2,737,050.52
2032	\$17,690,831.21	2%	\$2,850,364.42
2033	\$18,423,231.63	2%	\$2,968,369.50



Fiscal Year	Total TIA Funding	Inflation	Discretionary Only
2034	\$19,185,953.42	2%	\$3,091,260.00
2035	\$19,980,251.89	2%	\$3,219,238.16
2036	\$20,807,434.32	2%	\$3,352,514.62
<b>Total:</b>	\$174,535,353.21		\$28,121,310.65

Of the \$1.18 billion in combined federal and state revenues, roughly \$214 million is reserved for operations and maintenance of the existing roadway system and transit services, leaving \$806 million for capital improvements. When paired with \$28 million in local discretionary T-SPLOST proceeds, the total funds available for the work program over the MTP horizon amount to \$834 million, which is insufficient to cover the \$1.07 billion in unconstrained project costs.

As a result, we must prioritize projects that offer the highest community benefit and strategic value. The following chapter details the criteria and scoring methodology used to rank candidate projects and guide the allocation of the \$834 million among the highest-priority investments.



## 3 PROJECT RANKING

### 3.1 Overview of MTP Goals

The Valdosta-Lowndes 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is structured around six core goal areas that articulate the region's long-term vision for a safe, efficient, and equitable transportation network. Each goal area reflects Federal and State strategic priorities while addressing locally identified needs and opportunities. Together, these goals provide the foundation for evaluating and prioritizing candidate projects:

- **Goal 1 – Safety and System Reliability:** Enhance the safety of all users, including motorists, transit customers, pedestrians, and bicyclists, through targeted infrastructure improvements and operational strategies. Establish network resilience against natural hazards and man-made disruptions by identifying parallel routes and flood-resilient facilities.
- **Goal 2 – Infrastructure Condition:** Maintain and preserve critical assets in a state of good repair. Focus on pavement and bridge conditions on the National Highway System (NHS), multimodal facility upkeep, and lifecycle maintenance practices to optimize return on investment and minimize future rehabilitation costs.
- **Goal 3 – Congestion Reduction:** Reduce excessive delay through a combination of Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, signal timing optimization, and strategic capacity enhancements. Measure performance using person-mile reliability, peak-hour delay, and volume-to-capacity ratios.
- **Goal 4 – Freight Movement and Economic Vitality:** Support regional and statewide economic development by improving connectivity and reliability of freight corridors. Coordinate transportation investments with industrial growth areas, estimate truck travel-time reliability, and quantify the economic benefits of enhanced freight mobility.
- **Goal 5 – Environmental Sustainability:** Minimize adverse environmental impacts through context-sensitive design, incorporation of green infrastructure, and targeted emissions reduction projects under the CMAQ program. Promote modal shift to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel and advance resilience planning in known hazard zones.
- **Goal 6 – Reduced Project Delivery Delays:** Strengthen program delivery by streamlining approval processes, enhancing interagency coordination, and increasing transparency of project schedules. Monitor on-time delivery rates, citizen engagement in planning, and administrative milestones to accelerate implementation.

A comprehensive discussion of MTP goals, objectives, and their alignment with state and national targets, have been documented in the **Goals, Objectives, and Measures of Effectiveness Memo** of the VLMPD 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.



## 3.2 Performance Indicators

The Project Ranking framework operationalizes each MTP goal by mapping candidate projects to the Federal performance measures defined in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). Project evaluation draws principally from three national measure categories, supplemented by locally tailored metrics:

- **PM1 – Safety:** Safety is evaluated through three core indicators: the five-year rolling average of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT, and the total count of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. Targets correspond to GDOT’s PM1.a-c thresholds, ensuring consistency with statewide objectives.
- **PM2 – Infrastructure Condition:** Asset preservation metrics track the percent of Interstate and non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) lane-miles in good or poor condition, drawn from GDOT’s Highway Pavement Management System (HPMS), and the percent of NHS bridges classified in good or poor condition using National Bridge Inventory data. PM2.a-c targets define acceptable condition thresholds for roadway surfaces and structures.
- **PM3 – System Performance, Freight, and Air Quality:** System efficiency is assessed through person-miles traveled reliability on Interstate and non-Interstate NHS facilities (PM3.a), the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index (PM3.b), and peak-hour excessive delay per capita (PM3.c). Emissions benefits under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program (PM3.d) are quantified via regional travel demand model outputs. However, since the Valdosta-Lowndes region is in attainment status, the CMAQ assessment is not required for this MTP.

A complete list of performance indicator definitions and data sources have been discussed in the **Goals, Objectives, and Measures of Effectiveness Memo** that was submitted earlier as a part of the VLMPO 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan process.

## 3.3 Scoring Methodology

The project scoring methodology employs a consistent four-point scale (0-3) for each performance indicator, where a score of 0 denotes no anticipated benefit or a potential adverse impact, and a score of 3 represents the highest level of alignment with an MTP goal. **Table 3-1** provides a summary of individual measures and categorical thresholds.

Scoring definitions for each category are calibrated to reflect both Federal performance measure thresholds (PM1-PM3) and regionally specific objectives. The following sections offer a concise overview of the scoring approach by goal:

### 3.3.1 Safety

Safety scores reflect expected reductions in total crashes, fatal and serious injury crashes per 100 million VMT, and non-motorized incidents within a ¼-mile buffer of project limits. Projects associated with low crash densities (0-10 crashes per thousand AADT) receive lower points, while high-crash locations (>30 crashes per thousand AADT) that potentially achieve significant percent reductions earn top scores. Fatal crash rates and the share of commercial vehicle and vulnerable user crashes are similarly banded.



### 3.3.2 Freight Movement and Economic Vitality

Freight and economic vitality scoring emphasizes connectivity to designated freight corridors and economic development sites. Projects with no corridor access score lowest, while those that directly link to industrial zones, rail yards, or truck parking areas receive a maximum number of points. Truck traffic proportions are scored from under 1 percent to over 10 percent of AADT, and proximity to Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development (GRAD) select sites is evaluated in distance bands, with the closest projects achieving the highest ratings.

### 3.3.3 Infrastructure Condition

Pavement and bridge condition scores derive from current Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) ratings and the National Bridge Inventory (NBI). Rehabilitation of segments in “poor” condition is prioritized with higher scores, whereas preventative maintenance on “good” condition segments is credited for deferring future rehabilitation costs. Bridge projects are evaluated by sufficiency ratings, with those nearing replacement thresholds receiving elevated scores. Roadway widening projects are assumed to result in new pavement.

### 3.3.4 System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction

Congestion and mobility benefits are quantified through existing and projected thresholds of annual average daily traffic (AADT) and level of service (LOS) ratings for both current and “do nothing” networks. Signal optimization, TSM/TDM strategies, and targeted capacity enhancements are scored based on projected roadway capacity and peak-hour congestion, aligning with PM3 metrics for travel and reliability. Similarly, resilience measures, such as providing emergency-route redundancy in flood-prone corridors, are incorporated into the scoring framework.

### 3.3.5 Equity and Environmental Sustainability

Scores in this combined category address historic preservation, environmental impacts, and multimodal equity. Projects encroaching on historic districts or within ¼-mile of sensitive environmental resources receive lower scores, while those enhancing access to historic districts, implementing green infrastructure, or delivering transit and active-transportation improvements earn higher ratings. Connectivity to Areas of Persistent Poverty (AOPP) is also scored, with transit connections and on-site multimodal facilities receiving top points.

### 3.3.6 Project Delivery

Implementation readiness is evaluated based on TIP/STIP (statewide TIP) inclusion, alignment with the 2050 MTP, and stakeholder engagement quality. Projects already programmed in current funding plans score highest, while projects not yet under any phase of implementation score lowest. Public support is measured through stakeholder feedback, with significant positive dialogue contributing to top-tier scores.



### 3.4 Weighting of Criteria

To translate raw performance scores into composite rankings, individual metric scores are multiplied by weighting factors that reflect stakeholder priorities and regional objectives. Weighting is structured on two tiers: (1) Goal-level weights that allocate relative importance to each of the six MTP goal categories; and (2) Criteria-level weights that distribute the weight of each goal among its constituent performance measures. Both levels of weighting vary by project scope – (i) Highway & Bridges, (ii) ITS & Signalization, (iii) EV/AV Infrastructure, (iv) Public Transit, and (v) Active Transportation – to recognize differing emphasis across project types. For example, Safety (PM1) may carry a higher goal weight for Highway & Bridges projects, while Connectivity and Non-Car Accessibility receive greater emphasis for Active Transportation and Transit projects. Within each goal, measure-level weights further refine priorities: the share of total crashes, fatal crashes, and vulnerable road user incidents under Safety; the split between pavement and bridge asset conditions in PM2; and the balance of congestion and traffic volume in PM3.

Goal-level weights were informed by Federal and State performance guidelines and best practices from comparable Georgia MPOs and were then reviewed and approved by Valdosta-Lowndes MPO staff, and subsequently presented to the Technical Advisory Committee, Policy Committee, and public stakeholders. Table 3-1 provides full tabulations of both goal- and criteria-level weights for each project scope. Final composite project scores, a sum of weighted metric contributions, generate a single ranking index, guiding the development of a fiscally constrained, performance-based implementation program. Table 3-2 further breaks down criteria weights by project categories.



Table 3-1: Scoring Methodology

PERFORMANCE MEASURES			Score Points (1-3)			
			Measurement Units			
No.	Criteria	Measures	0	1	2	3
1	Safety	Total crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	0 - 10	10 - 20	20 - 30	More than 30
		Fatal crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	0 - 0.05	0.05 - 0.10	0.10 - 0.15	More than 0.15
		Percent CMV (trucks) crashes	0% - 3.5%	3.5% - 6.5%	6.5% - 10%	More than 10%
		Percent VRU (non-motorized) crashes	0% - 3.5%	3.5% - 6.5%	6.5% - 10%	More than 10%
2	Freight Mobility and Economic Vitality	Freight Designated Corridor	No Connection	Industrial Area and/or Rail Crossing	Corridor Connection including Rail Yards	On Freight Corridor or Truck Parking
		Percent Truck Traffic	0% - 1%	1% - 5%	5% - 10\$	More than 10%
		Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development (GRAD) Select Sites	Outside 1 mi.	Within 1 mi.	Within 0.5 mi.	Within 0.25 mi.
3	System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction	Total Existing AADT	0 - 10,000	10,000 - 20,000	20,000 - 30,000	More than 30,000
		Serves congested corridor (Existing LOS)	A/B	C	D	E/F
		Projected LOS (Do Nothing Network)	A/B	C	D	E/F
		Total Projected AADT (2050 Needs Network)	0 - 10,000	10,000 - 20,000	20,000 - 30,000	More than 30,000
4	System Reliability and Resiliency	Provide resiliency to regional network	New Roadway or Truck Parking	Project Adding Through Lanes or Rail Crossing	Add Turn Lanes, Bike Lanes or Paths, Sidewalks, EV, or ITS	Evacuation Route, Pavement/Bridge or Transit Project
		State of Good Repair	NA	Good	Fair	Poor
5a	Environment & Quality of Life	Potential impacts to environmental resources	Obvious Negative Impact to Environment	Possible Negative Impact to Environment	No Direct Environmental Impact	Positive Impact to Environment
5b	Equity	Historic Preservation	Negative Impact to Historic Sites/Areas	Project Outside Historic Sites/Areas	Improves Access to Historic Sites/Areas	Project Potential for Area Revitalization
		Increase Connectivity and Access	No Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.	Auto Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.	Bike/Ped Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.	Transit Connection: AOPP to Jobs, etc.
		Develop Safe, Affordable, and Accessible Transportation Solutions for Non-Car Users	Highway Project, No Bike/Ped Amenities	Highway Project with Bike/Ped Amenities	Transit or Active Transportation Project (Outside AOPP)	Transit or Active Transportation Project (Inside AOPP)
6	Project Readiness	Implementation Pipeline	2050 MTP *NEW*	2045 MTP	TIA	TIP/STIP
		Community and Stakeholder Needs	Negative Dialogue from Public	Project Not Mentioned by Public	Some Positive Dialogue from Public	Significant Positive Dialogue Rec'd



Table 3-2: Criteria Weights by Project Categories

EVALUATION CRITERIA & MEASURES			Project Scope			Project Scope			Project Scope			Project Scope			Project Scope		
No.	Criteria	Measures	Highway & Bridges			ITS & Signalization			EV/AV Infrastructure			Public Transit			Active Transportation		
			Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.	Criteria %	Goals Wt.	Criteria Wt.
1	Safety	Total crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	25.0%	15%	3.8%	25.0%	25%	6.3%	25.0%	5%	1.3%	25.0%	5%	1.3%	20.0%	20%	4.0%
		Fatal crashes per thousand AADT (within 0.25 mi)	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		7.5%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%	25.0%		5.0%
		Percent CMV (trucks) crashes	20.0%		3.0%	25.0%		6.3%	20.0%		1.0%	20.0%		1.0%	15.0%		3.0%
		Percent VRU (non-motorized) crashes	25.0%		3.8%	20.0%		5.0%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		1.3%	40.0%		8.0%
2	Freight Mobility and Economic Vitality	Freight Designated Corridor	40.0%	15%	6.0%	40.0%	15%	6.0%	40.0%	15%	6.0%	40.0%	5%	2.0%	40.0%	5%	2.0%
		Percent Truck Traffic	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%
		Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development (GRAD) Select Sites	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%
3	System Efficiency and Congestion Reduction	Total Existing AADT	30.0%	15%	4.5%	30.0%	25%	7.5%	30.0%	10%	3.0%	30.0%	5%	1.5%	30.0%	5%	1.5%
		Serves congested corridor (Existing LOS)	30.0%		4.5%	30.0%		7.5%	30.0%		3.0%	30.0%		1.5%	30.0%		1.5%
		Projected LOS (Do Nothing Network)	20.0%		3.0%	25.0%		6.3%	20.0%		2.0%	20.0%		1.0%	20.0%		1.0%
		Total Projected AADT (2050 MTP Network)	20.0%		3.0%	15.0%		3.8%	20.0%		2.0%	20.0%		1.0%	20.0%		1.0%
4	System Reliability and Resiliency	Provide resiliency to regional network	60.0%	15%	9.0%	60.0%	15%	9.0%	60.0%	25%	15.0%	60.0%	10%	6.0%	60.0%	10%	6.0%
		State of Good Repair	40.0%		6.0%	40.0%		6.0%	40.0%		10.0%	40.0%		4.0%	40.0%		4.0%
5a	Environment & Quality of Life	Potential impacts to environmental resources	25.0%	10%	2.5%	25.0%	5%	1.3%	25.0%	35%	8.8%	25.0%	45%	11.3%	25.0%	30%	7.5%
5b	Equity	Historic Preservation	25.0%		2.5%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		8.8%	25.0%		11.3%	25.0%		7.5%
		Increase Connectivity and Access	25.0%		2.5%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		8.8%	25.0%		11.3%	25.0%		7.5%
		Develop Safe, Affordable, and Accessible Transportation Solutions for Non-Car Users	25.0%		2.5%	25.0%		1.3%	25.0%		8.8%	25.0%		11.3%	25.0%		7.5%
6	Project Readiness	Implementation Pipeline	60.0%	30%	18.0%	60.0%	15%	9.0%	60.0%	10%	6.0%	60.0%	30%	18.0%	60.0%	30%	18.0%
		Community and Stakeholder Needs	40.0%		12.0%	40.0%		6.0%	40.0%		4.0%	40.0%		12.0%	40.0%		12.0%
				100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%



## 4 PERFORMANCE-BASED PLANNING

Building on the project scoring methodology and weighting presented in Chapter 3, this chapter distills key insights from the composite-score results and examines how those insights inform strategic investment, geographic distribution, and implementation sequencing.

### 4.1 Project Prioritization Results

This section presents the full ranked list of recommended projects, highlighting the very highest-scoring initiatives that deliver the greatest combined benefit per dollar invested. Transit extensions and operational safety fixes occupy the top slots, followed by a mix of multimodal and roadway investments that form the core of the fiscally constrained program. Table 4-1 below depicts all projects in rank order based on scores and weights previously described in Chapter 3.

Table 4-1: VLMPO 2050 MTP Recommended Projects - Prioritization Rank

Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
1	T-02		Route 2: East-West Connection	Public Transit	Fixed-Route Bus Route
2	T-01		Route 1: North-South Loop	Public Transit	Fixed-Route Bus Route
3	T-03		Route 3: Commuter Route to Moody Air Force Base	Public Transit	Fixed-Route Bus Route
4	T-07		Connected Bus Stops	Public Transit	Transit Connectivity
4	T-08		Upgraded Bus Amenities	Public Transit	Transit Infrastructure
6	R-51	0016898	SOUTH VALDOSTA TRUCK BYPASS - TIA	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
7	T-04		Expand Valdosta On-Demand Services	Public Transit	Reliability Improvements
7	T-05		Mobility Hubs	Public Transit	Transit Hub
7	T-06		Bus Super Stops	Public Transit	Transit Connectivity
7	T-09		Transit App Upgrades	Public Transit	Transit Infrastructure
11	R-25	0010296	I-75 @ CR 783/LOCH LAUREL ROAD - PHASE II	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
12	A-29		Toombs Street	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
13	I-07		ITS System Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
14	A-27		South Oak Street	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes
15	R-27		I-75 @ US 84	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
16	A-38		E-Bike/E-Scooter Program	Active Transportation	E-Bike/E-Scooter Program
17	R-65		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
18	R-70		South Patterson/Old Clyattville Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
19	R-48		North Valdosta Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
20	R-05		BAYTREE ROAD GRADE SEPARATION	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
21	A-05		Barack Obama Blvd	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
22	R-57		US 84/Hill Avenue at Fry Street	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements



Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
23	A-16		Lake Park Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
23	A-24		Old Hudson Street and/or McDougal Street	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
23	A-39		Fry Street	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
26	E-01		I-75 at Old Clyattville Rd NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
27	A-25		Park Avenue	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
28	R-52		SR 122	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
29	R-53		SR 122	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
30	R-26	0010295	I-75 @ SR 376 - PHASE II	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
31	I-01		I-75 Exit at Old Clyattville Rd New Signal	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
32	R-56		St. Augustine Rd./Clubhouse Dr./Ellis Dr.	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
33	A-10		Cyclist Education Program	Active Transportation	Public Outreach
33	A-14		Implement Complete Streets	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
33	R-62	0020358	WEIGH STATION @ I-75 SB IN LOWNDES COUNTY	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
36	R-01		Alden Avenue	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
37	R-14		Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
38	A-06		Bemiss Road (SR 125)	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
38	A-11		E Park Avenue	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes, Sidewalks
40	A-23		Northside Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
41	A-20		North Oak Street	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
42	A-31		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
43	A-30		U.S. Highway 84	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
43	R-61	0020359	WEIGH STATION @ I-75 NB IN LOWNDES COUNTY	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
45	A-02		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Northern Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
46	R-64		West Hill Avenue (US 84/US 221)	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
47	A-13		Gornito Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
48	R-02		Barack Obama Blvd	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
49	E-02		I-75 at Madison Hwy NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
50	A-17		Norman Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
51	A-37		Loch Laurel Road/SR 376	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
52	A-36		N Oak Street	Active Transportation	Bike Lane



Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
53	R-63		West Gordon Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
54	R-32		James Beck Overpass	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
55	A-03		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Southern Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
56	R-20		Cherry Creek Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
57	A-12		Eager/Jerry Jones Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
57	R-36	0020144	LAMAR STREET @ SUGAR CREEK IN VALDOSTA	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
59	R-45		North Oak Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
60	R-49		Park Avenue	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
61	R-34	0019937	JUMPING GULLY RD @ JUMPING GULLY CREEK 6 MI SW OF LAKE PARK	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
61	R-59		Val Del Road / North Valdosta Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
63	A-35		N St Augustine Rd	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
64	R-31		Inner Perimeter Road/S. Patterson Street	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
65	R-41		N. Oak Street Ext. / Bemiss Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
66	R-07		Baytree Road/ Sherwood Drive	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
67	R-44		North Lee Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
68	R-22	0015445	SR 7 BU FROM CS 188/NORTH OAK STREET TO SR 7 ALT	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
69	A-33		Bemiss Road (SR 125)	Active Transportation	Bike Lanes
70	R-03		Baytree Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
70	R-40		N. Ashley Street / Northside Drive	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
72	R-11		Bemiss Road / Connell Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
73	R-10		Bemiss Road	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
74	R-42		N. Valdosta Road / Inner Perimeter Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
75	R-33		James Road Extension/Western Perimeter N	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
76	A-15		Inner Perimeter Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
76	A-26		Pineview Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
78	R-13		Bemiss Road / Skipper Bridge Rd	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
79	A-01		Azalea City Trail Expansion - Eastern Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
80	A-09		Country Club Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
81	A-04		Azalea City Trail/Sustella Trail - Western Extension	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path



Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
82	A-28		St. Augustine Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
82	R-04		Baytree Road / Norman Drive	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
84	R-30		Inner Perimeter Rd. / Brookfield Rd. / Lake Laurie Dr. Intersection	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
85	R-17		Cat Creek Road / Pine Grove Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
86	A-32		Withlacoochee River Trail - north and south of Langdale Park	Active Transportation	Multi-Use Path
87	R-19		Cat Creek Road/ Radar Site Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
88	A-08		Berkley Drive	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
88	A-19		Norman Drive at St. Augustine Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
88	R-12		Bemiss Road / Davidson Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
91	R-35		Knight Academy Road/Studstill Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
92	R-47	0020542	OAK STREET EXTENSION FM S OF MURRY RD TO CHERRY CREEK RD-TIA	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
93	R-43		North Ashley Street	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
93	R-69		Western Perimeter S	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
95	R-46		North Oak Street	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
96	R-29		I-75/SR 7 Connector	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
97	A-22		North Valdosta Road	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
98	A-34		E Park Avenue	Active Transportation	Sidewalks
99	A-07		Bemiss Road at Inner Perimeter Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
100	A-18		Norman Drive at Baytree Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
101	R-06		Baytree Road North Extension	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
101	R-58		Val Del Road / Mcmillan Road / Bethany Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
103	R-60		Webb Road Realignment	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
104	R-28		I-75 @ New Interchange	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
105	R-09		Bemiss Knights Academy/Old Pine Roads Intersection	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
106	A-21		North Oak Street Extension at Inner Perimeter Road	Active Transportation	Intersection
106	R-15		Boone (Dairy) Road CSX Crossing	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
108	R-50		Prewitte Street / Bemiss Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
109	R-18		Cat Creek Road /State Route 122	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
110	R-23		Gornto Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements



Priority Rank	MTP ID	PI #	Project Name	Project Scope	Project Category
110	R-67		West Marion Avenue (SR 7)/Lakes Blvd.	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
110	R-68		West Marion Avenue / N. Gordon Street	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
113	R-37		Loch Laurel Road / Bevel Creek Bridge	Highway & Bridges	Roadway & Bridge Maintenance
113	R-38		Loch Laurel Road / Corinth Church Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
115	R-39		McMillan Road/Staten Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
116	R-55		SR 122/Val Del Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
117	R-54		SR 122/Skipper Bridge Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
118	R-08		Bemiss Knights Academy Road	Highway & Bridges	Operation & Safety Improvements
119	R-66		West Magnolia Street	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
120	R-24		Hagan Bridge Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
121	R-16		Cat Creek Road / New Bethel Road	Highway & Bridges	Intersection & Interchange Improvements
122	R-21		Dasher Grove Road Extension	Highway & Bridges	Roadway Capacity & Widening
123	T-10		Pedestrian and transit infrastructure upgrade	Public Transit	Transit Infrastructure
124	E-03		I-75 at Lakes Blvd NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	E-04		I-75 Bellville NEVI Improvement	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	E-05		Airport EV Infrastructure Installment	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	E-06		Valdosta Mall EV Infrastructure Installment	Electric & Alternative Fuel	Electric & Alternative Fuel
124	I-02		I-75 at Madison Hwy New Signal	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
124	I-03		I-75 at Bellville Rd New Signal	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
124	I-04		Bemiss Road Signalization Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
124	I-05		US-41 Signalization Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization
124	I-06		I-75 Interchange Signalization Enhancement	ITS & Signalization	ITS & Signalization

The following sections further explore the substantive findings, including what the prioritized program reveals about regional needs, where benefits concentrate, and how a fiscally constrained rollout can maximize safety, mobility, equity, and state-of-good-repair outcomes.

## 4.2 Key Findings from Project Prioritization

An examination of the full 132-project list uncovers three distinct performance “bands,” each reflecting different trade-offs between cost and composite benefit. The highest-ranking band is dominated by low-cost, high-safety or high-equity projects, while the middle band delivers balanced multimodal gains, and the lowest band consists of large-scale expansions whose near-term return on investment (ROI) is muted by high capital outlays. This tiered structure directs early funding to the most cost-effective



interventions, preserves core systemic investments, and defers major expansions to later phases or additional revenue streams:

**1. High-Impact Band (2025-2030)**

- Projects in this band deliver exceptional returns relative to cost, typically combining strong safety benefits, significant person-throughput gains, or positive equity impacts in disadvantaged communities. Eleven projects meet this threshold; they include low-cost operational improvements (e.g., signal timing, roundabouts), targeted transit extensions, and multimodal mobility hubs.

**2. Core Program Band (2030-2036)**

- Encompassing roughly 60 percent of all candidate projects, this middle tier comprises moderate-sized investments that advance more than one MPO goal area. Examples include pedestrian gap closures, modest roadway widenings, and ITS deployments. These projects form the backbone of the constrained program, ensuring geographic balance and broad goal attainment.

**3. Strategic Reserve Band (2037-2050)**

- Approximately 30 percent of projects fall here, predominantly large-scale capacity expansions and major bridge replacements, whose high capital cost dampens their near-term performance per dollar. While essential to long-range network resilience, these projects are deferred for advanced design or contingent on additional funding.

The stratification underscores that relatively small, targeted interventions often yield higher performance per dollar than large-scale expansions. This finding directs early investments toward “quick-win” projects that advance safety and equity while preserving capacity for future growth needs. With limited funds and a need for additional research, several projects are only funded for subsequent studies that would better lay out the scope and financial resources needed for full implementation.

## 4.3 Project Performance and Return on Investment

By comparing composite scores to planning-level costs, the VLMPO can quantify each project’s return on investment. Safety- and operations-focused initiatives could potentially yield the highest ROI. Transit and multimodal equity projects deliver strong social benefits, while active-transportation investments excel on safety and community access. Preservation and ITS projects, although lower in composite rank, shore up asset conditions and generate steady operational efficiencies that sustain network performance over time. The following bullets expand on this discussion:

**1. Safety and Operations**

- **Top Safety-Value Projects:** Signal optimization corridors and roundabout installations consistently rank highest for crash-reduction potential. Their low capital investment and rapid implementation timeline make them prime candidates for near-term TIP programming.
- **Equity in Safety Deployment:** Over half of the High-Impact Band safety projects lie in Title VI or Environmental Justice priority areas, demonstrating that targeted operations improvements also remedy historic safety inequities.

**2. Transit and Multimodal Equity**



- **Service Extensions as Equity Drivers:** Scoping study into the Fixed-route expansions to major employment centers and healthcare facilities occupy four of the top ten rankings. Their high composite scores reflect both potential person-throughput and access improvements for transit-dependent populations.
- **Mobility Hub Leverage:** Investments in hubs, providing seamless transfers among bus, micro-transit, and active transportation modes, score high by amplifying the impact of multiple routes and closing first/last-mile gaps.

### 3. Active Transportation and Connectivity

- **Network Continuity Matters:** Sidewalk infill and bike-lane projects that close critical network gaps outscore isolated segments, highlighting the importance of connectivity in the scoring model.
- **Safety Versus Throughput:** Active transportation initiatives score higher on equity and safety measures but lower on traffic throughput. This reinforces their core role in local accessibility and community health.

### 4. Asset Preservation and ITS

- **Lifecycle Cost Avoidance:** Pavement and bridge preservation projects rank somewhat lower on composite score yet offer essential lifecycle savings. Including such projects in the fiscally constrained program ensures long-term network sustainability.
- **Smart Infrastructure Benefits:** ITS deployments (signal coordination, traveler information systems) achieve mid-range scores by delivering steady mobility gains at moderate cost, creating operational efficiencies that complement capital projects.

By translating project prioritization rankings into a phased, geographically balanced, and fiscally constrained program, the VLMPO 2050 MTP advances a transparent, performance-based planning paradigm, one that ensures every investment measurably contributes to regional safety, mobility, equity, and sustainability goals.



## 5 CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

Throughout the Valdosta-Lowndes MPO's 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Preferred Investments and Strategy Report, a rigorous, performance-based approach has been applied to identify, score, and rank a comprehensive slate of roadway, transit, active transportation, ITS, and electric vehicle projects. The project prioritization process has drawn on quantitative metrics, qualitative stakeholder input, equity considerations, and sustainability objectives to establish a clear hierarchy of investments that best advance the region's goals for safety, mobility, economic vitality, infrastructure condition, congestion relief, and environmental stewardship.

### 5.1 Summary of Key Findings

The project prioritization framework evaluated over 120 candidate projects across six investment categories: roadways, public transportation, active transportation, intelligent transportation systems (ITS), electric vehicle infrastructure, and freight/logistics. These projects were scored based on their performance in key goal areas: safety, infrastructure condition, congestion mitigation, economic vitality, equity, environmental sustainability, and deliverability.

This performance-based process revealed several critical insights:

- **Balanced Portfolio of Investments:** The prioritization results reflect a blend of capacity enhancements, safety upgrades, and multimodal improvements. High-scoring roadway projects address critical congestion pinch points on I-75 interchanges and principal arterials while active transportation and transit initiatives create connective corridors for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders.
- **Safety and Equity Emphasis:** Projects targeting high-crash locations and underserved communities ranked highly under the Safety and Equity criteria. Intersection realignments, pedestrian refuge installations, and ITS signal optimization emerged as cost-effective means to reduce serious injuries and improve network access.
- **Return on Investment:** The comparative analysis of performance-to-cost ratios highlighted several projects—particularly targeted corridor optimizations and mobility hub developments—that potentially deliver large benefits relative to their planning-level costs. These “big bang for the buck” investments will provide measurable performance gains with modest funding commitments.
- **System Efficiency and Economic Vitality:** Freight and commuter routes serving Moody Air Force Base, the Valdosta Mall, and regional industrial parks performed strongly under the Freight Movement and Economic Vitality criterion. Investments in interchange upgrades and commuter transit service will support regional economic competitiveness.

### 5.2 Critical Reflections on the Prioritization Process

- **Data Limitations and Uncertainties:** Planning-level cost estimates, land use forecasts, and travel demand projections carry inherent uncertainties, particularly over a 25-year horizon. Future fluctuations in development patterns, material costs, fuel prices, and technology adoption rates



could affect project feasibility and comparative performance. Ongoing data updates will be essential to maintain responsiveness to changing conditions.

- **Stakeholder Alignment vs. Technical Scoring:** While the performance-based framework provides transparency, some locally supported projects with lower technical scores may warrant preservation in the fiscally constrained program for community cohesion. Balancing objective metrics with qualitative stakeholder priorities remains a deliberate management judgment.
- **Emerging Technologies:** The rapid evolution of electric vehicle charging technology and intelligent transportation systems could render some of today's specifications obsolete. Flexibility in design and procurement will help "futureproof" investments.

## 5.3 Fiscal Realities and the Need for Constrained Planning

While the unconstrained project list exceeds \$1.1 billion in estimated capital costs, the projected transportation revenues from all sources through 2050 amount to approximately \$1.176 billion. However, not all forecasted revenues are available for capital projects, as funding must also support system maintenance, operations, and administrative functions. Furthermore, funding eligibility varies across federal, state, and local sources, with specific constraints on uses and modal flexibility.

Given these limitations, some high-priority projects identified in this report might not be funded or delivered within the 2050 horizon. Strategic tradeoffs will be necessary, and some beneficial projects may remain unfunded unless additional or alternative revenue streams are identified.

## 5.4 Next Steps

The VLMPO 2050 MTP prioritization process has established a robust, transparent framework that aligns public investment with regional goals. By grounding decisions in data, performance metrics, and community values, the VLMPO is well-positioned to implement a transportation program that enhances safety, promotes equitable access, and supports economic growth. freight and tourist travel and fosters sustainable development throughout the Valdosta-Lowndes region.

The transition from prioritization to implementation will require continued coordination, innovation, and flexibility in the MPO process. As the region evolves, this plan should serve as a living blueprint, guiding informed investment choices and enabling adaptive responses to future challenges, changing conditions and opportunities. The next step in the 2050 MTP process is to adopt the Fiscally Constrained Implementation Plan, also known as the constrained project list or cost-feasible work program. This plan, consistent with prioritization processes documented in this report, will:

- **Compare Project Prioritization Results with Revenue Forecasts:** Each project's total estimated cost, readiness, and scoring rank is evaluated against expected federal, state, and local funding streams.
- **Select Cost-Effective Projects for Inclusion:** Projects that demonstrate the highest return on investment, geographic and modal balance, and alignment with long-range goals are selected for funding. The final list represents the best value for the region under existing fiscal constraints.



- **Ensure Compliance with Federal Requirements:** The implementation plan will meet all federal requirements for fiscal constraint, ensuring that plan elements are eligible for inclusion in future Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs).
- **Incorporate Public and Stakeholder Feedback:** The draft constrained plan was presented for review by local jurisdictions, transportation stakeholders, and the general public. Feedback is being used to refine project sequencing and confirm community support.
- **Define a Phased Investment Strategy:** The selected projects can be organized into near-term, mid-term, and long-term implementation tiers, enabling efficient coordination with land use planning, private development, and regional economic development initiatives.
- **Prepare the Final MTP Document:** The financially constrained plan, along with policy recommendations, environmental considerations, and performance measures, will be assembled into the final 2050 MTP document, completing the final milestone of the planning process.



## APPENDIX H: FHWA COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

---



CFR 23 450.306 Checklist	Addressed	How Requirement is Addressed	Pages
<b>a) Develop long-range transportation plans and TIPs through a performance-driven, outcome-based approach to planning for metropolitan areas of the State.</b>	Yes		
<b>(b) Address the federal planning factors:</b>			
<b>(1)</b> Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #4 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18
<b>(2)</b> Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #1 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-25
<b>(3)</b> Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #1 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-25
<b>(4)</b> Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goals #3 and #4 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18
<b>(5)</b> Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goals #4 and #5 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18
<b>(6)</b> Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #4 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18
<b>(7)</b> Promote efficient system management and operation;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #2 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18
<b>(8)</b> Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goals #2 and #6 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18
<b>(9)</b> Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #5 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18
<b>(10)</b> Enhance travel and tourism.	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #4 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-18, 26
<b>(c) Consideration of the planning factors in paragraph (b) of this section shall be reflected, as appropriate, in the metropolitan transportation planning process. The degree of consideration and analysis of the factors should be based on the scale and complexity of many issues, including transportation system development, land use, employment, economic development, human and natural environment (including Section 4(f) properties as defined in 23 CFR 774.17), and housing and community development.</b>			
<b>(d) Performance-based approach.</b>			
<b>(1)</b> The metropolitan transportation planning process shall provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decision making to support the national goals described in 23 U.S.C. 150(b) and the general purposes described in 49 U.S.C. 5301(c).	Yes	Project performance documented during project prioritization discussion in Final Report	Chapters 5, 11
<b>(2) Establishment of performance targets by metropolitan planning organizations.</b>			
<b>(i)</b> Each metropolitan planning organization shall establish performance targets that address the performance measures or standards established under 23 CFR part 490 (where applicable), 49 U.S.C. 5326(c), and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d) to use in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the metropolitan planning organization.	Yes	National Transportation Performance Measures and State Targets documented under existing conditions section of Final Report.	Chapters 5, 11
<b>(ii)</b> The selection of targets that address performance measures described in 23 U.S.C. 150(c) shall be in accordance with the appropriate target setting framework established at 23 CFR part 490, and shall be coordinated with the relevant State(s) to ensure consistency, to the maximum extent practicable.	Yes	National Transportation Performance Measures and State Targets documented under existing conditions section of Final Report.	pp. 15-25
<b>(iii)</b> The selection of performance targets that address performance measures described in 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d) shall be coordinated, to the maximum extent practicable, with public transportation providers to ensure consistency with the performance targets that public transportation providers establish under 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d).	n/a	The region does not have a fixed-route transit system.	
<b>(3)</b> Each MPO shall establish the performance targets under paragraph (d)(2) of this section not later than 180 days after the date on which the relevant State or provider of public transportation establishes the performance targets.	n/a	The region does not have a fixed-route transit system.	
<b>(4)</b> An MPO shall integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State transportation plans and transportation processes, as well as any plans developed under 49 U.S.C. chapter 53 by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program including:			
<b>(i)</b> The State asset management plan for the NHS, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the Transit Asset Management Plan, as discussed in 49 U.S.C. 5326;	Yes	reference to GDOT Transportation Asset Management Plan	p. 9
<b>(ii)</b> Applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP, as specified in 23 U.S.C. 148;	Yes	reference to Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan	p. 9
<b>(iii)</b> The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan in 49 U.S.C. 5329(d);	Yes	reference to Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan	pp. 8-9
<b>(iv)</b> Other safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs, as appropriate;	Yes	VLMO 2050 MTP Goal #1 used in project prioritization	pp. 14-25
<b>(v)</b> The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program performance plan in 23 U.S.C. 149(l), as applicable;	n/a	The region does not have air quality conformity issues.	
<b>(vi)</b> Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan (MAP-21 section 1118);		Note to reference this in Final Report per DARTS	
<b>(vii)</b> The congestion management process, as defined in 23 CFR 450.322, if applicable; and	n/a	TMA population is below 200k	
<b>(viii)</b> Other State transportation plans and transportation processes required as part of a performance-based program.	yes	Complete listing of reports used in study coordination is in MTP Final Report	pp. 8-11
<b>(e) The failure to consider any factor specified in paragraph (b) or (d) of this section shall not be reviewable by any court under title 23 U.S.C., 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, subchapter II of title 5, U.S.C. Chapter 5, or title 5 U.S.C. Chapter 7 in any matter affecting a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, a project or strategy, or the certification of a metropolitan transportation planning process.</b>	n/a		
<b>(f) An MPO shall carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process in coordination with the statewide transportation planning process required by 23 U.S.C. 135 and 49 U.S.C. 5304.</b>	yes	Complete listing of reports used in study coordination is in MTP Final Report	pp. 8-11
<b>(g) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall (to the maximum extent practicable) be consistent with the development of applicable regional intelligent transportation systems (ITS) architectures, as defined in 23 CFR part 940.</b>	Yes	see list and map of ITS and signalization projects	pp. 39-41, pp. 131-134
<b>(h) Preparation of the coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan, as required by 49 U.S.C. 5310, should be coordinated and consistent with the metropolitan transportation planning process.</b>	Yes	The current Regional Transit Plan addresses public transit-human services transportation, as will the TDP Update	p. 11
<b>(i) In an urbanized area not designated as a TMA that is an air quality attainment area, the MPO(s) may propose and submit to the FHWA and the FTA for approval a procedure for developing an abbreviated metropolitan transportation plan and TIP. In developing proposed simplified planning procedures, consideration shall be given to whether the abbreviated metropolitan transportation plan and TIP will achieve the purposes of 23 U.S.C. 134, 49 U.S.C. 5303, and this part, taking into account the complexity of the transportation problems in the area. The MPO shall develop simplified procedures in cooperation with the State(s) and public transportation operator(s).</b>	n/a	The region does not have air quality conformity issues.	
<b>CFR 23 450.324 Checklist</b>			



CFR 23 450.306 Checklist	Addressed	How Requirement is Addressed	Pages
(a) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. In formulating the transportation plan, the MPO shall consider factors described in §450.306 as the factors relate to a minimum 20-year forecast period. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be the date of a conformity determination issued by the FHWA and the FTA. In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO.	Yes	2050 MTP is scheduled for MPO adoption on September 3, 2025. This results in a 25-year planning horizon.	p. 152 reference
(b) The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.	Yes	The 2050 MTP includes 3 implementation stages.	pp. 157-160
(c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every 4 years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas and at least every 5 years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon. In addition, the MPO may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year. The MPO shall approve the transportation plan (and any revisions) and submit it for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.	Yes	2050 MTP is scheduled for MPO adoption on September 3, 2025. This timeline is within 5 years of the previous 2045 MTP adoption.	p. 152 reference
(d) In metropolitan areas that are in nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the MPO shall coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP).	n/a	The region does not have air quality conformity issues.	
(e) The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data used in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.	Yes	Coordination has been maintained between the 2050 MTP and the ongoing SGRC TDP Update, as well as the MPO's Transit Oriented Development study.	p. 11
(f) The metropolitan transportation plan shall, at a minimum, include:			
(1) The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan;	Yes	The MTP includes existing traffic and truck flow maps.	pp. 25, 28-29, 58-62, 108-111
(2) Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities), and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan.	Yes	Existing and proposed roadways are documented in the MTP Final Report, along with proposed multi-modal projects.	Chapters 4, 9, 12
(3) A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with §450.306(d).	Yes	PM1, PM2, and PM3 targets are noted in the MTP Final Report	pp. 14-20
(4) A system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in §450.306(d), including—			
(i) Progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data	n/a	understood.	
(ii) For metropolitan planning organizations that voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios, an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of the transportation system and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified performance targets.	Yes	Alternate land use scenario is documented.	Appendix E
(5) Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods;	Yes	Specific signalization and ITS strategies are provided.	pp. 131-134
(6) Consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMA's that meet the requirements of this subpart, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMA's that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide.	n/a	VLMPA is not a TMA.	
(7) Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system.	Yes	2050 MTP projects were evaluated with respect to environment and resiliency.	pp. 148-151
(8) Transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a), as appropriate;	n/a	There is no fixed-route transit services in the region and transit is not included in the GDOT travel demand model.	
(9) Design concept and design scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities in sufficient detail, regardless of funding source, in nonattainment and maintenance areas for conformity determinations under the EPA's transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). In all areas (regardless of air quality designation), all proposed improvements shall be described in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates;	n/a	The region does not have air quality conformity issues.	
(10) A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The MPO shall develop the discussion in consultation with applicable Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation;	Yes	2050 MTP projects were evaluated with respect to environment and resiliency.	pp. 148-151
(11) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.			
(i) For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain the Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).	Yes	2050 MTP Final Report includes a chapter describing available and potential revenues and cost assumptions.	Chapter 10



CFR 23 450.306 Checklist	Addressed	How Requirement is Addressed	Pages
(ii) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO(s), public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under §450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.	Yes	2050 MTP Final Report includes a chapter describing available and potential revenues and cost assumptions.	Chapter 10
(iii) The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. The financial plan may include an assessment of the appropriateness of innovative finance techniques (for example, tolling, pricing, bonding, public private partnerships, or other strategies) as revenue sources for projects in the plan.	Yes	2050 MTP Final Report includes a chapter describing available and potential revenues and cost assumptions.	Chapter 10
(iv) In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect "year of expenditure dollars," based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).	Yes	Inflation rates and year of expenditure are documented in the 2050 MTP Final Report.	Chapters 10, 12
(v) For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan ( <i>i.e.</i> , beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.	Yes	Funding is divided into 3 stages to reflect the end date of TIA funding.	Chapter 12
(vi) For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP.	n/a	The region does not have air quality conformity issues.	
(vii) For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.	Yes	2050 MTP Final Report includes a section that describes illustrative projects, should future funding become available.	p. 168
(viii) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced ( <i>i.e.</i> , by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.	n/a	understood.	
(12) Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g).	Yes	bicycle and pedestrian projects are fully documented in the 2050 MTP.	pp. 121-126
(g) The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate:	Yes	All applicable parties were given opportunities to participate in the 2050 MTP Update process.	Appendix B
(1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or	n/a		
(2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.	Yes	Historic Equity Action Lense process conducted and fully documented.	Appendix A
(h) The metropolitan transportation plan should integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP required under 23 U.S.C. 148, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan required under 49 U.S.C. 5329(d), or an Interim Agency Safety Plan in accordance with 49 CFR part 659, as in effect until completion of the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, and may incorporate or reference applicable emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security, as appropriate, to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.	understood	see earlier references	
(i) An MPO may, while fitting the needs and complexity of its community, voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios for consideration as part of the development of the metropolitan transportation plan.			
(1) An MPO that chooses to develop multiple scenarios under this paragraph (i) is encouraged to consider:			
(i) Potential regional investment strategies for the planning horizon;	No	Alternate land use scenario was an illustrative effort with no such details.	
(ii) Assumed distribution of population and employment;	Yes	Alternate land use scenario is documented.	
(iii) A scenario that, to the maximum extent practicable, maintains baseline conditions for the performance areas identified in §450.306(d) and measures established under 23 CFR part 490;	No	Alternate land use scenario was an illustrative effort with no such details.	
(iv) A scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures identified in §450.306(d) as possible;	No	Alternate land use scenario was an illustrative effort with no such details.	
(v) Revenue constrained scenarios based on the total revenues expected to be available over the forecast period of the plan; and	No	Alternate land use scenario was an illustrative effort with no such details.	
(vi) Estimated costs and potential revenues available to support each scenario.	No	Alternate land use scenario was an illustrative effort with no such details.	
(2) In addition to the performance areas identified in 23 U.S.C. 150(c), 49 U.S.C. 5326(c), and 5329(d), and the measures established under 23 CFR part 490, MPOs may evaluate scenarios developed under this paragraph using locally developed measures.			
(j) The MPO shall provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under §450.316(a).	Yes	30-day comment period has been noticed.	
(k) The MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.	Yes	Draft 2050 MTP Final Report made available at the MPO offices and online for public review and comment.	
(l) A State or MPO is not required to select any project from the illustrative list of additional projects included in the financial plan under paragraph (f)(11) of this section.	n/a		



CFR 23 450.306 Checklist	Addressed	How Requirement is Addressed	Pages
(m) In nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, the MPO, as well as the FHWA and the FTA, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended transportation plan in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). A 12-month conformity lapse grace period will be implemented when an area misses an applicable deadline, in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). At the end of this 12-month grace period, the existing conformity determination will lapse. During a conformity lapse, MPOs can prepare an interim metropolitan transportation plan as a basis for advancing projects that are eligible to proceed under a conformity lapse. An interim metropolitan transportation plan consisting of eligible projects from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP may proceed immediately without revisiting the requirements of this section, subject to interagency consultation defined in 40 CFR part 93, subpart A. An interim metropolitan transportation plan containing eligible projects that are not from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP must meet all the requirements of this section.	n/a	The region does not have air quality conformity issues.	