




Metropolitan Transportation Plan UPDATE 2025-2050



DECEMBER 2024

Page Intentionally Blank

Acknowledgements

This plan is a result of the stakeholders' collaborative efforts to envision the future of the Columbus-Phenix City region, including contributions from community members, elected officials, MPO staff, and the planning team:

C-PCMPO Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC)

Will Johnson, Director of Planning, Columbus, Chair
Vacant, Master Planner, Fort Moore
Vance Beck, PE Assistant Director of Engineering, Columbus
Shawn Blakeney, PE Russell County Engineer
Cooper Calhoun, PE Montgomery Area Traffic Engineer, Alabama DOT
Amber Clark, Director, Columbus Airport
Dylan Evans, Transportation Planning Specialist, Georgia DOT
Felton Grant, Transportation Planning Coordinator, Columbus
Tiffany Grier, METRA, Columbus
Justin Hardee, PE, Lee County Engineer
Pam Hodge, Deputy City Manager, Columbus
Wallace Hunter, City Manager, Phenix City
Matt Leverette, PE, Division Pre-Construction Engineer, Alabama DOT
Jim Livingston, Executive Director, River Valley Regional Commission
Angel Moore, City Engineer, Phenix City
Adam Smith, Pre-Construction Engineer, Georgia DOT
Andrew Swicegood, City Engineer, Smiths Station
Thomas Weaver, County Manager, Chattahoochee County

Consultant Team

Pond & Company

Wade Carroll, AICP, RSP
Richard Fangmann, PE, PTOE
Kat Onore, AICP
Elizabeth Burke
Patrick McArdle, PE

Benesch

Wally Blain, AICP
Bo Galloway, AICP

MPH and Associates, Inc.

Mary P. Huffstetler, AICP

PREPARED FOR



PREPARED BY

POND

Contents

CH 1. Introduction 9

What is Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization (CPCTS MPO)?	10
MTP Purpose	12
Federal Policy	13
MTP Process	14
What's in the MTP?	16

CH 2. Review of Previous Plans and Studies 17

Georgia Freight Plan	18
Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan Update	18
GDOT 2020 Title VI Program Plan	19
C-PCTS MPO Title VI Plan	19
METRA Transit Development Plan	20
RVRC Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan	20
J.R. Allen Parkway/US 80 Corridor Study	21
2nd Avenue Streetscape Study	21
Columbus-Muscogee County 2038 Comprehensive Plan	22
Phenix City Comprehensive Plan	22
Cusseta-Chattahoochee County Comprehensive Plan	23
RVRC Regional Plan	23

CH 3. Performance-Based Planning 25

Introduction	26
C-PCTS MPO Goals, Objectives, and Performance Metrics	28
Development of 2050 Performance Metrics	40
Overview of National Transportation Goals and State Targets	41

CH 4. Population and Employment 47

Introduction	48
Existing + Projected Population	49
Existing and Projected Employment	53

CH 5. Justice40 Analysis 57

What is Justice40?	58
Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Results	60
Traditionally Underserved Populations	62
Major Findings and Implications for Transportation Needs	71

CH 6. Land Use and Development 73

Introduction	74
Columbus-Muscogee County	76
Chattahoochee County	78
Harris County	79
Phenix City	80
Russell County, Lee County, and Smiths Station	82

CH 7. Roadway Network Characteristics 83

Introduction	84
Functional Classification	84
Number of Lanes	86
Grade Separated Roadways	86
Vehicular Volumes	88
Traffic Signals	90
Network Performance	92
Travel Patterns and Trends	99

CH 8. Safety 105

Highlights of Safety Needs	106
Auto Crashes	108
Pedestrian-Involved Crashes	110
Bicycle-Involved Crashes	112
Commercial Vehicle Crashes	114

CH 9. Transit	117
METRA	118
PEX	120
Transit Needs	121
Transit Propensity Areas	122
CH 10. Active Transportation	127
Inventory of Existing Facilities	128
Activity Centers	132
Active Transportation Needs	134
Active Transportation Recommendations and Prioritization	140
CH 11. Freight and Goods Movement	149
The Importance of Freight in the C-PCTS Region	150
Freight Profile	151
Rail Infrastructure	161
Truck Traffic	164
CH 12. Resiliency	169
Risk Assessment	170
Bridges	171
Flooding	173
Severe Storms and Tornadoes	175
Extreme Heat	175
Hurricanes	176
Man-made Events	177
Preparedness and Mitigation Strategies	178

CH 13. Revenues and Funding Sources	179
Introduction	180
Federal Funding Sources and Grant Programs	180
State Funding Sources and Grant Programs	184
Local Funding Sources	187
Projected Federal, State, and Local Funding for Transportation	188
Transit Funding	192

CH 14. Project Identification & Prioritization	195
Introduction	196
Project Identification Process	196
Project Prioritization Process	197

CH 15. Work Program	211
Introduction	212
Georgia Work Program	212
Alabama Work Program	227
Transit Recommendations	235
Policy Recommendations	236

Appendices

Appendix A: Compliance Checklist
Appendix B: TDM Technical Memo and Model Runs
Appendix C: Project Sheets
Appendix D: Systemwide Performance Reports
Appendix E: Outreach Summary
Appendix F: Work Program Tables
Appendix G: Environmental Mitigation

Figures

Figure 1.1. CPCTS Study Area	11	Figure 8.2. Auto Crashes by Severity	108
Figure 1.2. Planning and Program Development Process	15	Figure 8.4. Auto Crashes, 2018-2022	109
Figure 4.1. Base Year Population by TAZ	50	Figure 8.5. Pedestrian-Involved Crashes by Severity	110
Figure 4.2. 2050 Project Population by TAZ	51	Figure 8.6. Pedestrian-Involved Crashes	111
Figure 4.3. Areas of Projected Population Growth (2020-2050)	52	Figure 8.7. Bicycle-Involved Crashes by Severity	112
Figure 4.4. Base Year Employment by TAZ	54	Figure 8.8. Bicycle-Involved Crashes	113
Figure 4.5. 2050 Projected Employment by TAZ	55	Figure 8.9. Commercial Vehicle Crashes by Severity	114
Figure 4.6. Areas of Projected Employment Growth (2020-2050)	56	Figure 8.10. Commercial Vehicle Crashes by Functional Class	114
Figure 5.1. Concentration of Justice40 Communities	59	Figure 8.11. Commercial Vehicle Crashes	115
Figure 5.2. USDOT ETC Explorer Results for Transportation Insecurity in the Columbus-Phenix City MPO	61	Figure 9.1. METRA Transit Service	119
Figure 5.3. Concentrations of Households in Poverty	63	Figure 9.2. PEX Transit Service	120
Figure 5.4. Concentrations of Non-White Residents	65	Figure 10.1. Sidewalk Facilities	129
Figure 5.5. Concentrations of Non-English-Speaking Residents	66	Figure 10.2. Trails and Bicycle Facilities	131
Figure 5.6. Concentrations of Households which Lack Access to a Vehicle	67	Figure 10.3. Key destinations	133
Figure 5.7. Concentrations of Residents without a College Education	68	Figure 10.4. Complete Street Recommendations	142
Figure 5.8. Concentrations of Residents Aged 65 or Older	69	Figure 10.5. Sidewalk Recommendations	145
Figure 5.9. Concentrations of Disabled Residents	70	Figure 10.6. Bikeway Selection Guide (FHWA)	146
Figure 6.1. Future Land Uses for Columbus-Muscogee County, Harris County	77	Figure 11.1. The National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)	152
Figure 6.2. Phenix City Land Use Plan	80	Figure 11.2. Georgia's Statewide Designated Freight Corridors	153
Figure 7.1. Roadway Functional Classification	85	Figure 11.3. Regional Freight Network	154
Figure 7.2. Number of Lanes	87	Figure 11.4. Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET)	155
Figure 7.3. Vehicular Volumes	89	Figure 11.5. Rail Network and At-Grade Rail Crossings	162
Figure 7.4. Signalized Intersections	91	Figure 11.6. Rail Network and Separated-Grade Rail Crossings	163
Figure 7.5. Level of Service Grades (Source: Transportation for America)	92	Figure 11.7. Freight Truck Volume	165
Figure 7.6. 2020 Level of Service	94	Figure 12.1. Bridge Condition	172
Figure 7.7. 2050 Level of Service	96	Figure 12.2. High Risk Flood Areas	174
Figure 7.8. Max Travel Time Index (Source: Replica)	98	Figure 12.3. Evacuation Routes	177
Figure 7.10. AM Peak Hour Trip Origins (Source: Replica, 2023)	100	Figure 14.1. Capacity Prioritization Results Map	198
Figure 7.11. AM Peak Hour Trip Destinations (Source: Replica, 2023)	101	Figure 14.2. Operational Prioritization Results Map	201
Figure 7.12. PM Peak Hour Trip Origins (Source: Replica, 2023)	102	Figure 14.3. Complete Street Prioritization Results	207
Figure 7.13. AM Peak Hour Trip Destinations (Source: Replica, 2023)	103	Figure 15.1. Short-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2024-2029)	216
Figure 8.1. Crash History vs Urban Areas	107	Figure 15.2. Identified Alabama MTP Roadway Projects for Future Consideration	230
Figure 8.3. Auto Crashes by Functional Class	108		

Tables

Table 10.2. Complete Streets Prioritization Scoring	143
Table 10.3. Complete Streets Prioritization Scoring, continued	144
Table 11.1. Statutory or 40T/56 Ft. Restrictions for Thru Truck Routes in Columbus	156
Table 11.2. 40T/56 Ft. Restrictions for Local Truck Routes in Columbus	157
Table 13.1. GDOT Formula Funding 2025-2050 C-PCTS MPO Funding Projections	189
Table 13.2. GDOT TAP Funding	189
Table 13.3. GDOT CRP Funding	189
Table 13.4. TIA Funding	189
Table 13.5. 2024-2050 ALDOT Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding Projections for the C-PCTS MPO	190
Table 13.6. ALDOT TAP Funding	191
Table 13.7. ALDOT CRP Funding	191
Table 13.8. METRA Funding Projections 2024-2050	192
Table 13.9. PEX Funding Projections 2024-2050	193
Table 14.1. Project Types by Identification Method	196
Table 14.2. Project Types by Identification Method	197
Table 14.3. Capacity Projects Prioritization Scoring	198
Table 14.4. Operational Projects Prioritization Scoring	202
Table 14.5. Complete Streets Project Prioritization Scoring	208
Table 15.1. GDOT Formula Funding Allocation by Project Type	212
Table 15.2. GDOT Formula Funding Allocation by Project Type	212
Table 15.3. Unit Cost Estimates	213
Table 15.4. Projected Georgia Roadway Funds – 2025-2050	214
Table 15.5. Short-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2025-2029)	216
Table 15.6. Mid-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2030-2039)	217
Table 15.7. Long-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2040-2050)	217
Table 15.8. Projected Georgia Active Transportation Funds – 2025-2050	218
Table 15.9. Available GDOT Formula Funds for Additional Active Transportation Projects through 2029	219
Table 15.10. Short-Term Georgia Active Transportation Projects (2025-2029)	220
Table 15.11. Mid-Term Georgia Active Transportation Projects (2030-2039)	221
Table 15.12. Projected Georgia Maintenance Funds – 2025-2050	222
Table 15.13. Short-Term Georgia Maintenance Projects (2025-2029)	223

Table 15.14. Mid-Term Georgia Maintenance Projects (2025-2029)	223
Table 15.15. Projected Georgia Funds for EV Projects – 2025-2050	224
Table 15.16. Projected Funds for Georgia Special Studies – 2025-2050	224
Table 15.17. Georgia EV Projects (2025)	225
Table 15.18. Georgia Special Studies (2025)	225
Table 15.19. ALDOT Formula Funding Allocation by Project Type	226
Table 15.20. Additional funds for Alabama Active Transportation Projects	226
Table 15.22. Projected Alabama Roadway Funds – 2024-2050	227
Table 15.21. Alabama Project Costs vs Available Funding	227
Table 15.23. Identified Alabama MTP Roadway Projects for Future Consideration	228
Table 15.24. Projected Alabama Active Transportation Funds – 2024-2050	230
Table 15.25. Unallocated Alabama Active Transportation Funds – 2024-2050	232
Table 15.26. Short-Term Alabama Active Transportation Project (2024-2029)	230
Table 15.27. Projected Alabama Maintenance Funds – 2024-2050	231
Table 15.28. Unallocated Alabama Active Transportation Funds – 2024-2050	231
Table 15.29. Short-Term Alabama Maintenance Projects (2024-2029)	232
Table 15.30. Mid-Term Alabama Maintenance Projects (2030-2039)	232
Table 15.31. Long-Term Alabama Maintenance Projects (2040-2050)	233
Table 15.32. PEX Recommendation Operating Cost Comparison	234
Table 15.33. LRPT Baseline Cost Comparison for Concept 1	234
Table 15.34. PEX Short- Mid Term and Mid-Long Term Transit Recommendations	235
Table 15.35. Policy Recommendations Summary Table	236

Page Intentionally Blank

01

Introduction


What is Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization (CPCTS MPO)?

The Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study (CPCTS) is one of sixteen Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in Georgia, and one of twelve in Alabama. An MPO is a federally-designated body made up of representatives of local governments and transportation agencies, with authority and responsibility for transportation policy in metropolitan planning areas. Federal law requires an MPO for any urbanized area with at least 50,000 people.

Responsibilities of the MPO include:

- **Program and allocate federal funds to transportation projects and infrastructure investments through identifying and evaluating alternative transportation improvement options.**
- **Create and coordinate policy that guides transportation planning in its area of jurisdictions. A key element of policy development is that it is data driven, goal focused and anticipated outputs are measurable.**
- **Establish and manage a fair and impartial setting for effective regional decision making in the Columbus-Phenix City region.**
- **Transparent decision making through active public involvement is a key requirement. Successful existing and future transportation plans seek to incorporate and sustain meaningful public input.**
- **Prepare and maintain a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Preparation of this document occurs once every five (5) years and has a typical planning horizon between 20 to 30 years.**
- **Develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which is similar to the MTP however with a much shorter planning horizon. Transportation projects presented in the TIP are also included in the MTP.**

Figure 1.1. CPCTS Study Area



MTP Purpose

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is developed by CPCTS every five years to provide a comprehensive framework for transportation planning and investment in the Columbus-Phenix City region.



LONG-TERM VISION

The MTP outlines a long-term vision for transportation infrastructure and services in the metropolitan area, typically spanning 20 to 30 years. They articulate goals and objectives related to mobility, accessibility, safety, sustainability, and economic development.



COORDINATION

The MTP serves as a platform for coordinating transportation planning efforts among various stakeholders, including local governments, transit agencies, transportation departments, and the public. They facilitate collaboration to address regional transportation challenges and ensure consistency with state and federal planning requirements.



PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

The MTP involves extensive public participation processes to gather input from residents, businesses, advocacy groups, and other stakeholders. Public engagement helps MPOs understand community needs and preferences, ensuring that transportation investments align with the priorities of the people they serve.



POLICY GUIDANCE

The MTP establishes policies and strategies for managing transportation resources effectively. They may address issues such as land use, transit-oriented development, congestion management, environmental protection, and equity. MTPs also incorporate state and federal transportation policies to ensure compliance and eligibility for funding.



FINANCIAL PLANNING

The MTP includes financial plans that identify funding sources and allocate resources to transportation projects and programs over the planning period. These financial plans consider revenue projections, funding constraints, cost estimates, and prioritization criteria to maximize the impact of available resources.



PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

The MTP prioritizes transportation projects based on established criteria, such as project readiness, cost-effectiveness, safety benefits, environmental impacts, and equity considerations. Prioritization helps MPOs make informed decisions about which projects to pursue first and how to sequence investments over time.



FEDERAL REQUIREMENT

The MTP is mandated by federal transportation legislation, such as the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act in the United States. MPOs must develop and update MTPs regularly to maintain eligibility for federal transportation funding and ensure compliance with federal planning regulations.

Federal Policy

BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE LAW



The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill will deliver generational investments in the economy for working people. The infrastructure bill will rebuild and replace infrastructure that is decades, or even a century, old. It will promote safety, help us combat the climate crisis, and advance equitable access to transportation.

– U.S. Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg Statement on Passage of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), signed into law in November 2021, is a landmark piece of legislation in the United States aimed at revitalizing the nation's infrastructure. It represents a bipartisan effort to address critical infrastructure needs across various sectors, including transportation, broadband, water systems, energy, and resilience to climate change. The law provides significant funding for infrastructure projects over a five-year period, totaling over \$1 trillion, with investments targeted at modernizing and expanding essential infrastructure networks nationwide.

Key components of the BIL include funding for traditional infrastructure projects such as roads, bridges, and public transit, as well as investments

in emerging areas like electric vehicle charging stations, broadband internet access, and climate resilience measures. Funds are distributed to local projects through a combination of competitive grants, formula-based allocations, and direct appropriations to federal agencies responsible for administering specific programs. State and local governments, tribal communities, and other eligible entities can apply for funding to support infrastructure improvements that align with the goals and priorities outlined in the legislation. Additionally, the law includes provisions to enhance accountability, transparency, and equity in the distribution of funds to ensure that investments address the most pressing infrastructure needs and benefit communities across the country.


MTP REQUIREMENTS

Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTPs) must adhere to federal requirements to ensure comprehensive and coordinated transportation planning in metropolitan areas. These requirements include:

- 1. Inclusive Process:** MTPs must be developed collaboratively with input from stakeholders.
- 2. Long-Range Focus:** Plans should cover at least a 20-year horizon and address all transportation modes.
- 3. Financial Planning:** MTPs must include a financially constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- 4. Performance-Based Approach:** Plans should set performance targets and use data to inform decisions.
- 5. Environmental Compliance:** MTPs must comply with environmental laws and consider environmental justice.

Meeting these requirements ensures that MTPs serve as effective roadmaps for sustainable and equitable transportation systems in metropolitan regions.

MTP Process



HOW DOES THE MTP FIT INTO THE OVERALL PROJECT DELIVERY PROCESS?




Figure 1.2. Planning and Program Development Process

What's in the MTP?

The MTP is comprised of the following sections:

<p>2 Review of Relevant Studies— Provides an overview of past and ongoing efforts, and how they relate to the MTP</p>	<p>7 Roadway Characteristics—Describes current road network and needs.</p>	<p>12 Resilience—Describes flooding risks, evacuation routes, bridge conditions, and overall resiliency needs.</p>
<p>3 Performance-Based Planning— Outlines goals, performance measures, and the prioritization process</p>	<p>8 Safety Analysis—Analyzes crash history and describes safety needs.</p>	<p>13 Revenues and Potential Funding Sources—Outlines current funding sources and revenue projections.</p>
<p>4 Population and Employment— Provides current and future population and employment estimates, on which traffic projections are based</p>	<p>9 Transit—Describes current transit services and needs.</p>	<p>14 Project Identification and Prioritization—Lists all proposed projects and the results of the prioritization exercise.</p>
<p>5 Justice 40 Analysis—Identifies disadvantaged populations in Columbus region, where they live, work, and travel, and their mobility needs.</p>	<p>10 Active Transportation—Describes current walking and biking infrastructure and needs.</p>	<p>15 MTP Work Program—Lists financially constrained project program and aspirational projects.</p>
<p>6 Land Use and Development— Identifies future land uses and planned major developments across the Columbus region.</p>	<p>11 Freight and Goods Movement— Describes current freight infrastructure and needs.</p>	<p>APPENDICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendices Appendix A: Compliance Checklist Appendix B: TDM Technical Memo and Model Runs Appendix C: Project Sheets Appendix D: Systemwide Performance Reports Appendix E: Outreach Summary Appendix F: Work Program Tables Appendix G: Environmental Mitigation

02

Review of Previous Plans and Studies


Georgia Freight Plan

Completed in March 2023, the Georgia Freight Plan is a comprehensive assessment of demand scenarios for the state's freight and logistics infrastructure, exploring investment options and policy considerations to support local businesses, boost statewide economic benefits, and ensure the efficient movement of goods. It documents freight planning activities and investments, identifies current and future needs through analysis and stakeholder engagement, and guides transportation decisions. Integrating strategies from existing documents, the plan prioritizes investments crucial to Georgia's economic growth and competitiveness, setting specific goals and addressing issues not covered in other statewide plans.



Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan Update

A predecessor to the Georgia Freight Plan, first adopted in 2012 with a focus on private-sector stakeholders, the Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan identifies the statewide freight corridor network, highlighting Georgia's key freight routes, high truck volume locations, and critical bottlenecks. The plan outlines freight improvement project recommendations identified through stakeholder outreach, transportation plans, and needs analysis. Key projects, spanning all transportation modes and regions, were evaluated, grouped into packages, and analyzed for economic impact to prioritize investments. The report includes chapters on project identification, evaluation, prioritization, economic benefits, and funding options, providing a comprehensive framework for enhancing Georgia's freight and logistics infrastructure.



RELEVANCE TO MTP


The freight data and analytics and policies outlined in the Georgia Freight Plan were considered in the development of the MTP Freight Element. Furthermore, the Transearch data utilized for the Plan update was used to develop commodity flow analysis for the C-PCTS MPO region.

RELEVANCE TO MTP

Provides historical context for the C-PCTS MPO connections to the remainder of the state as well as a framework for assessing freight needs.

GDOT 2020 Title VI Program Plan

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Title VI Plan defines discrimination and ensures nondiscrimination in federally funded programs, prohibiting exclusion based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. It includes procedures for complaints, public awareness, training, and compliance monitoring. The plan emphasizes outreach, education, and proactive measures, requiring all GDOT employees and sub-recipients to adhere to Title VI regulations. Overseen by the Equal Employment Opportunity Office and supported by an Interdisciplinary Team, GDOT ensures continuous non-discriminatory practices across all operations.




RELEVANCE TO MTP

Like the MPO plan, the GDOT Title VI Plan was consulted in developing the Stakeholder and Public Involvement Plan and the development of the overall prioritization process for the MTP update.

C-PCTS MPO Title VI Plan

The 2020 Title VI Plan for the Columbus-Phenix City MPO ensures compliance with Title VI and Environmental Justice principles, as required for receiving federal and state funds. The Director of Planning oversees the program, with day-to-day administration by the Title VI Coordinator. The plan mandates adherence to federal regulations, emphasizes inclusive public participation, and provides meaningful access for individuals with Limited English Proficiency. By defining clear responsibilities, engaging diverse communities, and implementing inclusive practices, the MPO aims to prevent discrimination and promote equitable access to transportation planning and services for all community members.




RELEVANCE TO MTP

The MPO Title VI Plan was consulted in developing the Stakeholder and Public Involvement Plan and the development of the overall prioritization process for the MTP update.

METRA Transit Development Plan

The Columbus-Muscogee County Transit Development Plan (TDP) aims to analyze past and current community growth to forecast future public transit needs in the area. It supports strategies to meet the transit needs of the city, county, and commuters, while adhering to federal, state, and local transportation regulations. The TDP provides a framework for the evolution of transit services, focusing on safety, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness, aligned with funding, regulatory requirements, and local transportation planning efforts.




RELEVANCE TO MTP

The TDP is the main policy document guiding the implementation of transit service throughout much of the C-PCTS MPO region.

RVRC Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

The River Valley Regional Commission's Bike Ped Plan aims to elevate the region's quality of life by championing cycling and walking as practical transportation options, while also fostering health and tourism. Through a collaborative effort involving RVRC staff, advisory committees, local agencies, and community members, the plan sets forth goals such as improving non-motorized mobility, boosting economic development through biking and walking initiatives, and integrating bike-ped facilities into regional planning. Key recommendations highlight the importance of establishing networks, engaging the public, and collaborating with the Georgia Department of Transportation for funding. Despite funding constraints, emphasis is placed on project prioritization and partnership with local governments to advance infrastructure enhancements conducive to active lifestyles and economic growth in the River Valley region.



RELEVANCE TO MTP

The RVRC Regional Bike Plan provided a policy framework for assessing bicycle and pedestrian needs in the Georgia portion of the C-PCTS MPO.

J.R. Allen Parkway/US 80 Corridor Study


The J.R. Allen Parkway/US 80 Corridor Study aimed to address congestion, safety, and mobility issues along a 10-mile stretch from the U.S. 80 Bridge to Beaver Run Road. The study focused on traffic mitigation, bridge analysis, interstate standard feasibility, and multimodal analyses. Collaborating with state and local agencies, private developers, and the community, the study developed recommendations drawn from data collection and public input, including both highway and multimodal improvement projects to tackle high crash zones and congestion. The corridor study concluded with preliminary suggestions for funding and prioritizing project implementation.

RELEVANCE TO MTP

The recommendations of the report were considered and integrated into the MTP work program.

2nd Avenue Streetscape Study

The 2nd Avenue Streetscape Study aims to redefine the vision for 2nd Avenue from Manchester Expressway to 19th Street/Talbotton Road. Focusing on transportation, streetscape character, and wayfinding signage, the study seeks to enhance mobility and aesthetics while accommodating various users. Key objectives include conceptual wayfinding and gateway design, multi-modal functionality, pedestrian activity enhancement, and traffic analysis. Public input was sought through virtual events, resulting in a proposed concept plan featuring landscaped medians, street trees, and pedestrian lighting to create a safer, more inviting corridor conducive to health, environmental stewardship, and potential redevelopment opportunities.




RELEVANCE TO MTP

The recommendations of the report were considered and integrated into the MTP work program.

Columbus-Muscogee County 2038 Comprehensive Plan

Over 15 months, citizens, officials, stakeholder groups, and planning staff collaborated to create the 2018-2038 Comprehensive Plan for Columbus. Driven by extensive public input, this plan adopts a forward-thinking and innovative approach to shaping the city's future over the next 20 years. It aims to provide guidance on state planning guidelines and offers crucial advice on development, zoning, policies, and initiatives. By engaging a diverse range of community members through meetings, interviews, social media, and surveys, the plan addresses key topics such as transportation, economic development, quality of life, public safety, housing, and land use. This collaborative effort ensures the plan is practical and actionable, honoring past insights while embracing future opportunities.




RELEVANCE TO MTP

The land use characteristics and character areas identified within the Plan were assessed for bicycle and pedestrian needs and to identify locations for Complete Streets.

Phenix City Comprehensive Plan

The Phenix City Comprehensive Plan outlines a 20-year strategy for guiding public and private investment, focusing on capital improvements, annexation, services, growth management, and economic development. It aims to provide residents, property owners, and developers with confidence in future investments by illustrating development plans, coordinating land use with transportation, conserving natural and historic features, and fostering a sustainable community. Combining vision, goals, maps, priority actions, and policies, the plan informs decision-making while promoting efficiency, stability, and quality of life. As a living document, it will evolve through continuous review and implementation, ensuring alignment with the community's vision for growth and change.




RELEVANCE TO MTP

The land use characteristics and character areas identified within the Plan were assessed for bicycle and pedestrian needs and to identify locations for Complete Streets.

Cusseta-Chattahoochee County Comprehensive Plan

The Cusseta-Chattahoochee County Comprehensive Plan identifies six major needs: internet improvements, adding more businesses, water system enhancements, eliminating blight and adding affordable housing, improving road and transportation options, and increasing youth programs and community interaction. The plan emphasizes the Broad Street Corridor, connecting U.S. 520/SR 280 and McNaughton Street, as key areas of interest due to their commercial and public service significance. The plan includes structural improvements to parks, housing, and creating a bike trail linking the high school to major corridors. As a policy guide, the plan aims to inspire local pride, guide daily decisions, and address needs and opportunities in land use, infrastructure, housing, and economic development, supported by detailed analyses and maps.



RVRC Regional Plan

The River Valley Regional Commission (RVRC) Regional Plan outlines a vision and sets goals and policies across various sectors, including natural and cultural resources, land use, housing, community facilities, transportation, economic and workforce development, education, health and human services, and regional cooperation. Developed through comprehensive community input from surveys, listening sessions, and strategic meetings, the plan identifies key regional needs and opportunities. It prioritizes economic growth, affordable housing, efficient community services, integrated transportation, resource conservation, accessible health services, educational advancements, and regional collaboration. The plan aims to promote balanced economic development, protect resources, enhance the quality of life, and foster regional cooperation over the next five years, ensuring all residents can benefit equitably from the region's progress.

RELEVANCE TO MTP

The land use characteristics and character areas identified within the Plan were assessed for bicycle and pedestrian needs and to identify locations for Complete Streets.

RELEVANCE TO MTP

The land use characteristics and character areas identified within the Plan were assessed for bicycle and pedestrian needs and to identify locations for Complete Streets.

Page Intentionally Blank

03

Performance- Based Planning

Introduction

This section presents the policy framework to guide the recommendations and priorities for the C-PCTS MPO and the MTP update. As such, this document presents a structured approach to updating the performance framework, a fundamental component of the C-PCTS MPO MTP update. It underlines the dedication to integrating community insights and stakeholder inputs, ensuring the transportation strategy resonates with local needs and broader state and federal objectives.

MTP POLICY FRAMEWORK

Passed in 2021, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) provides \$550 billion over fiscal year 2022 through 2026 in new Federal investments in infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, mass transit, electrical vehicle infrastructure and more. With respect to MPOs, the BIL carries forward the same planning factors as provided in the previous transportation bill, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or "FAST Act." As such, **the metropolitan planning process adheres to these 10 planning factors:**



Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;



Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users



Increase the **security** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users



Increase **accessibility and mobility** of people and freight



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**



Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight



Promote **efficient** system management and operation



Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system



Improve the **resiliency and reliability** of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate **stormwater** impacts of surface transportation



Enhance **travel and tourism**

The BIL carried forward the same MTP requirements of the FAST Act with the following enhancements:



An emphasis on connecting the transportation network to **affordable housing**



A heightened emphasis on **safety**



Prioritization of **complete streets**



Emphasis of using **web-based outreach techniques**

The MTP update team carries forward the intentions for Metropolitan Planning under the FAST Act and BIL by:

1. **Addressing all the 10 factors of the FAST Act.**
2. **Ensuring leadership from the Housing Authority of Columbus, GA is engaged and surveyed on improving transportation to serve the region's affordable housing units.**
3. **Emphasizing rightsizing to support Complete Streets implementation in the bicycle and pedestrian analysis and project identification tasks.**
4. **Implementing web-based tools for meaningful input.**

The remainder of the document details how the MTP goals, objectives, and performance measures from the 2045 MTP were refined based on the BIL. This policy framework will set the parameters for the project prioritization process for projects to be included in the 2050 MTP Cost Feasible Work Program.

C-PCTS MPO Goals, Objectives, and Performance Metrics

A key objective of the MTP update is ensuring its consistency with federal and state transportation policy. This section highlights the federal and state policy documents and how they influence the C-PCTS MPO goals, objectives, and performance measures.

ALIGNING C-PCTS MPO WITH FEDERAL AND STATE GOALS

BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE LAW (BIL)

The BIL is a substantial piece of legislation to improve various aspects of transportation and infrastructure, including roads, bridges, public transit, and more. The transition from the FAST Act to the BIL represents a significant overhaul and expansion of federal funding for addressing the nation's transportation and infrastructure needs, and the support of job creation through infrastructure investment. Some of the new components of the BIL include new prioritization of infrastructure and its application to social justice, equity, and environmental considerations, as well as a broadening of requirements for inclusive planning. These changes necessitate new considerations for the 2050 MTP update.

GEORGIA 2050 STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SWTP)/2021 STATEWIDE STRATEGIC TRANSPORTATION PLAN (SSTP)

The Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (SWTP)/2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan (SSTP) combines the Georgia Department of Transportation's (GDOT) strategic business case for transportation investment with the long-range, comprehensive transportation planning considerations required under Federal Law. The plans guide how the Georgia Department of Transportation will invest approximately \$71 billion in forecasted Federal and State revenues from current sources through 2050.

The Georgia SWTP is a multimodal long-range transportation plan with a "horizon year" of 2050. The SWTP is a fiscally constrained and strategic document that outlines Georgia's transportation investments, assesses all major transportation modes' current and future performance, and examines the linkages between modes. This performance-based strategy guides the GDOT in all program and project decisions. It identifies key transportation priorities, addresses infrastructure needs, and estimates all project costs. The plan typically includes details on road improvements, transit enhancements, bridge projects, and other initiatives to advance the state's transportation network.

Senate Bill 200 (SB200) required the creation of an SSTP, which serves as the official, intermodal, comprehensive, and fiscally constrained transportation plan, which includes programs and activities to support the implementation of the State's transportation goals and policies. The SSTP identifies strategies for three components of statewide investment, including:

- **Foundation investments—** taking care of our existing transportation system
- **Catalytic investments—** growing Georgia's economy
- **Innovation investments—** preparing for transportation demands of the future

The following pages show the Goals of the 2050 MTP and the BIL planning factors and Georgia SWTP/SSTP. Overall, the goals from the 2045 aligned with those from the BIL, with the following exceptions:

- The BIL specifically calls out an MPO planning factor for implementing Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications in the investment program. A **specific goal was developed to promote ITS applications.**
- While not a specific MPO planning factor identified in the BIL, a major cornerstone of the FHWA evaluation criteria for funding projects is to further equity per the Justice 40 initiative. Therefore, a **specific goal was developed to address equity in the C-PCTS MPO planning process.**

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE ENVIRONMENT



National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS

The 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP do not currently address this federal goal.



GOAL #1

Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2

Reform State Government



GOAL #3

Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4

Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

The 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP do not currently address this federal goal.

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- To reduce auto-related emissions
- To minimize and avoid noise impacts

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- To conform to regional and local land use plans providing connectivity & mobility
- To reduce sprawl and foster compact, mixed-use development patterns
- To promote site development that provides the opportunity for access & on-side circulation
- To protect existing neighborhoods and community integrity

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Impacts to the natural environment associated with transportation projects
- Reduce gaps within multimodal networks
- Project inclusion of green infrastructure elements and techniques
- Reduction in vehicle miles of travel

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

INCREASE THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM



National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS

- | | |
|---|--|
| 
GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses | 
GOAL #2
Reform State Government |
| 
GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia | 
GOAL #4
Put Georgians first |

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

- Improve highway safety
- Improve evacuation options

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Reduce crashes and fatalities and enhance security

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- To reduce the number and severity of accidents involving vehicles, bicyclists, pedestrians, and others
- To correct systematically high crash locations

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Number of fatalities in the calendar year and rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT
- Number of serious injuries per calendar year and number of serious injuries per 100 million VMT
- Number of bicycle/pedestrian injuries and fatalities in the calendar year

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

INCREASE ACCESSIBILITY AND MOBILITY OF PEOPLE AND FREIGHT

National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Achieve a reduction in congestion on the National Highway System and improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.




Image source: Atlanta Journal Constitution

State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS



GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2
Reform State Government



GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4
Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

Increase access to jobs, goods, and services throughout emerging metros and rural Georgia

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Assure that freight moves safely and efficiently while minimizing impacts on sensitive community areas.
-

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- To allow for truck circulation and movement
- To provide for the special infrastructure needs

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- AADT
- Level of Service
- Vehicle to Capacity Ratio
- Access to Employment and Activity Centers

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR



ENHANCE THE INTEGRATION AND CONNECTIVITY

National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system and enhance connectivity across modes.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS



GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2
Reform State Government



GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4
Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

- Improve operation and reliability of existing infrastructure through cost-effective advanced technologies

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Build, operate, and maintain an interconnected network of transportation facilities that meet the needs of motorists, transit riders, pedestrians, cyclists, and shippers and receivers.

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- To provide physical connections among modes
- To create a seamless public transportation system – service, fares, and operations

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Provide Pedestrian Linkages
- Encourage Intermodal Transfer
- Inter-agency/intergovernmental coordination

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

EMPHASIZE THE PRESERVATION OF THE EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM



National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS



GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2
Reform State Government



GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4
Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

Maintain infrastructure for safety and performance.

Improve operation and reliability of existing infrastructure through cost-effective advanced technologies

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Assure that freight moves safely and efficiently while minimizing impacts on sensitive community areas.

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- To minimize congestion and delay on main travel arteries
- To adequately fund routine maintenance and rehabilitation of pavement, bridges, etc.
- To achieve a well-maintained transit fleet

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Staff will track number of converted properties that negatively affect the transportation network.
- Percent of NHS Bridges in Poor condition as a percentage of total NHS bridge deck area.
- Percent of NHS bridges in Good condition as a percentage of total NHS bridge deck area.
- Percent of non-interstate roads meeting GDOT maintenance standards.

Image source: Atlanta Journal Constitution

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

ENCOURAGE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TSM AND TDM TO REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND PROMOTE LOW-COST SOLUTIONS OF ROAD CAPACITY

National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by improving project delivery processes.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS



GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2
Reform State Government



GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4
Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

- ✓ Improve operation and reliability of existing infrastructure through cost-effective advanced technologies

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- ✓ Promote the deployment of ITS and smart technologies throughout the roadway network and TDM strategies to promote low-cost solutions to congestion relief.

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- ✓ Optimize network efficiency through signalization.
- ✓ Utilize technology to enhance network efficiency

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- ✓ Projects with ITS elements identified
- ✓ Linear miles of ITS conduit installed within the MPO


BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

IMPROVE THE RESILIENCY AND RELIABILITY

National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting the environment and improving resilience to climate change and natural disasters.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS



GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2
Reform State Government



GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4
Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

- Improve operation and reliability of existing infrastructure through cost-effective advanced technologies.
- Improve evacuation options

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Improve livability and the quality of the transportation system

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- Maximize livability by addressing recurring and non-recurring congestion
- Determine vulnerable areas that impact the transportation network and target investments to mitigate
- Identify deficiencies in storm-water infrastructure related to transportation and develop mitigation strategies

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Reduction in system vulnerability
- Agency coordination to address incident-related, non-recurring congestion
- Incorporation of multimodal facilities
- Inter-agency strategies identifying stormwater issues/impacts on the transportation system


BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

ENHANCE TRAVEL AND TOURISM

National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Improve the national freight network, support rural communities' access to trade markets, and promote regional economic development.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS



GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2
Reform State Government



GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4
Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

- Increase access to jobs, goods, and services throughout emerging metros and rural Georgia.

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Improve livability and the quality of the transportation system.

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- Maximize livability by addressing recurring and non-recurring congestion
- Determine vulnerable areas that impact the transportation network and target investments to mitigate
- Identify deficiencies in storm-water infrastructure related to transportation and develop mitigation strategies

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Connections to regional tourist attractions
- Availability of multimodal transportation services targeting to visitors

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

SUPPORT ECONOMIC VITALITY

National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

Strengthen the global competitiveness and productivity of metropolitan areas and enhance the efficiency of the transportation system.



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS



GOAL #1

Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2

Reform State Government



GOAL #3

Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4

Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

Increase access to jobs, goods, and services throughout emerging metros and rural Georgia

Support strategic economic development (e.g., GRAD sites)

Facilitate broadband and other technology deployment

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Contribute to the economic vitality and quality of life supporting continued growth and development

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- Provide transportation linkages to employment, business, retail activity, and other activity centers
- To maintain accessibility in heavily traveled corridors

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Identify congestion areas by collecting travel time data
- Project cost/vehicle miles of travel
- Projects include bicycle and pedestrian facilities

BIL NATIONAL PLANNING FACTOR

EQUITY (NOT A FACTOR)



While equity is not a designated MPO Planning Factor in the BIL, it is a highlighted focus of its overall intent.

National Framework

BIL NATIONAL GOALS

N/A (Not currently a BIL National Planning Factor)



State Framework

RELEVANT GA 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP STATE GOALS

N/A



GOAL #1
Make Georgia #1 for Small Businesses



GOAL #2
Reform State Government



GOAL #3
Strengthen Rural Georgia



GOAL #4
Put Georgians first

RELEVANT IMPLICATIONS FOR SSTP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

N/A

Local Framework

C-PCTS MPO 2050 GOALS

- Integrate equity into the MTP update process and overall C-PCTS MPO Public Involvement Plan

C-PCTS MPO 2050 OBJECTIVES

- Provide significant transportation investment in historically disadvantaged communities
- Enhance transportation model options other than the private automobile in historically disadvantaged communities
- Promote TCC and CAC membership opportunities from disadvantaged communities

C-PCTS MPO 2050 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Number of TIP projects in historically disadvantaged communities
- Level of investment (\$) in TIP in historically disadvantaged communities
- Number of Complete Streets and pedestrian projects in historically disadvantaged communities
- Number of TCC and CAC members from disadvantaged communities

Development of 2050 Performance Metrics

The objectives and performance measures were amended to conform to the slight adjustment of goals as follows:



TO ADDRESS ITS IMPLEMENTATION

OBJECTIVES ADDED

- Optimize network efficiency through signalization
- Utilize technology to enhance network efficiency

PERFORMANCE MEASURES ADDED

- Projects with ITS elements
- Linear miles of ITS conduit installed



TO ADDRESS EQUITY

OBJECTIVES ADDED

- Provide significant transportation investment in historically disadvantaged communities
- Enhance transportation model options other than the private automobile in historically disadvantaged communities
- Promote TCC and CAC membership opportunities from disadvantaged communities

PERFORMANCE MEASURES ADDED

- Number of TIP projects in historically disadvantaged communities
- Level of investment (\$) in TIP in historically disadvantaged communities
- Number of Complete Streets and pedestrian projects in historically disadvantaged communities
- Number of TCC and CAC members from disadvantaged communities

Overview of National Transportation Goals and State Targets

Under the BIL, state and local plans must align with the national goals for performance management. This encompasses safety, interstate and National Highway System (NHS) pavement condition, interstate and NHS bridge condition, system reliability for passenger and freight travel, peak hour excessive delay, and reduction of polluting emissions from transportation. These performance measures (PM) are categorized into three groups, with updates according to the following schedule:

- PM1 - Safety Performance Measures:** Updated annually per the BIL to enhance road safety and reduce traffic-related fatalities.
- PM2 - Pavement and Bridge Condition on Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS Roads:** Updated every four years under the BIL, focusing on maintaining infrastructure in a state of good repair.
- PM3 - System Performance/Freight Movement/CMAQ on Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS Roads:** Updated every four years, emphasizing improving transportation system efficiency and reliability while mitigating emissions.


C-PCTS MPO can develop its own performance measures or adopt those of GDOT and ALDOT. Given the overall influence of GDOT and ALDOT roadways on the overall performance of the regional network, the C-PCTS MPO will carry forward the GDOT and ALDOT performance measures in this MTP.

PM 1: SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Under the BIL, MPOs must support or develop specific safety performance targets. C-PCTS MPO aligns with GDOT's Safety Performance Measures, now updated annually and based on a rolling five-year average under the BIL guidelines. These targets, detailed in Table 3, form the basis of a performance-based planning process, encompassing ongoing performance management and monitoring. The BIL's emphasis on safety enhancement necessitates a rigorous approach to target setting and evaluation, ensuring continued focus on reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries.

ALDOT PM1 SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES	2024 TARGET
Number of Fatalities	1,000
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT	1,400
Number of Serious Injuries	6,400
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT	9.80
Total Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	400

Figure 3.1. PM1: GDOT Safety Performance Measures




PM2: PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE CONDITION ON INTERSTATE AND NON-INTERSTATE NHS ROADS

Under BIL, the PM2 targets are dedicated to monitoring and improving pavement and bridge conditions on both interstate and non-interstate NHS roads. These targets are updated every four years, with a possibility of an interim revision at the two-year mark as shown in Table 2. These targets are integral to the performance-based planning process, ensuring sustained focus on infrastructure maintenance and improvements.

ALDOT PM2 FHWA BRIDGE AND PAVEMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES	2024 TARGET
Percentage of Interstate Pavement in Good Condition	> 50%
Percentage of Interstate Pavement in Poor Condition	< 5%
Percentage of non-Interstate NHS Pavement in Good Condition	> 25%
Percentage of non-Interstate NHS Pavement in Poor Condition	< 5%
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition by Deck Area	> 25%
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition	< 3%

Figure 3.2. PM2: GDOT Bridge and Pavement Condition Performance Measures on Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS Road




PM3: TRAVEL TIME RELIABILITY, PEAK HOUR EXCESSIVE DELAY, AND FREIGHT RELIABILITY ON INTERSTATE AND NON-INTERSTATE NHS ROADS

This set of performance measures, as mandated by the BIL, focuses on assessing travel time reliability, managing peak hour delays, and ensuring freight mobility reliability on both Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS facilities. As with PM1 and PM2, C-PCTS MPO can develop unique measures and targets or support those set by GDOT. Opting for alignment with GDOT, C-PCTS MPO supports these identified targets, revised every four years with potential interim revisions at the two-year mark. These targets, listed in Table 5, form a crucial component of the performance-based planning process under the BIL.

ALDOT PM3 FHWA SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES	2024 TARGET
Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate System that are Reliable	92%
Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled on non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable	90%
Truck Travel Time Reliability Index	1.3

Table 3.2. PM3: GDOT System Performance/Freight Movement/CMAQ (PM3) Performance and Targets



PM4: TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In 2012, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP-21, included new Transit Asset Management (TAM) provisions which were intended to improve the safety of the nation’s public transportation systems, ensure that those systems are in a state of good repair, and provide increased transparency into agencies’ budgetary decision-making process. The TAM Final Rule 49 USC 5326 became effective October 1, 2016, and required transit agencies that receive federal funds to develop Transit Asset Management Plans by October 2018. The transit asset performance measures adopted by METRA (Georgia) and PEX (Alabama) are provided to the right. Both agencies adopt the standards from their respective statewide plans.

Transit performance measures were supplied by PEX and METRA.

ALDOT PM4 FTA STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2024 TARGET

% of Rolling Stock (Revenue Vehicles) with a particular asset class meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	<p>Minivans: Reduce by 5% of current active inventory</p> <p>Vans: Reduce by 5% of current active inventory</p> <p>Cutaway Buses: Reduce by 5% of current active inventory</p> <p>Full Size Buses: Reduce by 0% of current active inventory</p>
% of Equipment (including no-revenue vehicles and equipment value over \$50k) that have meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark (ULB). Non-expendable, tangible property has a useful life of at least one that is purchased with FTA funds.	Overall reduce inventory by 10%
% of FTA-funded Facilities with condition rating below 3.0 (average) of FTA Average TERM scale.	<20% of FTA funded facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 (adequate)

METRA State of Good Repair Performance Targets

1) Rolling Stock - Percent of revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark				
Performance Measure	2024 Target (%)	2024 Performance (%)	2024 Difference	2025 Target (%)
AB - Articulated Bus		N/A		N/A
AO - Automobile	20.00			20.00
BR - Over-the-road Bus				20.00
BU - Bus	20.00	14.61	5.39	20.00
CU - Cutaway	53.00	64.62	-11.62	40.00
DB - Double Decker Bus		N/A		N/A
MV - Minivan	10.00			10.00
OR - Other		N/A		N/A
SB - School Bus				N/A
SV - Sports Utility Vehicle		N/A		N/A
VN - Van	20.00	15.38	4.62	50.00

2) Equipment - Percent of service vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark				
Performance Measure	2024 Target (%)	2024 Performance (%)	2024 Difference	2025 Target (%)
Automobiles	20.00	80.00	-60.00	50.00
Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles	20.00	17.24	2.76	50.00
Steel Wheel Vehicles		N/A		N/A

3) Facility - Percent of facilities rated below 3 on the condition scale				
Performance Measure	2024 Target (%)	2024 Performance (%)	2024 Difference	2025 Target (%)
Passenger / Parking Facilities	10.00	20.00	-10.00	10.00
Administrative / Maintenance Facilities	25.00	28.57	-3.57	25.00

PM5: TRANSIT SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In compliance with changes made by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to 49 U.S.C § 5329(d), a risk reduction program has been developed by METRA and PEX to improve safety by reducing the number and rates of accidents, injuries, and assaults on transit workers. Standards for both agencies are provided to the right.

ALDOT PM5 FTA TRANSIT SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES	2024 TARGET	
	DEMAND RESPONSE	FIXED ROUTE
Fatalities	0	0
Rate of Fatalities	0%	0%
Injuries	0	0
Rate of Injuries	0%	0%
Safety Events	0	0
Rate of Safety Events	0%	0%
Mean Distance between Major Mechanical Failure	36,524	18,332

GDOT PM5 FTA TRANSIT SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES	2024 TARGET	
	DEMAND RESPONSE	FIXED ROUTE
Accidents Involving Buses (total)	3	3
Accidents Involving Buses (per 100,000 VRM)	0.25	0.25
Assaults and Injuries to Transit Workers (total)	0	0
Assaults and Injuries to Transit Workers (per 100,000 VRM)	0%	0%

Page Intentionally Blank

04

Population and Employment

Introduction

The data of population and employment provide the lens of demographic characteristics of Columbus-Phenix City region. By analyzing trends in socioeconomic data, organizations like the Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization could examine current factors to forecast future needs.

In general, this section of the MTP utilizes a multitude of data sources. In particular, population and employment data were derived from Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs), 2020 Census data, the Georgia Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, and other resources from previous studies and documents that were conducted for the Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study MPO. The Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study MPO is interested to see how the 2020 Census will affect the region's planning in the near future, and if any significant changes do occur, they will be reflected in future documents.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Population and employment growth serves as a key indicator of transportation development. They highlight where investments in infrastructure and services are needed to accommodate rising travel demand. A larger population generally means increased traffic demand and volumes. The Columbus-Phenix City MPO region is having additional travel generations around Phenix City and areas in the southwest of Columbus. Roadways across those areas are expected to burden more traffic volumes in the future.

As can be seen by the employment growth maps, Central Columbus and Phenix City are expected to be the primary hubs of employment growth over the next 30 years. These areas show very high projected increases in employment density, indicating significant urban development and business expansion, which may lead to increased traffic volumes in rush hours in those areas.

Existing + Projected Population

EXISTING (2020)

Population data in Columbus-Phenix City were obtained at the block level from 2020 Census. The blocks were aggregated to find the TAZ's population. Group housing populations (such as nursing homes, university dorms, etc.) were excluded from the total population for each TAZ, as these populations don't share the same travel patterns as the general population. Population density by TAZ is shown in Figure 4.1 on page 50.

The central areas of Columbus and Phenix City are the most densely populated, with over seven residents per acre, suggesting urban development patterns with likely higher residential and commercial development. The rural regions around the boundaries of these cities have significantly lower population densities, characteristic of less developed or more agricultural land use.

Overall, the population distribution shows a typical urban-suburban-rural gradient, with the highest concentrations of residents in the urban core and progressively fewer residents towards the outer areas.

PROJECTED (2050)

Population projections were developed based on 2050 population data from the GSTDM and Georgia Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (OPB). GSTDM population data was used for the Alabama TAZs and OPB numbers were used for Georgia TAZs. The projected population in 2050 has similar distribution as in 2020, while the over amount of population increases. This is a modest increase and falls within the trends. Projected population distribution is shown in Figure 4.2 on page 51.

GROWTH

Areas of growth are highlighted in Figure 4.3 on page 52. Chattahoochee County doesn't have Traffic Analysis Zones, thus there are rare projected population and employment amount in that region, indicating a very low growth in the next 30 years. Population growth density is relatively low in the outskirts of the MPO region with less than 0.2 people added per acre. Phenix City has relatively high population growth, up to about four people per acre. Significant growth is projected in Phenix City and areas in the southwest of Columbus, indicating these regions will become more developed and densely populated. The map indicates that rural areas, especially those outside the MPO boundary and towards the west and north, are expected to see limited population growth.

Figure 4.1. Base Year Population by TAZ




Figure 4.2. 2050 Project Population by TAZ





Figure 4.3. Areas of Projected Population Growth (2020-2050)



Existing and Projected Employment

EXISTING (2020)

In 2020 base year, the employment is distributed along the interstate and highways, especially in the central areas of the Columbus MPO. These areas likely include commercial centers or large employers that can related to major travel attractions in morning peaks. The outskirts of the metropolitan area, particularly to the west and south, have the lowest employment densities. These employment concentrations are shown in Figure 4.4 on page 54.

PROJECTED (2050)

Project employment concentrations for the year 2050 are shown in Figure 4.5 on page 55. Workplace-based Employment data is developed based on the 2019 Georgia Statewide Travel Demand Model (GSTDM) employment data from the updated 2020/2050 GSTDM. The GSTDM uses a halo zone structure and has SE data for TAZs of relatively small sizes inside of Georgia, and SE data for TAZs of larger sizes in the state adjacent to Georgia including Alabama, so the counties covered by C-PCTS are all within the GSTDM modeling area. While the GSTDM's TAZs and C-PCTS' TAZs don't have a direct one-to-one relationship, both models'

TAZs have been updated based on the 2020 Census boundaries, so relationship could be established at Census Tract level for SE data comparison or transfer. The GSTDM's employment data was developed based on ESRI and REMI data purchased by GDOT.

GROWTH

As can be seen in Figure 4.6 on page 56, the population increases sharply in the areas around center of Phenix city, Ladonia, and Smiths Station. While margin areas of Columbus MPO show minimal growth, Phenix city and Smith Station are projected to grow significantly, especially to the center and east. This indicates an expected increase in commercial activities and potentially new business developments in these areas. The outskirts and rural areas of the metropolitan region, especially towards the west and north, are projected to have low to very low employment growth.

Figure 4.4. Base Year Employment by TAZ




Figure 4.5. 2050 Projected Employment by TAZ





Figure 4.6. Areas of Projected Employment Growth (2020-2050)



05

Justice40 Analysis


What is Justice40?

Justice40 is a federal initiative which aims to allocate 40% of the overall benefits from certain federal investments such as climate and clean energy, including sustainable transportation, to address decades of underinvestment in disadvantaged communities. This initiative is particularly relevant to the Columbus-Phenix City MPO as it highlights areas within the region that may be facing underinvestment and require targeted support. Identifying these disadvantaged areas allows for efforts to be directed toward implementing projects and allocating funding to address specific needs within these communities, thereby promoting equity and sustainability across the region.

Aligning with the Justice40 initiative, the Columbus-Phenix City MPO is committed to rectifying historical inequities, addressing gaps in transportation infrastructure and public services, and developing a sustainable transportation system that serves all citizens equitably. This focus emphasizes supporting communities that have faced historical transportation disinvestment or barriers to accessing transportation services and infrastructure, such as limited transportation options, inadequate pedestrian infrastructure, or disproportionately high rates of road incidents. These efforts aim not only to improve mobility and accessibility but also to foster healthier environments and economic opportunities for residents.

Equity in transportation is not synonymous with equality. A fair transportation plan considers the specific circumstances affecting a community's mobility and connectivity requirements. Transportation serves a critical role in enhancing social and economic opportunities by ensuring access to affordable and dependable transportation choices. Moreover, it must prioritize the needs of historically underserved populations. Mapping Justice40's disadvantaged communities and other equity indicators can inform transportation investment decisions to promote equity within the Columbus-Phenix City MPO Figure 5.2 on page 61.

Figure 5.1. Concentration of Justice40 Communities




Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Results

The Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Explorer, developed by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), is an interactive web application that complements the Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST) created by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). While the CEJST identifies disadvantaged communities, the ETC Explorer offers a deeper understanding of the transportation-related disadvantages within communities. This tool provides insights into how communities experience transportation insecurity, helping users understand how USDOT investments can address and mitigate these issues.

The ETC Explorer assesses transportation disadvantage across 85,500 census tracts using 2020 census data. This data is then normalized using min-max scaling to ensure comparability across different units of measurement, standardizing values within a range of 0 to 1. The analysis incorporates five critical components

JUSTICE40 COMPONENT	INDICATORS
 <p>Transportation Insecurity Inability to reliably, regularly, and safely access essential destinations.</p>	<p>Transportation Access, Transportation Cost Burden, and Transportation Safety</p>
 <p>Environmental Burden Measures pollution, hazardous facility exposure, water pollution, and the built environment.</p>	<p>Ozone Level, PM2.5 Level, Diesel PM Level, Air Toxics Cancer Risk, Hazardous Sites Proximity, Toxics Release Sites Proximity, Treatment & Disposal Facility Proximity, Risk Management Sites Proximity, Coal Mine Proximity, Lead Mines Proximity, Pre-1980's Housing, High Volume Road Proximity, Railways Proximity, Airports Proximity, Ports Proximity, and Impaired Surface Water</p>
 <p>Social Vulnerability Assesses socioeconomic indicators impacting quality of life.</p>	<p>200% of Poverty Line, No HS Diploma, Unemployment, House Tenure, Housing Cost Burden, Uninsured, Lack of Internet Access, Endemic Inequality, 65 or older, 17 or younger, Disability, Limited English Proficiency, and Mobile Homes</p>
 <p>Health Vulnerability Evaluates health conditions linked to pollution and lifestyle factors such as poor walkability and long commutes.</p>	<p>Asthma Prevalence, Cancer Prevalence, High Blood Pressure Prevalence, Diabetes Prevalence, and Low Mental Health Prevalence</p>
 <p>Climate and Disaster Risk Burden Reflects risks to transportation from sea level rise, precipitation changes, extreme weather, and heat</p>	<p>Anticipated Changes in Extreme Weather (Future Extreme Weather Risks), Annualized Disaster Losses (Annualized Losses Due to Hazards), and Impervious Surfaces (from Land Cover)</p>

Figure 5.2. USDOT ETC Explorer Results for Transportation Insecurity in the Columbus-Phenix City MPO



Each component's score is derived from the sum of ranked, normalized indicators, resulting in composite scores. Census tracts are then percentile-ranked on both national and statewide levels. Tracts ranking at the 65th percentile or higher are classified as disadvantaged. Notably, the Transportation Insecurity component is given

double weight in the overall score calculation, highlighting its importance based on extensive feedback and sensitivity analyses.

This comprehensive methodology provides valuable insights into the cumulative impacts experienced by communities. By examining these combined

effects, the USDOT can pinpoint communities with the highest burdens, guiding targeted funding and project implementation to effectively address and mitigate transportation disadvantage. Figure X.2 shows the ETC Explorer results for Transportation Insecurity in the Columbus-Phenix City MPO.

Traditionally Underserved Populations


Understanding and addressing the needs of traditionally underserved populations is crucial for promoting equity and sustainability within the Columbus-Phenix City MPO region. These populations often face significant barriers to accessing transportation and other essential services, perpetuating cycles of poverty and limiting economic opportunities. Traditionally underserved populations include, but are not limited to, racial and ethnic minorities, low-income households, people with disabilities, elderly individuals, and households without a vehicle. Demographic Analyses were completed using geospatial methods to visualize the geographic distribution of underserved populations in relation to Justice40 areas.

POVERTY

Each year, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) establishes a poverty threshold for the country, which varies based on household size. For 2022, the federal poverty income threshold was set at \$23,030 for a household of three people. According to data from the 2022 American Community Survey (ACS), there are significant concentrations of poverty within the region. Households in poverty are distributed throughout the MPO region, with higher

concentrations observed in denser, more urban areas. **Notable clusters are found in Columbus and Phenix City (between US 280 and I-185 and north of US 431), where more than half of the population in certain block groups lives in poverty.** These areas are also designated as Justice40 disadvantaged communities. Figure 5.3 illustrates the concentrations of households in poverty within the Columbus-Phenix City MPO.

Figure 5.3. Concentrations of Households in Poverty



RACE

Populations of minority residents are **concentrated in Columbus and Phenix City areas, in and around the vicinity of I-185, US 280, US 431, and SR 85.**

Figure 5.4 on page 65 shows concentrations of populations of minority residents. Minority populations are defined as all persons who self-identify as Hispanic or non-white, including Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.

LANGUAGE

As shown in Figure 5.5 on page 66, the map reveals that there are relatively few areas with high concentrations of non-English speaking residents within the region. **Most of the region, represented by light blue areas (0% - 1%), has very low concentrations of residents with limited English proficiency. Only a few pockets, primarily in and around the central urban area of Columbus, as well as Phenix City and Ladonia, show moderate**

to high concentrations of non-English speaking residents, indicated by medium to dark blue areas (5% - 17%).

Additionally, the overlap between these higher concentration areas and the Justice40 Communities (marked with red hatching) suggests a compounded need for investment and support in these regions. Recognizing the limited number of these areas can help in directing focused resources and initiatives to ensure that residents with limited English proficiency receive the necessary support to access equitable opportunities and community resources.

VEHICLE ACCESS

As is shown in Figure 5.6 on page 67, the areas with highest percent of zero-car households include the **block groups between US 280 and I-185 and south of US 431**, which also has high concentrations of households below the poverty income threshold.

EDUCATION

Figure 5.7 on page 68 illustrates concentrations of residents whose educational attainment does not exceed a high school diploma. It shows that block groups with the highest concentrations of such populations are situated **in or near Columbus and Phenix City, specifically between US 280 and I-185.** These areas also demonstrate high concentrations of households living below the poverty income threshold and households lacking access to a vehicle.

AGE

The population aged 65 or older is distributed across the Columbus-Phenix City MPO. However, spatial analysis reveals notable **concentrations in Piney Grove, Smiths Station, Ladonia, and Columbus.** Additionally, high concentrations of individuals in this age group are observed in Cusseta as well as the northwestern part of the region. Figure 5.8 on page 69

illustrates the concentration of the 65-and-older population specifically in the Columbus region.

DISABILITY

Block groups with disabled populations can be found throughout the MPO region, as is shown in Figure 5.9 on page 70. The concentration of disabled residents **closely aligns with the concentration of the 65-and-older population.**

Figure 5.4. Concentrations of Non-White Residents




Figure 5.5. Concentrations of Non-English-Speaking Residents




Figure 5.6. Concentrations of Households which Lack Access to a Vehicle




Figure 5.7. Concentrations of Residents without a College Education




Figure 5.8. Concentrations of Residents Aged 65 or Older





Figure 5.9. Concentrations of Disabled Residents



Major Findings and Implications for Transportation Needs

The analysis of traditionally underserved populations within the Columbus-Phenix City Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) region reveals critical insights that inform transportation planning and equity initiatives. The Columbus-Phenix City Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) region exhibits notable disparities in transportation access and equity among traditionally underserved populations. **Areas with high concentrations of households below the poverty income threshold, particularly in Columbus and Phenix City, face significant challenges related to economic mobility and access to essential services. These disparities are compounded by limited vehicle ownership, which restricts residents' ability to commute to work, access healthcare, and participate fully in community life.** Addressing these transportation barriers through targeted investments in infrastructure is essential for fostering economic opportunity and social inclusion.

Furthermore, the concentration of minority populations, including Hispanic and non-white residents, highlights the need for transportation planning that considers their unique mobility needs and challenges. Concurrently, **areas with higher concentrations of non-English speaking residents necessitate language-accessible services and outreach efforts to ensure equitable access to transportation resources.** Addressing these disparities requires targeted efforts to improve language access and culturally competent services.

Tailoring transportation initiatives to meet the needs of elderly residents and individuals with limited educational attainment, who are also concentrated in certain neighborhoods, is critical. By prioritizing accessibility and inclusivity in transportation planning, the MPO can enhance mobility options, promote community connectivity, and improve overall quality of life for all residents across the region.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Addressing the needs of traditionally underserved populations within the Columbus-Phenix City MPO region requires a multifaceted approach:

- **Targeted Investment:** Directing resources towards improving transportation access in Justice40 communities and areas with high poverty rates and vehicle ownership challenges.
- **Enhanced Outreach and Support:** Implementing language-accessible services and outreach programs to better serve non-English speaking residents.
- **Accessibility Initiatives:** Prioritizing infrastructure improvements and services that enhance mobility for elderly and disabled populations.
- **Education and Workforce Development:** Supporting educational initiatives and workforce training programs to uplift communities with lower educational attainment levels.

By integrating these findings into transportation planning efforts, the MPO can foster more equitable access to transportation resources, thereby enhancing quality of life, economic opportunities, and community resilience for all residents.

Page Intentionally Blank

06

Land Use and Development

Introduction

Land use and development drive traffic patterns and infrastructure needs. Examining the relationship between land use and transportation allows for more efficient, sustainable, and integrated transportation systems. This chapter explores the land uses that are relevant to this transportation plan based on the implications of each use on the City of Columbus' transportation network. This component of the plan:

1. Identifies transportation planning and development priorities.
2. Establishes a framework to align the City's planning vision and transportation needs.
3. Determines transportation infrastructure needs based on demand and land use.

HOW DO DIFFERENT LAND USES INFLUENCE TRANSPORTATION?



RESIDENTIAL

Residential land use areas typically cause more significant commuter traffic in response to their different densities and transportation options. High density residential areas tend to have a greater propensity for transit and active transportation such as walking or cycling. However, lower density residential areas rely more on auto-travel for commuting which can cause an increase in traffic congestion. With higher density residential areas having more access to transit and active transportation networks, the reliance on private cars is not as high as lower density residential areas.



COMMERCIAL/RETAIL

Due to commercial areas being a hub for retail, dining, and services, there is usually more traffic during the daytime, weekends, and holidays. There are also moderate freight demands in retail areas that receive deliveries throughout the day causing more cargo trains and trucks to travel alongside. Businesses in commercial areas typically cater to a diverse customer base which further increases traffic volumes as people travel to these areas to access their goods and services. Furthermore, commercial trips tend to attract shorter trips that generate more traffic in retail areas.



OFFICE

Office land use areas are catalysts for activating traffic hour trips and congestion, primarily due to concentrated travel demand during common work hours of the day. The high concentration of office workers commuting to and from work in these areas creates significant traffic volumes, particularly during morning and evening rush hours. To address these challenges, there is a growing demand for efficient transportation alternatives and transit options such as carpooling, cycling lanes, and pedestrian pathways. Office areas often serve as focal points for the development of nearby services such as retail stores, restaurants, and recreation which can feedback even more traffic.



INDUSTRIAL

Industrial land use holds a significant influence on transportation networks by generating high demands for freight traffic and workforce access. Since industrial areas are hubs for manufacturing, distribution, and logistics activities, there is a need for regular shipments of raw materials and finished goods through cargo trucks. Much of this traffic is associated with industrial lands that are serving as access points around highways and major roads leading to industrial facilities. This concentration of traffic flow can impact intersections and local roads with more congestion and potential damage to infrastructure. Furthermore, industrial areas require efficient access for employees, which can further heighten the amount of traffic in zones leading to these facilities, especially during peak working hours.



INSTITUTIONAL

Institutional land use areas including schools, hospitals, government offices, and parks significantly impact transportation dynamics due to their concentrated daily activities and events. These areas experience high levels of pedestrian, vehicular, and emergency vehicle traffic, especially during peak hours when students arrive and leave school or when hospital staff change shifts. Therefore, these institutions' demands impact traffic patterns and increase the demand for parking. There is, therefore, a critical need for additional consideration and specialized traffic calming management to manage flow and ensure safety around these areas. These may include designated drop-off zones, improved pedestrian crossings, and enhanced public transport access to reduce the reliance on private vehicles.

FORT MOORE

Fort Moore spans across Muscogee and Chattahoochee counties and extends into Russell County, Alabama. Situated adjacent to the city of Columbus, Fort Moore significantly impacts the local economy and community. As a major U.S. Army installation, it provides numerous employment opportunities and contributes to the area's economic stability. The fort collaborates closely with Columbus on various initiatives, including infrastructure projects, community development, and support services for military families, fostering a strong and mutually beneficial relationship between the installation and the region.

Columbus-Muscogee County

As a consolidated City-County, the City of Columbus and Muscogee County share the same boundary. The section describes the future land use distribution for this area.



RESIDENTIAL

The City of Columbus is the second most populous city in the state of Georgia, with over 200,000 total residents. The residential uses in Columbus are rural, single-family, multi-family, and mixed-use. As indicated in the future land use map, the city is composed of mainly residential land uses which indicates a greater reliance on auto travel. Future policies for residential zoning should encourage infill and higher density development in appropriate areas to alleviate automobile dependency.



COMMERCIAL/RETAIL

Commercial and retail hubs are concentrated throughout Columbus. Commercial properties are concentrated along the I-185 corridor with other pockets throughout the city. The major highway corridor provides good driving access to those commercial destinations along I-185, but they are more challenging to access by other modes (walking, biking, and transit). For the commercial/retail spaces throughout the city, integrating commercial and residential spaces through mixed-use development would significantly reduce auto travel by enhancing convenience and accessibility to retail spaces.



OFFICE

Offices are concentrated in West Columbus with major predominance bordering Phenix City. The arterial roads leading to West Columbus are more likely to experience peak hour congestion due to commuter traffic on weekdays.



INDUSTRIAL


Industrial land has a major presence in the City of Columbus to support the City's logistics, manufacturing, and distribution networks. The light manufacturing and heavy manufacturing land uses are concentrated on the outskirts of Columbus and along I-185, SR 85, SR 22, and US 280. This indicates a higher occurrence of commuter related traffic during peak hours for individuals that commute into Columbus from the surrounding communities.



PUBLIC/ INSTITUTIONAL

Columbus has a large presence of public and institutional land with many grade level schools and three higher education institutions. The institutional land use that is concentrated in East Columbus belongs to Columbus State University which indicates a higher occurrence of traffic during peak seasons such as football season and the academic school year. The other institutions, such as grade schools, also indicate high levels of traffic during the academic school year and peak hours during the day.

Figure 6.1. Future Land Uses for Columbus-Muscogee County, Harris County



Chattahoochee County



RESIDENTIAL

Chattahoochee County has been experiencing a steady decline in residential population with 8,661 total residents. Chattahoochee's residents currently are mainly within single-family neighborhoods, with some in duplex, and multi-family units. Residential land represents about 12% of the County. The main clusters of residences are: southwest of downtown Cusseta, to the west of US 27; just east of downtown Cusseta, around Gordy Mill Pond Road, SR 137 (Broad Street), and Manta Road; and in the northeast corner of the County along SR 26 (Clarke Duncan Hwy). There are also large swaths of rural residential land use across the county, which tend to have much larger lots and lower densities compared to traditional suburban residential development, therefore generating fewer overall trips.



COMMERCIAL/ RETAIL

Commercial land use in Chattahoochee County is for non-industrial businesses including retail, office, service, and entertainment facilities with the uses being located in one building as a single use or grouped together in shopping centers/office buildings. In order to help the revenue base, the number of commercial uses need to increase as it is only sitting at 0.17% of Chattahoochee's land use. Since there is ample vacant land available for use along US 27, SR 520/SR 280, and SR 26, it can be reserved for commercial growth.



OFFICE

Office is not designated as its own land use in the Chattahoochee County future land use map. It is included as part of the commercial land use.



INDUSTRIAL

There is not much industrial land use in Chattahoochee with it taking up only 0.2% of the total acreage. The number of industrial uses need to increase to help the revenue base as well. Similar to commercial land use, ample vacant land along US 27, SR 520/280, and SR 26 should be reserved for industrial growth.



INSTITUTIONAL

Chattahoochee has a small percentage of its land used for public and institutional use including parks, recreation, a town center, and schools including schools from the Chattahoochee County District schools. To increase this land use, the county should ensure proper management of developed and undeveloped land near Broad Street to Town Center and the King Street intersection. This will provide an effort to improve the usability of the area by improving traffic flow, landscaping, signage, facades, parking, and connectivity. Given the amount of natural resources and land dedicated to natural areas, there will be more protection of park/recreational/conservation land use including State, Federal, and local parks, conservation areas, protected open space, and other significant preserves.

Harris County

Refer to Figure 6.1 for the map showing future land use planned for the portion of Harris County that is within the MPO boundary.



RESIDENTIAL

Harris County has experienced a large population growth since 1990 and is still increasing at a rapid rate with 34,943 residents in 2018 and estimate of 40,492 residents by 2030. The county is positioned northwest of Columbus and sits along I-185. The land use in the portion of Harris County within the MPO is primarily residential. The residential land use is compiled into two categories: rural residential and established residence. It is mainly rural residential, with some pockets of established residential.



COMMERCIAL/ RETAIL

There are no commercial or retail land uses in this portion of Harris County, meaning residents must travel elsewhere to access the aforementioned destinations.



OFFICE

There are no office land uses in this portion of Harris County, which means residents with office jobs are commuting during peak hours and weekdays.



INDUSTRIAL

There is a large industrial area concentrated along I-185, providing good commercial vehicle access to the interstate. There is also some industrial land off of US 27 on the very northern edge of the MPO.



INSTITUTIONAL

There is very minimal institutional and public land in Harris County within the MPO boundary.

Phenix City



RESIDENTIAL


There is a mix between low, medium and high residential density future land uses in Phenix City. High density residential areas are earmarked to be within one-quarter mile of activity centers and commercial corridors, such as US 431, US 80, and US 280. These developments serve as transitional corridors between other land uses and residential areas. Single-family residential areas are positioned outside of commercial/retail and institutional land uses. However, there is an increase in population in Phenix City, so there is a need to increase the high density infill and redevelopment. Therefore, it is necessary to create a stronger sense of place and cohesiveness between the land uses and buildings that are placed closer together in order to cultivate a walkable environment with less traffic.



COMMERCIAL/RETAIL

There are many commercial and mixed-use environments near the highways and major roads including commercial activity centers and mixed-use activity centers. These areas are concentrated in the city's downtown area, and along major state roads (US 431, US 80, and US 280). The property along US 280 is designated as Highway Commercial / Mixed Use. The downtown commercial areas accommodate multimodal trips, while the state roads are very auto-oriented.

Figure 6.2. Phenix City Land Use Plan





OFFICE

There are a variety of land uses in Phenix City that can accommodate office spaces. These include mixed use, downtown mixed use and highway/commercial mixed use. These areas are positioned throughout the city to neighbor US 280 and other industrial land uses such as light and general industrial land use. There are also additional offices that uses neighboring institutional land.



INDUSTRIAL

Industrial land use is divided into two subcategories: Light Industry and General Industry. The land uses are positioned to the south of downtown along the river, Downing Drive and Brickyard Road. These sites have transportation access to the highway, rail and river. They are both positioned on the southern end of Phenix City away from residential areas. Light industry encompasses warehousing and distribution, research and technology, and large commercial facilities. General industry includes both light and heavy facilities that require more land. These facilities are positioned away from residential areas to minimize their impact on residential areas and quality of life.



INSTITUTIONAL

Institutional land use is comprised of government facilities, schools, medical facilities, community service, and places of assembly and worship. Institutional facilities such as grade schools are located near residential areas. Institutional facilities are encouraged to reflect the development of the areas they are located in. These facilities are generally appropriate to neighbor most of the other land uses.

Russell County, Lee County, and Smiths Station

Unlike Georgia, the state of Alabama does not mandate its communities to adopt Comprehensive Plans or develop future land use maps. Therefore, the land use analysis is based on existing land use and development patterns.

RUSSELL COUNTY

Russell County is home to Phenix City, which is where the majority of its development and population is. The land in unincorporated Russell County is primarily used for residences and agriculture. There are large tracts and clusters of undeveloped, agricultural, and low-density residential land towards the edge of the MPO boundary, particularly southeast of US 280, between US 80 and US 431. The largest concentration of commercial development is along US 280, with major retail, hotels, and auto-oriented businesses. There are nodes of commercial development along US 80, which also serves as the main connector for neighborhoods in Ladonia. There is a large swath of single-family residential area south of US 80, along Woodland Drive. There are also large neighborhoods off of S Seale Rd, US 431, and Sandford Rd.

LEE COUNTY & SMITHS STATION

Lee County is home to Smiths Station, which is a small community located along US 280 on the eastern corridor of the county. The land in Smiths Station is primarily composed of commercial and residential land with variances in residential density. Residential development is the most prominent land use in Smiths Station. There are several large subdivision developments that connect to US 280 and Lee Road 240 (Railroad Avenue). There is one higher density development situated along Lee Road 240 and the rest of the arterial road is used for restaurants and education facilities. Commercial development is concentrated on either side of Lee Road 240 (Railroad Avenue) and US 280 which are the main arterial roads in Smiths Station. US 280 is positioned in between residential and commercial development, including a major gas station, a medical facility, and multiple places of assembly and worship.

07

Roadway Network Characteristics

Introduction

This section provides a comprehensive inventory of the current transportation infrastructure, including details on roadway classifications, bridge conditions, network conditions, and travel trends. This evaluation identifies existing bottlenecks, areas of congestion, and other issues that impact traffic flow and safety. These insights ensure the region can continue to provide safe, efficient, and well-maintained assets critical to the region's economic vitality and quality of life.

Roads and bridges comprise the most fundamental elements of the region's transportation infrastructure. Even with significant investments in alternative modes by the year 2045, automobiles, trucks, and other highway-related modes will still constitute the core of all transportation facilities. The Columbus MPO roadway network characteristics recorded in this chapter are functional classification, number of travel lanes, and Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT).

Functional Classification

A roadway's Functional Classification (FC) provides information about the intended character by identifying the types of functions it designed to serve and the traffic volumes it can support. In consultation with the C-PCTS MPO, the Georgia Department of Transportation updates the road classifications as least every ten years.



Interstate Highways are high-capacity, high-speed roads designed for long-distance travel, with limited access points and no at-grade intersections,



Principal Arterials are major roads that facilitate high traffic volumes and connect key areas of a city with regional and interstate networks.



Minor Arterials provide essential links between neighborhoods and principal arterials, supporting moderate traffic volumes and balancing access with mobility.



Major Collectors gather traffic from local roads and direct it to arterial roads, managing moderate volumes and offering a mix of property access and mobility.




Minor Collectors connect local streets to major collectors, serving lower traffic volumes and providing access within neighborhoods and to smaller commercial zones.



Local Roads primarily serve residential and small commercial areas, focusing on providing access to individual properties and supporting local pedestrian and vehicular movement.

C-PCTS MPO benefits from the presence of I-185 and other 6-lane arterials, which greatly enhance regional connectivity and accessibility. This robust arterial roadway network not only facilitates the freight movements and commuting travels within the region but also supports commercial activities and opportunities such as distribution centers and logistics hubs.

Figure 7.1. Roadway Functional Classification



Number of Lanes

The number of lanes on a roadway is also a key feature of the MPO network, directly impacting the capacity of a roadway. The map below depicts the number of bi-directional through lanes on C-PCTS MPO roadways. These lanes allow vehicles to travel in both directions along the same stretch of road, typically separated by a centerline or median. As shown in Figure 7.2 on page 87, most roadways in the Columbus MPO region have two or three through lanes. Roads with more than four lanes are mainly interstate and major arterials. Further analysis reveals that roadways with only one through lane are mainly entry and exit ramps on highways.


ROADWAYS WITH 5+ LANES

ROADWAYS WITH 5+ LANES	
GEORGIA	I-185
	US 280 (Victory Drive)
	US 80
	US 27 (Veterans Parkway)
	US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway)
	SR 22 (Wynnton Road)
	Airport Thruway
	Buena Vista Road
	13th Street
	Talbotton Road
	Woodruff Road
ALABAMA	Whittlesey Boulevard
	University Avenue
	Miller Road
	US 80
	US 280
	US 431 (Martin Luther King Jr Parkway)
	SR 165
	Broad Street/Broad Street Extension
Summerville Road @ US 80	
13th Street/14th Street/Crawford Road	

Grade Separated Roadways

Grade separation utilizes a bridge or tunnel to separate traffic flows and increase roadway safety. Separated roadways existing throughout the region along or near the largest roadways, including I-185 and portions of US 80 and US 280 in both Columbus-Muscogee County and Alabama. Grade separated roadways can also be found near the Norfolk Southern railyard in Columbus, such as SR 22 (13th Street) and 11th Street,

Figure 7.2. Number of Lanes




Vehicular Volumes

Traffic volumes along a roadway section provide context for regional and subregional travel patterns. Roads with higher volumes indicate they are expected to burden greater travel demands, and maintaining sufficient operations on these roads is vital to the health of the transportation network in an area. Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes in the city provide a clear measure of traffic on different road segments, helping MPOs understand current travel demand. AADT data is crucial for assessing whether existing infrastructure can accommodate current and future traffic volumes, guiding in the planning of road widening, new road construction, or other capacity enhancements.

The roadway traffic volumes presented below are derived from two sources: ALDOT and GDOT. The distribution of vehicular volume corresponds with roadway classifications and number of lanes. Higher traffic volumes are observed on major arterials and highways, which feature advanced traffic management systems and controlled access points to ensure efficient traffic flow and safety. AADT data for the Columbus-Phenix City region is shown in Figure 7.3 on page 89.

Figure 7.3. Vehicular Volumes



Traffic Signals

Traffic signals are an effective intersection control method to accommodate high volume locations with a large interchange of traffic. Traffic signals also require routine maintenance and can be retimed and/or coordinated to improve operations within an area. There are 270 signals in the Columbus-Muscogee County, all of which are operated by Columbus Consolidated Government. All traffic signals within the City of Columbus are presented in Figure 7.4 on page 91. Traffic signals are primarily located within the midtown area and along major commercial corridors entering and exiting the midtown area. These roadways include SR 22 (Wynnton Rd), US 27 (Veterans Parkway), and US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway).

Information on signalized intersections was not available for Alabama, but signals are present on major corridors such as US 280, US 80, 14th Street, and Broad Street.


Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and transportation technology enable infrastructure and vehicles

to communicate with each other and with central repositories such as traffic management centers, thereby achieving greater efficiency. In recent years, ITS and transportation technology have rapidly evolved into real-time data-driven systems, significantly advancing transportation safety and mobility. The transportation industry increasingly finds that addressing safety, capacity, and other modern transportation challenges can be effectively achieved by incorporating select ITS and transportation technologies.

Various ITS solutions, such as intelligent infrastructure, offer numerous benefits. For instance, they can reduce crashes through advanced driver warnings via Variable Message Signs (VMS), enhance mobility through smart or coordinated signal corridors, and reduce emissions by minimizing vehicle idling times.



Figure 7.4. Signalized Intersections



Network Performance

LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

Volume-to-capacity ratio is a key tool for identifying roadway segments that are operating at a deficient level of service. Level of Service (LOS) designations are letter grades “A” through “F”, which are similar to report card grades. As demonstrated in Figure 7.5, level of service “A” is considered the best and a free flow condition, with grades “E” and “F” indicating unsatisfactory operations. While “A” is the best level of service, transportation infrastructure investments are expensive and funding resources are constrained, which makes achieving LOS “A” on all facilities in a transportation network infeasible. Generally, an acceptable LOS is defined as “D” or better for urbanized areas.

LOS and delay are calculated for the average of all intersection approaches for traffic signal, roundabout, and all way stop control while for minor street stop control the metrics are determined by the single approach leg with the highest delay. Locations experiencing LOS E or F under existing conditions are identified as high priority locations for operational and capacity improvement projects.

A daily Level of Service is calculated by the daily traffic on a facility derived from the model and dividing that number by the daily capacity of the roadway. A daily Level of Service of less than 0.7 indicates that the roadways are operating at LOS C or better. LOS D has an operational value between 0.7 and 0.85; LOS E between 0.85 and 1.0 and LOS F is greater than 1.





Figure 7.5. Level of Service Grades
(Source: Transportation for America)

EXISTING CONGESTION

Existing congestion levels for 2020 were derived from the travel demand model developed by the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT). Figure 7.6 on page 94 shows the 2020 LOS throughout the MPO. The majority of roadways operate at LOS C or better, providing acceptable traffic conditions.

		
COLUMBUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Segments of I-185 ▪ SR 22 (Macon Road) ▪ SR 219 (River Road) ▪ Buena Vista Road ▪ Farr Road ▪ Flat Rock Road ▪ Warm Springs Road ▪ Moon Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I-185 between US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) and SR 22 (Macon Road) ▪ Segments of US 80 (Joe Allen Parkway) ▪ Bridge crossings between Columbus and Phenix City ▪ Areas at or near I-185 Interchanges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » US 280 (Victory Drive) » SR 22 (Macon Road) » Buena Vista Road » Forrest Road » St. Mary's Road » Airport Thruway
PHENIX CITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US 80 west of US 280 ▪ US 431 south of US 280 ▪ Opelika Road ▪ Summerville Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US 280 entering Smiths Station ▪ Near the intersections of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US 80 and US 280 ▪ US 280 and US 431

Figure 7.6. 2020 Level of Service



PROJECTED (2050) CONGESTION

Projected levels of congestion were also derived from the GDOT travel demand model. Projected volumes are based on projected population and employment totals derived from various sources including local plans, Woods and Poole, and REMI. That said, it should be noted that these projected totals may not occur at the level included in the travel demand model. It is for that reason that these projections are re-evaluated every five years to continually provide an accurate forecasting process. The projected LOS, shown in Figure 8, illustrates the network performance expected in 2050.

Many roadways in Columbus-Muscogee County show more deficiencies in 2050 LOS than in 2020. In addition to the currently congested roadways, the following roadways are anticipated to operate in congested conditions in 2050:

- 13th Street
- 54th Street
- SR 22 (Wynnton Road)
- Edgewood Road
- Miller Road


Given the high number of projected growth, the most significant deficiencies are projected in Russell and Lee counties. In fact, most of the arterial network is projected to operate at LOS F or LOS E. All of the currently congested roadways are projected to operate under more congested conditions. In addition, these roadways are projected to operate at congested conditions in 2050:

- Riverchase Road
- 13th Street
- 14th Street
- Crawford Road
- 5th Avenue
- Broad Street
- Railroad Street
- Sandfort Road
- Seale Road
- Brickyard Road

It should be noted that local officials in the Alabama communities within the C-PCTS MPO have expressed that the growth projected in the travel demand model is far more than they anticipate locally.

In order to mitigate the existing and projected congestion throughout the region, a universe of projects has been identified and is provided in Chapter 14 of this MTP. These projects are also prioritized and, based on cost estimates, programmed in the MTP work program through 2050.

Figure 7.7. 2050 Level of Service



2050 LOS (E+C)

- C or Better
- D
- E
- F
- MPO Boundary
- - - County Boundary
- ▭ State Boundary
- ▭ Municipality

0 2.5 5 7.5 10 Miles




EXISTING CONGESTION AND BOTTLENECKS: TRAVEL TIME INDEX (TTI)

Travel Time Index (TTI) is a measure of congestion that is easier to comprehend than traditional measures such as Level of Service (LOS) or total delay which is also included below. TTI is the ratio of the average travel time during the peak period to the time required to make the same trip at free-flow speeds. For example, if the TTI is 2.0, a 20-minute trip at free flow speeds would take 40 minutes during the peak period.

Quarter-hourly speed data from Replica were used to calculate TTI. Replica's speed data set is vehicle probe-based travel time data set (meaning it uses GPS data from phones in cars to identify vehicle location) acquired by Replica from a variety of sources. Locations along major roads with peak hour TTI greater than two can be considered to be bottlenecks. In addition, other locations with TTI lower than 2 still experience some degree of congestion and are candidates for potential projects.

Figure 7.8. Max Travel Time Index (Source: Replica)



Travel Patterns and Trends

AM PEAK

The highest density of AM peak hour trip origins is concentrated in the urban centers, particularly in Columbus. Compared to Alabama State, regions in Georgia generate more trips per square mile during AM rush hours, especially the communities on both sides of I-85 and US 27. **The destinations in those periods are concentrated in the center of Columbus with a distinctly higher trip density, reflecting its role as a major employment and activity center.** The high-density areas (Columbus and parts of Phenix City) require robust transportation infrastructure to handle the high volume of morning peak hour trips. This includes efficient public transit systems, road maintenance, and even expansion to reduce congestion. Alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling are also supposed to be potential solutions for midtown areas.

PM PEAK

In PM peak hours, trip origins are located quite the same as the AM peak due to consistent commuter patterns and land use distribution. Similarly, the destinations also align with the AM peak origins where are most likely residential areas.

While traffic is often located in the same areas across the region, trips during PM peak hours show less traffic in some locations. This can be seen in Phenix City along Knowles Road and Opelika Road. Traffic in Columbus-Muscogee County is lower along Lynch Rd between US 80 (Macon Road) and US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) and along 39th Street during PM peak hours than AM peak hours. Many of these slight differences can be seen around schools, potentially due to more variation in PM pickup times than AM drop off times.

Figure 7.10. AM Peak Hour Trip Origins (Source: Replica, 2023)




Figure 7.11. AM Peak Hour Trip Destinations (Source: Replica, 2023)




Figure 7.12. PM Peak Hour Trip Origins (Source: Replica, 2023)





Figure 7.13. AM Peak Hour Trip Destinations (Source: Replica, 2023)



Page Intentionally Blank

08

Safety

Highlights of Safety Needs

Understanding the location and characteristics of crashes is key to identifying areas where investments in safety improvements can provide significant benefits to the transportation system and users. Needs identified in the safety analysis are highlighted below:

ARTERIAL ROADWAYS

Arterial roadways often exhibit a high number of crashes in the Columbus-Phenix City region. These roadways often have 3 or more lanes with frequent turning movements, as well as high traffic volumes and high speeds. Additionally, freight routes utilize many arterial roadways, leading to a large amount of commercial vehicle traffic. Safety investments along these roads can have a major impact on the corridors where a large number of crashes are occurring, as well as many fatal and serious injury crashes.



PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS

Pedestrians and bicyclists are disproportionately affected by fatal or serious injury crashes. Safety improvements can be made to reduce crashes involving these vulnerable roadway users, particularly in urban areas where pedestrian and bicycle activity is highest and along major roadways where high vehicular volumes and speeds create dangerous conditions for active transportation users.





Figure 8.1. Crash History vs Urban Areas




URBAN AREAS

The majority of crashes occur in urban areas, likely due to the high traffic volumes and dense residential and commercial land uses. Safety improvements in these areas can have major impacts on the safety of the transportation network by benefitting a large number of users and their ability to safely access daily destinations in Columbus and Phenix City.

Auto Crash Density

- More Crashes
- Fewer Crashes
- Urban Areas



This section describes the safety analysis that was conducted using GDOT Numetric crash data from 2018–2022. The analysis focused on crashes involving automobiles, pedestrians, bicycles, and commercial vehicles to provide a deeper understanding of the location and characteristics of crash occurrences. In addition, fatal and serious injury crashes, known as KSI crashes, were highlighted to provide insight into where these dangerous crashes are occurring. This analysis provides insight into important areas of investment to reduce the number of crashes and KSI crashes.

Auto Crashes

Between 2018–2022 there were 48,823 total crashes across the Columbus-Phenix City MPO. The density of auto crashes is concentrated in areas like Downtown Columbus, particularly along busy roadways like 13th Street. Crashes are also concentrated along I-185 near intersections with other major roadways and along US 280 near the intersection of US 80.

Fatal and serious injury crashes occurred across the MPO, with the greatest number of these crashes on major roadways such as US 280, US 80, and US 431 in Alabama and along US 27 (Veterans Parkway), I-185, and US 80/SR 22 (Macon Road) in Georgia. These are roadways with high traffic volumes and traffic speeds present on these roadways.




Figure 8.2. Auto Crashes by Severity





Figure 8.3. Auto Crashes by Functional Class

Figure 8.4. Auto Crashes, 2018-2022



Pedestrian-Involved Crashes

Pedestrian safety is paramount for regional transportation planning as it ensures the protection and well-being of all residents, promotes equitable access to transportation options, and encourages sustainable urban development. Prioritizing safe and accessible walking environments helps reduce traffic fatalities and injuries, fostering a healthier and more active community. Dangerous walking conditions disproportionately impact people who do not have access to a vehicle or are unable to drive.

There were 380 crashes involving pedestrians in the Columbus-Phenix City MPO between 2018–2022. These crashes are concentrated throughout Downtown Columbus and Downtown Phenix City. Urban areas typically have higher pedestrian traffic volumes because of land use patterns. Coupled with high vehicular traffic volumes, these dense areas often see higher density of pedestrian-involved crashes than rural areas. Crash density is highest in the northern

portion of Downtown Columbus, which contains the densest commercial area of the MPO. Other hotspots for pedestrian-involved crashes exist further north along Hamilton Road and SR 85 (Manchester Expressway), to the east of Downtown along SR 22 (Wynnton Road), and south along Victory Drive. These are relatively large roads, with high speeds and high traffic volumes, creating dangerous conditions for pedestrians.

Of these pedestrian-involved crashes, 46 resulted in a fatality and 66 crashes resulted in a serious injury. These crashes across the region, with high occurrences along Victory Dr, Veterans Pkwy, and Buena Vista Rd. Some fatal and serious injury crashes also occurred to the north of Phenix City and Columbus in more rural areas. These areas may have less pedestrian activity, but they can be dangerous for pedestrians as there is typically no dedicated pedestrian infrastructure and roads often carry high speed traffic.





Figure 8.5. *Pedestrian-Involved Crashes by Severity*

Figure 8.6. Pedestrian-Involved Crashes



Bicycle-Involved Crashes

While biking trips represent a small portion of all trips in the region, bicycle safety is essential in regional transportation planning to protect residents, provide fair access to transportation, and foster sustainable urban development. Creating secure and accessible cycling paths can significantly lower traffic injuries and fatalities, encouraging a healthier and more active community. Poor cycling conditions particularly disadvantage those who depend on bicycles as their main transportation mode or cannot afford other options. Moreover, investing in cycling infrastructure supports environmental goals by reducing motor vehicle dependency and cutting down carbon emissions.

There were 180 crashes involving a bicyclist in the Columbus-Phenix City MPO between 2018-2022. The density of bicycle-involved crashes is concentrated in Columbus and Phenix City, where there is typically the most bicycling activity. Other high density areas include

SR 22 (Wynnton Rd) and US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) from 2nd Avenue to I-185. See Figure 8.8 for additional crash hotspots. Bicycle-involved crashes may not be occurring in areas without existing bicycle facilities because people may not be frequently traveling by bicycle.

There were four fatal crashes and 13 serious injury crashes involving a bicyclist within this time period. The location of these crashes were spread across the MPO.





Figure 8.7. *Bicycle-Involved Crashes by Severity*

Figure 8.8. Bicycle-Involved Crashes



Commercial Vehicle Crashes

There were 2,223 commercial vehicle crashes from 2018-2022. Similar to auto crashes, crashes involving commercial vehicles and large trucks are concentrated in Downtown Columbus and along or at the intersections of major roadways. Areas with particularly high concentrations of commercial vehicle crashes are US-280 at the intersections of US-80 and along US-80 at the intersection with US-27. As truck routes are typically centered along these types of major roadways, it is not unexpected that crash density is highest on these roads, especially when coupled with typically high speeds. Fatal and serious injury crashes also occurred along major roadways, such as I-185, US-85, and US-280.




Figure 8.9. Commercial Vehicle Crashes by Severity





Figure 8.10. Commercial Vehicle Crashes by Functional Class

Figure 8.11. Commercial Vehicle Crashes




Commercial Vehicle Crash Density

- More Crashes
- Fewer Crashes
- Fatal or Serious Injury Crash
- Municipality
- MPO Boundary
- County Boundary
- State Boundary

COMMERCIAL VEHICLE CRASH HOTSPOTS

- 1** US 280 @ US 80 (J R Allen Parkway)
- 2** US 280 @ US 80 (Crawford Rd)
- 3** Downtown Columbus
- 4** US 80 @ 2nd Avenue
- 5** US 27 (Veterans Parkway) from Double Churches Road to Whittlesey Boulevard
- 6** US 27 (Veterans Parkway) from 54th Street to I-185
- 7** I-185 @ Airport Thruway
- 8** I-185 @ US 27 (Manchester Expressway)
- 9** I-185 @ SR 22 (Macon Road)
- 10** I-185 @ Buena Vista Road
- 11** US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) @ US 80 (J R Allen Parkway)



Page Intentionally Blank

09

Transit

This section provides an overview of transit services available within the Columbus-Phenix City MPO and an overview of ridership data. Transit data was also analyzed in relation to certain equity metrics to identify high transit propensity areas. This analysis highlights areas where improvements to transit services can benefit those residents who are likely to frequently use or rely on transit for transportation.

METRA

METRA SERVICES

The METRA Transit system operates in the Columbus area with fixed routes, paratransit, and two on demand services:



FIXED ROUTE SERVICE

The fixed route service operates ten routes Monday through Saturday from 4:30 AM to 8:30 PM. All routes have a one hour headway between the arrival of a transit vehicle at each stop.



ON-DEMAND SERVICES


The on-demand services provided are the Uptown On-Demand Golf Cart Shuttle and the Robert S. Poydasheff VA Clinic Demand Response Transportation. The Uptown Golf Cart Shuttle services Bay Avenue to 1st Avenue and 9th Street to 14th Street, accessing 14th Street from Front Avenue to avoid crossing the large intersection of 13th Street. Service is free and first come, first serve to accommodate personalized trips throughout the service area. Trips can be scheduled for a group of up to 5 per cart.



PARATRANSIT SERVICE

The METRA Paratransit Service provides curb-to-curb transportation to eligible individuals with disabilities who cannot access the fixed route service. Door-to-door service is also available to individuals upon request. This service operates Monday through Saturday from 4:30 AM to 8:30 PM, and reservations must be made one to fourteen days in advance. The service area is within a 3/4-mile radius of a corridor located on each side of all fixed bus routes and within 3/4 mile radius of each station. METRA implemented a premium paratransit service on July 1, 2024, extending service an additional 3/4-mile and including Robert S. Poydasheff VA Clinic and the Department of Drivers Services in Midland.

Figure 9.1. METRA Transit Service



METRA RIDERSHIP

Figure 9.1 highlights ridership across the METRA fixed route system, showing ridership for each route and the 20 METRA bus stops with highest ridership. The route with the highest ridership serves western Columbus, providing access to largely residential areas, as well as industrial businesses and government services near Schatulga Road. Another highly utilized route accesses major commercial areas along SR 22 (Wynnton Road), SR 103 (Buena Vista Road), and US-280 (Victory Drive). High ridership is also seen on the route traveling north to commercial areas along Whittlesey Boulevard and US 27 (Veterans Parkway) near the I-185 and US 280 interchange, also accessing the Columbus Airport and the Piedmont Columbus Regional Hospital–Midtown.

High ridership stops are mostly at commercial areas, as well as near shopping centers, recreation centers, schools, hospitals, and multifamily housing. The highest ridership is at the METRA Transfer Center, which provides connections to all system routes. Other high ridership bus stops provide access to major shopping centers, such as those along US 27 and Midtown Shopping Center and others near I-185. High ridership stops can be found near community facilities, such as the Columbus Public Library and the Safe House of Chattahoochee Valley Ministry. Additionally, a high ridership stop is located near multifamily housing and schools along Fort Benning Road and social and government services such as Social Security Services.

PEX

PEX SERVICES

In Phenix City, the Phenix City Express (PEX) provides a fixed route and paratransit service that travels throughout Phenix City.



FIXED ROUTE SERVICE

The Fixed Route service consists of a northside and southside route, with a transfer stop at the Central Activities Center/Phenix City-Russell County Library. The service also makes a stop at 2nd Avenue in Downtown Columbus to provide a connection to the METRA transit system. In addition, the Fixed Route service may make a reasonable modification to policies, practices, or procedures by request in order to accommodate access for individuals with physical and mental impairment. The PEX Fixed Route Service operates Monday through Friday from 8 AM to 4 PM. Both routes have a one hour headway.




PARATRANSIT SERVICE

The PEX Paratransit Service provides curb-to-curb service upon request for individuals with disabilities. The service area is within a 3/4-mile radius of the fixed routes, as well as additional areas within Phenix City and Columbus city limits. This service operates Monday through Friday from 8AM to 4PM.

PEX RIDERSHIP

PEX Ridership data was not provided.

Figure 9.2. PEX Transit Service



Transit Needs

1 CONNECT TO LOW-INCOME AREAS

Ownership of a personal vehicle can be a challenge for low-income residents throughout the region. Therefore, many residents within areas with high amounts of low income households may rely on transit to reach day to day destinations across the Columbus-Phenix City MPO. While transit routes may provide access along these roadways, with stops located 1-3 block apart on all routes, transit routes may be located over 1 mile away from some low income residents, reducing their ability to easily access services.

METRA will conduct a study of services in 2025 that will include recommendations for micro-transit and other on-demand services in Muscogee County.

2 REDUCE HEADWAYS

The current one-hour headways for both METRA and PEX fixed route services require a significant amount of travel planning and may lead to long wait time at any given stop, especially if users miss their planned bus, or if there are delays in service. Shorter headways can provide more convenient and flexible transit service for users. Potential solutions for creating shorter headways include operating more service vehicles, modifying or reducing routes, dedicated bus lanes, traffic signal priority, and bus stop design that reduces the amount of time buses are stopped.

METRA recommends thirty-minute headways on all high ridership routes.

3 CONNECT TO DISABLED POPULATIONS

Locating a bus stop within ½ mile, a ~10 minute walk, of residences in these areas increases the convenient access to goods and services in other areas of the region. Even with fixed transit services nearby, disabled populations also require greater access to on-demand services.

METRA will conduct a study of services in 2025 that will include recommendations for micro-transit and other on-demand services in Muscogee County.

4 EXPAND SERVICE HOURS AND DAYS

While areas with high percentages of zero-vehicle households are relatively well-covered by transit routes, these people would benefit from expanded service hours and weekend service to make transit travel more convenient and reliable.

METRA conducted a study in 2019 which found very low or no ridership after 8:30 PM and no demand for Sunday service. Expanded service will require further study for implementation.

5 ADD TRANSIT AMENITIES

Additional transit amenities, such as benches and shelters, can be placed at bus stops to allow transit users to sit comfortably and access shade while waiting for bus service. Lighting at bus stops can also improve safety for users waiting in the dark.


METRA recommends additional sidewalk facilities and ADA curb cuts along transit routes for improved accessibility.

Transit Propensity Areas


Analyzing certain equity metrics in relation to transit services provides an understanding of areas that may have a high propensity for transit use. Data showing zero-vehicle households, low-income households and disabled populations were mapped to help understand areas that may have a higher propensity for utilizing transit as residents may not have access to a car or the ability to drive (see Section 5—Justice 40 Analysis for these maps). Comparing existing transit services with these metrics provides insight into how these areas are currently served by transit, as well as where improvements can be made to better serve residents. Transit propensity areas in Columbus-Phenix City are described in further detail in the following pages.

TRANSIT SERVICE TO...


LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES




ZERO-VEHICLE HOUSEHOLDS



DISABLED POPULATIONS




LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES



Many low-income areas in the central parts of Columbus and Phenix City are currently served by transit. This includes routes along Cusetta Road, St Marys Road, US 280 (Victory Drive), Hamilton Road, 8th Street, 13th Street, US 431 (Martin Luther King Jr Parkway S) and Seale Road.

Low-income block groups outside of the central area have less access to transit services, leaving some residents a significant distance from current routes, particularly south of Columbus and Phenix City. Investments can be made to expand or improve service in areas throughout Columbus including Buena Vista Rd, south of Knowles Rd, west of Brickyard Rd, and along US 280 (Victory Drive) near the intersection of I-185. In Phenix City, improvements can be made to reach low-income block groups along Broad Street and further south along US 431 (Martin Luther King Jr Parkway S).


ZERO-VEHICLE HOUSEHOLDS



Areas with the largest amounts of zero-vehicle households are relatively well served by current fixed-routes services. This includes routes along Cusseta Road, US 280 (Victory Drive), 2nd Avenue, and W 13th Street.

Areas of potential improvement include expanding routes along Buena Vista Rd near I-185 in Columbus, as well as in Ladonia and southwest along US 431 (Martin Luther King Jr Parkway S) in Phenix City. In addition, investments can be made to improve aspects of the current service, such as reducing headways and additional service days, to provide even more convenient transportation throughout the region.

DISABLED POPULATIONS



Block groups with a significant disabled population in Columbus and Muscogee County are relatively well served by fixed transit routes along SR 22 (Wynnton Road), 2nd Avenue, 13th Avenue, Buena Vista Road, Cusetta Road, and S Lumpkin Road. Block groups in central Phenix City are also served by current fixed transit services along Broad Street, Seale Rd, and US 431 (Martin Luther King Jr Parkway S) .

Disabled populations that are not currently served by fixed transit include areas such as Smiths Station, Ladonia, and south of Phenix City near Nuckels Road. In Columbus Muscogee County, limited service is provided to disabled populations north of US 27 (Victory Drive) near I-185.

It should be noted that disabled individuals may utilize on-demand services in addition to or instead of fixed transit services.

Page Intentionally Blank

10

Active Transportation

Active transportation facilities are important for creating a strong network that provides convenient and safe transportation options for users. As previously discussed, some residents in the MPO may rely on walking and biking as their primary transportation mode or as a way to access transit services. Ensuring safe, consistent, and well maintained sidewalk, trails, and bike facilities can provide significant improvements to the regional transportation network. This chapter provides an overview of the existing active transportation network, recommendations for Complete Streets improvements, and an analysis of active transportation needs.

Inventory of Existing Facilities


SIDEWALK FACILITIES

Existing sidewalk facilities are shown in Figure 1. In Columbus-Muscogee County there are 126 miles of roads with complete sidewalks (sidewalk on both sides of the street). There are 106 miles of roads with partial sidewalk (sidewalk on one side of the street). Most sidewalks are located in central Columbus. Sidewalk facilities are scattered along larger roadways in the more rural areas of Columbus. Pockets of sidewalk networks also exist within certain neighborhood developments.

There are 6 miles of segmented sidewalk facilities in Phenix City, mostly existing in the central area of the City. A majority of sidewalk facilities follow one side of the roadway. Sidewalks typically have a 1-2 foot grass buffer or are located directly behind the curb, providing little separation from vehicle traffic. A number of existing sidewalks have significant maintenance issues.

For comparison, there are about 1,889 total miles of roadways and 1,351 miles of roadways within urban areas.

Figure 10.1. Sidewalk Facilities



- Sidewalk on Both Sides of Street
- Sidewalk on One Side of Street
- Municipality
- MPO Boundary
- - - County Boundary
- ⋯ State Boundary

TRAILS AND BICYCLE FACILITIES


Existing trail and bicycle facilities are shown in Figure 2. In Columbus-Muscogee County, there are 44.6 miles of completed paved trail, including the Chattahoochee Riverwalk through Downtown Columbus and the Fall Line Trace traveling northeast through the City. There are 30 miles of planned paved or unknown surface trails, including multiple segments of future expansion along the Dragonfly Trails. There are 5.9 miles of bike lanes in central Columbus. These are on-street facilities, either conventional bike lanes or buffered bike lanes.

Trail and bike facilities west of the river include the Phenix City Riverwalk, running 1.2 miles along the river, through Downtown Phenix City.

In addition, there are 58 miles of completed regional trails, mostly in Chattahoochee County just south of Columbus. There are 7.7 miles of planned trails in this area. There are a number of unpaved recreational trails in Columbus-Muscogee County, including 46 miles of completed natural surface or gravel trails, many of which are located in Standing Boy Mountain State Park off of Old River Road. There are also 3.5 miles of planned unpaved trails in this area.




Buffered bike lane along Rigdon Road in Columbus.



Chattahoochee Riverwalk in Downtown Columbus.

Figure 10.2. Trails and Bicycle Facilities



Activity Centers

Activity centers across the region include schools, parks, recreation centers, senior centers, hospitals, and transit stops. These are facilities that are likely daily destinations for many residents. Figure 3 shows the location of community activity centers in relation to active transportation facilities.

Destinations within Downtown Columbus have access to a relatively robust sidewalk and trail network. However, facilities in residential and more suburban parts of the City are limited. This means that residents must drive to their destination or travel along inconsistent sidewalk and bike facilities to reach Downtown or other destinations. In some cases, destinations are located along a dedicated active transportation facility that is isolated from other facilities. An example of this is the Chattahoochee Riverwalk, connecting multiple parks and community centers. The trail has limited connections to the larger active transportation network, requiring users to drive to the trail in order to use it and reach nearby destinations by walking or biking.

Similarly, in Phenix City, existing facilities Downtown require people to drive into the City to use them. Many destinations are located outside of the central area along roadways where there are no active transportation facilities. Those that aren't able to drive to these destinations must walk or bike within or next to the roadway.




Sidewalk facilities in Downtown Columbus.



Sidewalk facilities on one side of the street end abruptly.

Figure 10.3. Key destinations



Active Transportation Needs

1 HIGH DEMAND AREAS

Modeled active trip volumes provide a picture of areas where there is high demand for walking and biking. These are areas where investment in active transportation facilities can benefit a large number of existing users and provide connection along popular routes and to important destinations.

2 LOW INCOME AREAS


As car ownership can be a challenge for low income residents, assessing areas with high amounts of low income residents can highlight areas where active transportation facilities are needed for those that rely on active modes of transportation for daily travel. Providing dedicated pedestrian and bicycle facilities in these areas that connect to community destinations can improve the utility and convenience of the network.

3 ZERO VEHICLE HOUSEHOLDS

Areas with high amounts of zero vehicle households can also provide insight into areas where a significant number of residents likely rely on active modes and transit for transportation. Improvements in active transportation facilities in these areas can provide a major benefit for those that rely on these modes for daily transportation.

4 HIGH CRASH AREAS

Improving existing facilities or investing in dedicated facilities in areas of high active transportation crashes helps to improve the safety of the transportation system. Assessing high crash areas helps to understand specific areas and types of areas where conflicts are occurring between active transportation users and vehicles. Investments in facilities and safety improvements in these areas may be needed to reduce crashes.



HIGH DEMAND AREAS

High trip volumes can be seen in areas like Downtown Columbus that have a robust active transportation network. It is important to maintain existing facilities in these areas to ensure accessibility for all users.

Many large roadways also see high volumes, especially those that provide major connections throughout the region and access to destinations such as large retail centers. Investing in new facilities and filling gaps in existing facilities is important along these roadways to provide safe and convenient ways to access major destinations. These roadways include:

- US 280 (Victory Drive) from N Lumpkin Road to I-185
- SR 22 (Wynnton Road) from Buena Vista Road to GA 22 Spur (Macon Road)
- US 27 (Veterans Parkway) from Airport Thruway to
- US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) from SR 219 (River Road) to I-185
- US 280 (Phenix City) from Sandfort Road to Crawford Road
- US 80 (Phenix City) from Ramsey Road to Westside Drive

Active Trips/Mi

- More Trips
- Fewer Trips

Municipality

MPO Boundary

County Boundary

State Boundary




Source: Replica, 2022

LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

Equity metrics, such as low income households, were analyzed in relation to active transportation facilities to understand how high propensity areas are currently served by the network and identify areas where improvements may have a significant impact on the ability of residents to travel throughout the region.

Low income block groups in Downtown Columbus are relatively well served by existing facilities, with options to walk or bike to destinations throughout Downtown. Low income areas that have limited facilities can be seen southeast of Downtown in block groups along Cusseta Road and Buena Vista Road and to the north along US 27 (Veterans Parkway). These block groups have access to segments of sidewalk but lack complete and consistent facilities to connect to the larger transportation network.


In Phenix City, block groups with high amounts of low income households are along US 431 (Martin Luther King Jr Parkway), Seale Road, and S Railroad Street have very few existing facilities, limiting the ability of residents to walk or bike to destinations.



ZERO VEHICLE HOUSEHOLDS

Similar to low income households, zero vehicle households near Downtown Columbus are relatively well served by existing facilities. One block group to the north of Downtown along US 27 (Veterans Parkway) has a significant amount of sidewalk facilities, although they are not all complete or connected sidewalks. Moving southeast outside of the City, improvements can be made to provide better access to six block groups with high amounts of zero vehicle households located along Cusseta Road, Buena Vista Road, and US 280 (Victory Drive). These block groups have very limited access to existing facilities, significantly reducing the ability of residents to safely access destinations across the region.

In Phenix City, block groups with zero vehicle households and very few or no active transportation facilities can be seen along Broad Street, near US 280 and US 80, and between US 431 (Martin Luther King Jr Parkway) and SR 165. Improved facilities in these areas are needed to connect residents from their homes to destinations and services.




HIGH PEDESTRIAN CRASH AREAS

Many high pedestrian-involved crash areas throughout the region have limited facilities for pedestrians. The lack of continuous or dedicated facilities paired with high traffic volumes on roadways such as US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) and US 280 creates a dangerous environment for those walking to and from destinations along these corridors.

In areas of high crashes that do have existing facilities, such as Downtown Columbus at 13th Street and Broadway, improvements may be needed at intersections. While pedestrians may have dedicated space and facilities along the roadway, intersections can be particularly dangerous as users have to move into the roadway to cross the street.


Investing in new facilities and improvements in these high crash areas provides safe options for all roadway users, especially those reaching daily destinations by walking.




HIGH BICYCLIST-INVOLVED CRASH AREAS

High crash areas often lack dedicated bike facilities, requiring bicyclists to ride within the roadway or along inconsistent sidewalks. High crash areas that lack bike facilities include roadways such as US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway), US 27 Veterans Parkway, and US 80. These large roads carry high volume and high speed traffic, increasing the need for dedicated bike facilities that are separated from traffic.

Crashes are somewhat concentrated around existing facilities, like along Warm Springs Connector near the Fall Line Trace. Crashes in these types of areas are likely occurring as bicyclists are making connections from existing facilities to nearby destinations along roads that don't have dedicated facilities. Providing connections between facilities and activity centers can improve safety throughout the network. Crashes are also occurring within intersections, highlighting the importance of improvements where bicyclists must travel within the roadway to cross streets.



- Bicyclist-Involved Crash
- Bike Lane
- Paved Trail
- Complete
- Planned
- Municipality
- MPO Boundary
- County Boundary
- State Boundary



Active Transportation Recommendations and Prioritization

This plan includes a list of proposed corridors for priority active transportation infrastructure and policy throughout the C-PCTS MPO. The goal is to provide guidance and resources to the MPO and individual municipalities for filling high priority gaps along corridors and in nodes where there is the highest need. A robust active transportation network can not only improve the ability of residents to travel throughout the region using active modes, but can also improve quality of life, benefit economic growth, improve inequities, and reduce congestions and carbon emissions from single occupancy vehicles.

There are a number of factors that should be considered when implementing active transportation improvements. Improvements should create **continuous facilities, filling gaps in existing facilities and implementing continuous segments of new facilities. Facilities should strive to connect to destinations throughout the region. Creating facilities that lead from residences to neighborhood and regional destinations creates opportunities for residents to replace vehicle trips with active trips for daily travel.**

These recommendations consider a number of demographic factors. Equity demographics, such as low income areas and zero vehicle households, should be assessed to ensure that the network

provides transportation options to those that may rely on alternative modes of transportation.

The following sections describe specific recommendations for active transportation facilities and sidewalks, as well as prioritization for specific recommendations. They are organized into two separate categories:

1. **Priority Complete Streets Corridors**—Lists specific corridors as tier 1, 2, and 3 priorities for complete streets improvements. These corridors tend to be higher speed, higher volume roadways and will therefore require a robust level of separation between cars and walkers/bikers in order to provide safe and comfortable accommodation. Scoping studies will be required to determine the appropriate facility types and design for each corridor.
2. **Priority Sidewalk Areas**—Highlights areas surrounding the high priority corridors and neighborhood connectors where there is a high concentration of walking and biking destinations. Sidewalk construction and maintenance should be prioritized in these parts of the region.

Helpful resources for planning, design, and implementation are listed at the end of this section. Finally, the chapter concludes with policy guidance that can help to strengthen the MPO's active transportation network.

WHAT ARE COMPLETE STREETS?

Complete Streets is the principle that all roadways should accommodate all anticipated users. This means that all roads where walking and biking is anticipated should have safe, comfortable accommodations for those users. In order to provide the MPO with an actionable workplan, this section of the report identifies the corridors that should be the highest priority for complete streets interventions.

PRIORITY COMPLETE STREETS CORRIDORS

STEP ONE: CORRIDOR IDENTIFICATION

Roadways within the region were initially assessed to understand where corridors with the greatest need for Complete Streets were located throughout the region. This analysis considered active trip volumes, active transportation crash history, and the presence of transit routes. Additional corridors with a high concentration of parks, schools, transit stops, and commercial centers were added to this list. These corridors are particularly important for neighborhood connectivity. This initial analysis resulted in a list of 32 corridors across the MPO that displayed the greatest need for Complete Street facilities, including previous active transportation project recommendations from the 2045 MTP. Identified corridors with ongoing or funded Complete Street projects were removed from the list before scoring.

STEP TWO: SCORING

These corridors were then scored using a data-driven prioritization process to provide an objective analysis of which corridors would provide the most benefit to users as a Complete Street. Eight prioritization criteria were determined to score corridors, each worth one point, giving a max score of eight points. The graphic at right lists each scoring criteria with a description of the threshold that resulted in a one point score. The highest scoring roadways were identified as priority or Tier 1 corridors for Complete Street improvements. The lower scoring roadways were identified as Tier 2 and 3 for lower-priority projects. While all of these projects are important, this tiered system provides the MPO with a general order in which to pursue projects for implementation.

Prioritization Criteria



High Active Trip Volumes

Corridor has a segment with modeled active trip volumes of > 18,000 trips/mi



High Active Transportation Crash History

More than 4 crashes occurred along the corridor from 2018-2022



Access to Zero Vehicle Households

Corridor touches a block group with > 25% zero vehicle households



Access to Transit

A bus stop is located along the corridor



Access to Community Destination

Corridor is within 1/4 mile of a park, school, or other activity center



Access to Major Retail Corridor

Corridor has major commercial zoning along both sides of street



Access to Multi-Family Housing

Corridor is within 1/4 mile of multi-family housing zoning




Public Input

Corridor was called out in Social Pinpoint map comments

Figure 10.4. Complete Street Recommendations

ANALYSIS OF ROADWAYS

Corridors with a total score of 6 or 7 are identified as Tier 1, high priority, Complete Street corridor recommendations. Corridors with a total score of 4-5 are considered Tier 2 recommendations. The remaining corridors scoring 1-3 points are Tier 3 recommendations.



Complete Street Corridor Recommendations

- Tier 1
- Tier 2
- Tier 3

TIA or GDOT Project

Existing Facilities

- Sidewalk on Both Sides of Street
- Sidewalk on One Side of Street
- Complete Paved Trail
- Planned Paved Trail

Base Features

- Municipality
- MPO Boundary
- County Boundary
- State Boundary

0 1 2 3 4 Miles



Table 10.2. Complete Streets Prioritization Scoring

ID	Corridor	From Street	To Street	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score	
				High AT Volumes	High AT Crash History	Access to Zero Vehicle Households	Access to Transit	Access to Community Destination	Access to Major Retail Corridor	Access to Multi-family Housing	Public Input		
Tier 1	GA-12	St Marys Rd Streetscape	Buena Vista Rd	Northstar Dr	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7
	GA-13	US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) Streetscape	River Rd	Woodruff Rd	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
	GA-14	Wynnton Road Streetscape	Buena Vista Rd	Edgewood Cir	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
	GA-15	Buena Vista Road Streetscape	Annette Ave	Floyd Rd	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
	GA-16	Victory Drive Streetscape	N Lumpkin Rd	Santa Fe Rd	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
	GA-17	Hamilton Road Streetscape	39th St	23rd St	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
	GA-18	US 27 (Veterans Pkwy) Streetscape	US 27 ALT (Manchester Expy)	Whitesville Rd	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
	AA-19	Broad Street Streetscape	S Railroad St	Dillingham St	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Tier 2	AA-20	US 280 Streetscape	Crawford Rd	Sandfort Rd	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
	GA-21	River Road Streetscape	50th St	Hamilton Rd	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	6
	GA-22	Armour Road Streetscape	Warm Springs Rd	W Britt David Rd	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5
	GA-23	Forrest Road Streetscape	SR 22 (Wynnton Rd)	Woodruff Farm Rd	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	5
	AA-24	14th Street/ Crawford Rd Streetscape	15th Ave	28th Ave	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	5
	GA-25	Airport Thruway Streetscape	US 27 (Veterans Pkwy)	Smoke Dr	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	5
	GA-26	N Lumpkin Road Streetscape	Cusseta Rd	US 27 (Victory Dr)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	5
	AA-27	S Seale Road Streetscape	Dillingham Street	5th Street S	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4


Table 10.3. Complete Streets Prioritization Scoring, continued

	ID	Corridor	From Street	To Street	Prioritization Criteria							Total Score	
					High AT Volumes	High AT Crash History	Access to Zero Vehicle Households	Access to Transit	Access to Community Destination	Access to Major Retail Corridor	Access to Multi-family Housing		Public Input
Tier 2	GA-28	Miller Road Streetscape	Fall Line Trace	SR 22 (Wynnton Rd)	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
	GA-29	23rd Street & Comer Avenue Streetscape	1st Ave	Southern St	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
	GA-30	Brown Avenue Streetscape	Wynnton Rd	Cusseta Rd	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
	GA-31	Warm Springs Connector Streetscape	Miller Rd	Miligen Rd	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	4
	GA-32	38th Street Bike Improvements	Meritas Drive	1st Avenue	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
Tier 3	GA-33	Bradley Park Drive Streetscape	SR 219 (River Rd)	Whitesville Rd	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
	GA-34	Schomburg Road Streetscape	Hancock Rd	Warm Springs Rd	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
	AA-35	Stadium Drive Streetscape	Phenix City Intermediate School	13th Avenue	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
	GA-36	Woodruff Road Streetscape	Devonshire Dr	Camille Dr	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
	GA-37	Britt David Road Streetscape	US 27 (Hamilton Rd)	Airport Thruway	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
	GA-38	Whittlesey Road & Whittlesey Boulevard Streetscape	Bradley Park Dr	Moon Rd	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
	AA-39	US 80 Streetscape	Coffield Dr	Mimosa Rd	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
	AA-40	Mullin Road Streetscape	Lee Road 728	Lee Road 243	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	GA-41	Broad Street (Cusseta) Streetscape	Anderson Road	Osteen Street	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Figure 10.5. Sidewalk Recommendations

SIDEWALK RECOMMENDATIONS

Priority areas for sidewalk infrastructure are located within a half mile of high priority complete street corridors and ongoing complete street projects. These areas should be a priority for investment in sidewalk facilities that fill gaps and make connections on necessary roadways.



DESIGN GUIDANCE

SHARED-USE FACILITIES

Shared-use facilities, such as shared-use paths or trails, are wide, off-road facilities that provide a dedicated space for pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as other non-motorized users. Shared-use facilities can be located along major roadways with high traffic and/or high speeds to separate active transportation users from traffic and improve safety along busy corridors. In areas with adequate right-of-way, these facilities can be implemented instead of sidewalk facilities or can replace existing sidewalks during maintenance and development/redevelopment. New shared-use facilities can improve the utility of the existing trail system that can be found throughout the C-PCTS MPO.

Additional resources for shared-use path planning and implementation include:

- Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), [Pedestrian and Streetscape Guide](#)
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), [Evaluation of Safety, Design, and Operation of Shared-Use Paths](#)

BICYCLE FACILITIES

On-street bicycle facilities can be implemented in addition to sidewalks to provide both bicyclists and pedestrians with space along the corridor. The appropriate type of bicycle facility should be determined based on roadway characteristics, such as traffic volumes and speeds, as well as available right-of-way. As speeds and volumes along a roadway increase, the separation between bicycle facilities and roadway traffic should increase, as shown in Figure 6, the Bicycle Selection Guide created by the FHWA.


Additionally, opportunities for road diets should be explored as a strategy for including bicycle facilities along certain roadways. Road diets involve analyzing roadway volumes and capacity in order to remove one or more drive lanes, using the resulting space for active transportation facilities.

Additional resources for bicycle facility planning and implementation include:

- National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), [Urban Bikeway Design Guide](#)

- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), [Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities](#)
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), [MUTCD Traffic Controls for Bicycle Facilities](#)
- FHWA, [Road Diet Informational Guide](#)

Figure 10.6. *Bikeway Selection Guide (FHWA)*



Notes

1 Chart assumes operating speeds are similar to posted speeds. If they differ, use operating speed rather than posted speed.

2 Advisory bike lanes may be an option where traffic volume is <3K ADT.

3 See page 32 for a discussion of alternatives if the preferred bikeway type is not feasible.

SIDEWALKS

Sidewalk facilities can be implemented to fill gaps in existing facilities and create connections to neighborhood destinations and the larger transportation network. These facilities, typically 5-8 feet wide, should be buffered from the roadway if possible in order to provide comfortable separation from roadway traffic. Placement of sidewalks should consider context of each roadway, such as right-of-way, vehicle speeds and volumes, land use context, and nearby destinations.

Sidewalk design should also consider features like street trees for shade and lighting for additional comfort.

Additional resources for sidewalk planning and implementation include:

- Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), [Pedestrian and Streetscape Guide](#)
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), [Guide for Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities](#).
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), [MUTCD Pedestrian Control Features](#)

COMPLETE STREETS

Corridors identified for complete street treatment are those with high active transportation demand, high vehicle volumes and speeds, and significant crash history.

There are a number of facility types that can be implemented as part of a complete street, as each design is dependent on the local context and needs of users. Possible facility types include sidewalks, bike lanes, bus lanes, accessible transit stops, median

islands, pedestrian signals, roundabouts, as well as others. Feasibility studies should be completed for each recommended complete street corridor to determine specific needs for implementation.

Additional resources for complete streets planning and implementation include:

- Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), [Complete Streets Policy](#)
- AARP, [Complete Streets in the Southeast: A Tool Kit](#)



Example of Complete Street improvement. (Source: Smart Growth America)

Page Intentionally Blank

11

Freight and Goods Movement

The Importance of Freight in the C-PCTS Region

Efficient freight movement is essential for the economic health of a region. It supports businesses by ensuring timely delivery of goods, raw materials, and products, thereby fostering economic growth and competitiveness. Enhancing freight infrastructure can lead to job creation in logistics, transportation, warehousing, and related sectors. Identifying key freight corridors and infrastructure needs helps prioritize investments in roads, bridges, railways, ports, and intermodal facilities that are critical for freight movement.

Maintaining and upgrading existing infrastructure is vital to handle the demands of freight traffic. By addressing bottlenecks and improving the reliability of freight routes, delays are minimized, leading to greater predictability of deliveries. Improving infrastructure and implementing advanced technologies can help reduce accidents and enhance the safety of freight transport. Ensuring that land use policies and zoning regulations support efficient freight movement by providing adequate space for warehouses, distribution centers, and freight corridors is also essential.

Freight and goods movement is a critical component of the MTP

aimed at ensuring the efficient and effective transportation of goods within and through a metropolitan area. The purpose of incorporating freight and goods movement into an MTP is multi-faceted, supporting economic vitality, infrastructure improvements, and system efficiency and reliability. analysis of the current state of freight transportation within the region. It establishes a baseline understanding of the existing freight transportation infrastructure, operations, and logistics within the region. This includes identifying key freight corridors, modes of transportation (such as highways, railroads, ports, and airports), freight volumes, traffic patterns, and existing infrastructure conditions

Freight Profile

A freight profile plays a pivotal role in transportation planning, economic development, and infrastructure management.

It provides a detailed analysis of freight movement within a specific region, pinpointing key trends, challenges, and opportunities. In the Columbus-Phenix City region, the freight network is crucial to the economic framework, underpinning a variety of industries and contributing significantly to the area's economic health. The freight infrastructure in this region supports essential sectors such as manufacturing, retail, and logistics, which are integral to both local and regional economic growth. The comprehensive insights from a freight profile enable stakeholders to understand and optimize the movement of goods, prioritize infrastructure investments, support economic development, ensure safety and reliability, promote sustainability, and inform holistic transportation planning and policymaking.

DESIGNATED FREIGHT ROUTES

The Columbus-Phenix City region relies on a network of designated freight routes to efficiently manage the transportation of goods, supporting economic growth and regional connectivity. These routes are critical for the economic vitality of the area, ensuring the smooth movement of freight and supporting various industries. The primary designated freight routes include major highways and interstates, which connect local businesses to regional, national, and international markets. These routes are continuously developed and maintained to meet the demands of freight transportation, ensuring the region's competitiveness in the global market.

Recognized Freight Networks are primarily focused on supporting economic activities by facilitating the efficient movement of goods and materials. These networks enable businesses to transport products to markets and consumers effectively, incorporating highways, railways, ports, and intermodal facilities.

Collectively, these networks comprise the C-PCTS MPO Regional Freight Network as shown on Figure 11.1., the freight routes include:

1. **FHWA National Highway Freight Network**—A system of highways identified to support the efficient movement of goods throughout the United States, enhancing economic competitiveness and facilitating interstate commerce. More information is provided on page 152.
2. **Statewide Designated Freight Corridors** - Building off the NHFN, this network includes interstates and highways most critical to freight movement in the state. More information is provided on page 153.
3. **STRAHNET Facilities**—The Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) is the Department of Defense's (DoD's) strategic defense network for domestic operations. STRAHNET facilities consist of roads deemed necessary for emergency mobilization and peacetime movement of commodities to support U.S. military operations. STRAHNET facilities include: US 280, US 80, US 431, I-185, and US 27 Alt (from I-185 to US 80). See Figure 11.2 on page 155 for a map of these facilities.
4. **Thru Truck Routes**—Thru trucks not making a pickup, delivery, or having specific business within Columbus, GA, must travel only on designated thru truck routes. These routes are established with weight and length restrictions controlled by the Georgia Department of Transportation (Sec. 20-9.48.)
5. **Local Truck Routes**—Commercial trucks and other vehicles making trips, pickups, deliveries, or drop-offs within Columbus must travel on designated local truck routes. Local truck traffic making pickups and drop-offs is authorized to use the thru truck routes, shown in Table 11.1 on page 156 (Sec. 20-9.49.).

NATIONAL HIGHWAY FREIGHT NETWORK (NHFN)


Figure 11.1. *The National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)*



The National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) represents roadway facilities where FHWA strategically focuses Federal resources and policies toward improved national freight mobility. Influencing the region, I-185 (and nearby I-85) are included in the NHFN. As such, improvements to I-185 are eligible for funding from the National Highway Freight Program and the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects competitive grant program (commonly called INFRA).

GEORGIA'S STATEWIDE DESIGNATED FREIGHT CORRIDORS


Figure 11.2. Georgia's Statewide Designated Freight Corridors



Georgia's statewide freight corridor network plays a substantial role in freight and goods movements in the Columbus region. I-185 and US 80 are included on this network and are vital to the regional economy. In addition, there is a Norfolk Southern rail yard on the west side of I-185 off of Andrews Road.

*Source: Georgia Statewide Freight & Logistics Plan, GDOT, 2021 Revised-October, 2016

Figure 11.3. Regional Freight Network




- Regional Freight Network
- MPO Boundary
- Municipality
- County Boundary
- State Boundary
- MPO Boundary

0 2.5 5 7.5 10 Miles



Figure 11.4. Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET)



The Columbus-Phenix City region boasts a strategically positioned network of highways, interstates, and railroads that facilitate the seamless movement of goods. Key routes such as I-185, US Highway 80, and US Highway 27 connect the area to major markets across Georgia, Alabama, and beyond. This robust connectivity is essential for regional trade, allowing businesses to access broader markets and ensuring efficient distribution of products across state lines and to international destinations.

Additionally, the region includes strategic defense networks, STRAHNET, which support national security and emergency mobilization. These routes ensure that the transportation of military and defense-related goods is efficient and reliable, supporting both peacetime logistics and emergency operations.

It should be noted that there are some routes that have limitations to accommodate larger trucks due to roadway geometric and/or bridge characteristics. Table 11.1 and Table 11.2 describe the following restriction types:

- Statutory—Weight/length restrictions as controlled by GDOT as state statutory regulations
- 40T/56 Ft.—No trucks over 40 tons or 56 feet allowed (route belongs to the City of Columbus)
- 32.5T/56 Ft.—No trucks over 32.5 tons or 56 feet allowed (route belongs to the City of Columbus)
- 18T/30 Ft.—No trucks over 18 tons or 30 feet allowed (route belongs to the City of Columbus)
- 10T/30 Ft.—No trucks over 10 tons or 30 feet allowed (route belongs to the City of Columbus)
- 3T—No trucks over 30 tons allowed (route belongs to the City of Columbus)

Table 11.1. Statutory or 40T/56 Ft. Restrictions for Thru Truck Routes in Columbus

Thru Truck Route	From	To	Street Classification	Restriction
I-185	Victory Dr, US 280	Harris County Line	Limited Access	Statutory
2nd Av	13th St	14th St	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
2nd Av, SR 85	14th St	Manchester Expy, SR 85	Arterial	Statutory
2nd Av Connector, SR 85	Manchester Expy, SR 85	J.R. Allen Pkwy, US 80	Arterial	Statutory
4th St, US 280	Alabama State Line	10th Av	Arterial	Statutory
13th Av, Spur 22	Buena Vista Rd	13th St	Arterial	Statutory
13th St	Alabama State Line	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
13th St, Spur 22	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	13th Av, Spur 22	Arterial	Statutory
14th St, SR 85	2nd Av, SR 85	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Arterial	Statutory
Beaver Run Rd, US 80	Manchester Expy, SR 85	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Arterial	Statutory
Buena Vista Rd, Spur 22	13th Av, Spur 22	Wynnton Rd, Spur 22	Arterial	Statutory
J.R. Allen Pkwy, US 80	Alabama State Line	1,200 Ft east of Warm Springs Rd	Limited Access	Statutory
J.R. Allen Pkwy, US 80	1,200 Ft east of Warm Springs Rd	Manchester Expy, SR 85	Arterial	Statutory
Macon Rd, Spur 22	Tate Dr	Beaver Run Rd, US 80	Arterial	Statutory
Macon Rd, US 80	Beaver Run Rd, US 80	Talbot County Line	Arterial	Statutory
Manchester Expy, SR 85	2nd AV, SR 85	Reese Rd	Arterial	Statutory
Manchester Expy, SR 85	Reese Rd	Harris County Line	Limited Access	Statutory
River Rd, SR 219	Veteran Pkwy, SR 1	Harris County Line	Arterial	Statutory
Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	4th St, US 280	Harris County Line	Arterial	Statutory
Victory Dr, US 280	10th Av	I-185	Arterial	Statutory
Wynnton Rd, Spur 22	Buena Vista Rd	Tate Dr	Arterial	Statutory

Table 11.2. 40T/56 Ft. Restrictions for Local Truck Routes in Columbus

Thru Truck Route	From	To	Street Classification	Restriction
5th Av	13th St	Talbotton Rd	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
6th Av	4th St, US 280	Linwood B1	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
9th St	Front Av	10th Av	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
10th Av	Victory Dr, US 280	Talbotton Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
10th St	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	10th Av	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
54th St	Chumar Dr	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Airport Thwy	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	West Britt David Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Andrews Rd	Cusseta Rd	Buena Vista Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Armour Rd	Warm Springs Rd	Airport Thwy	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Bradley Park Dr	Brookstone Centre Pkwy	Whittlesey Rd, East	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Brennan Rd	Cusseta Rd	Buena Vista Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Buena Vista Rd	Wynnton Rd, Spur 22	Schatulga Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Chattsworth Rd	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Technology Pkwy	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Corporate Ridge Pkwy	Woodruff Farm Rd	Schatulga Rd	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Cusseta Rd	10th Av	Ft Benning Reservation	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Farr Rd	Old Cusseta Rd	St Marys Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Flat Rock Rd	J.R. Allen Pkwy, US 80	Warm Springs Rd	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Flat Rock Rd	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Beaver Run Rd, US 80	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Floyd Rd	Buena Vista Rd	Forrest Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Forrest Rd	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Floyd Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Fortson Rd	Williams Rd	Harris County Line	Arterial	40T/56FT
Fort Benning Rd	Ft Benning Reservation	Cusseta Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Front Av	9th St	13th St	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Gentian Bl	Warm Springs Rd	Milgen Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Grey Rock Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Harris County Line	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Hilton Av	Edgewood Rd	Warm Springs Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Linwood Bl	6th Av	10th Av	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Martin Luther King, Jr. Bl	10th Av	Buena Vista Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Milgen Rd	Gentian Bl	Flat Rock Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Miller Rd	Moon Rd	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Miller Rd	W Britt David Rd	Windsor Dr	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.

Thru Truck Route	From	To	Street Classification	Restriction
Moon Rd	Windsor Dr	Wilbur St	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Moon Rd	Whittlesey Bl	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Morris Rd	Buena Vista Rd	Forrest Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
North Lumpkin Rd	Victory Dr, US 280	Cusseta Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Old Cusseta Rd	Cusseta Rd	Ft Benning Reservation	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Reese Rd	Gentian Bl	Manchester Expy, SR 85	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
River Rd	Hamilton Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Schatulga Rd	Buena Vista Rd	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Smith Rd	I-185, West Ramps	Fortson Rd	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
South Lumpkin Rd	Ft Benning Reservation	Victory Dr, US 280	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
St Marys Rd	Buena Vista Rd	Northstar Dr	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Talbotton Rd	2nd Av	12th Av	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Technology Pkwy	South Dead End	Macon Rd, US 80	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Torch Hill Rd	South Lumpkin Rd	Ft Benning Rd	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
University Av	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Manchester Expy, SR 85	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Warm Springs Rd Conn.	Milgen Rd	Miller Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Warm Springs Rd	12th Av	Gentian Bl	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Warm Springs Rd	Miller Rd	Schomburg Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Whitesville Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	J.R. Allen Pkwy	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Whittlesey Bl	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Moon Rd	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Whittlesey Rd	Bradley Park Dr	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Williams Rd	Whitesville Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
West Britt David Rd	Airport Thwy	Miller Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Woodruff Rd	Warm Springs Rd	Manchester Expy, SR 85	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Woodruff Farm Rd	Forrest Rd	Milgen Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Wooldridge Rd	Fortson Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Collector	40T/56 Ft.
Wynnton Rd	10th Av	Buena Vista Rd	Arterial	40T/56 Ft.
Billings Rd	Miller Rd	Gateway Rd	Arterial	32.5T/56 Ft.
Gateway Rd	Billings Rd	J.R. Allen Pkwy, US 80	Collector	32.5T/56 Ft.
Hamilton Rd	Talbotton Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Collector	32.5T/56 Ft.
Whitesville Rd	Airport Thwy	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Arterial	32.5T/56 Ft.
13th Av	13th St	Linwood Bl	Collector	18T/30 Ft.

Thru Truck Route	From	To	Street Classification	Restriction
13th St	13th Av	Cherokee Av	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Almond Rd	Fortson Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Billings Rd	Gateway Rd	Warm Springs Rd	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Benning Dr	South Lumpkin Rd	Cusseta Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Biggers Rd	River Rd, SR 219	Whitesville Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Blackmon Rd	Warm Springs Rd	Pierce Chapel Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Brown Av	Martin Luther King, Jr. Bl	Wynnton Rd, Spur 22	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Cartledge Rd	Macon Rd, US 80	Talbot County Line	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Cascade Rd	Green Island Dr	River Rd, SR 219	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Cherokee Av	13th St	Hilton Av	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
County Line Rd	Warm Springs Rd	McKee Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Double Churches Rd	River Rd, SR 219	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Edgewood Rd	Hilton Av	Sue Mack Dr	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Elm Dr	Forrest Rd	Macon Rd, Spur 22	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Forrest Rd	Floyd Rd	Schatulga Rd	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Fortson Rd	Double Churches Rd	Williams Rd	Arterial	18T/30Ft.
Fulton Rd	Macon Rd, US 80	County Line Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Garrett Rd	Yarbrough Rd	Mehaffey Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Green Island Dr	Cascade Rd	Mountainbrook Dr	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Grey Rock Rd	Warm Springs Rd	Harris County Line	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Hancock Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Blackmon Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Hubbard Rd	Whitesville Rd	Fortson Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Jenkins Rd	Fulton Rd	Chattsworth Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Linwood Bl	10th Av	13th Av	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Lynch Rd	Macon Rd, US 80	Yarborough Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Mehaffey Rd	Garrett Rd	Harris County Line	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
McKee Rd	Macon Rd, US 80	County Line Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Midland Rd	Macon Rd, US 80	County Line Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Mobley Rd	River Rd, SR 219	Whitesville Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Mountainbrook Dr	Green Island Dr	River Rd, SR 219	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Northstar Dr	St Marys Rd	Steam Mill Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Old River Rd	River Rd, SR 219	Harris County Line	Collector	18T/30 Ft.

Thru Truck Route	From	To	Street Classification	Restriction
Pierce Chapel Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Warm Springs Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Psalmnd Rd	Beaver Run Rd, US 80	Warm Springs Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Schomburg Rd	Warm Springs Rd	Hancock Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
St Marys Rd	Northstar Dr	Ft Benning Reservation	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Smith Rd	Whitesville Rd	I-185, West Ramps	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Standing Boy Rd	Green Island Dr	Rolling Bend Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Steam Mill Rd	Buena Vista Rd	Pinecrest Dr	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Warm Springs Rd	Manchester Expy, SR 85	Warm Springs Rd Conn.	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Warm Springs Rd	Schomburg Rd	Harris County Line	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
West Britt David Rd	Veterans Pkwy, SR 1	Airport Thwy	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Whitesville Rd	J.R. Allen Pkwy, US 80	Harris County Line	Arterial	18T/30 Ft.
Yarbrough Rd	Lynch Rd	Garrett Rd	Collector	18T/30 Ft.
Dillingham St	Alabama State Line	Front Av	Collector	10T/30 Ft.
Brown Av	Cusseta Rd	Martin Luther King, Jr. Bl	Collector	3T


Rail Infrastructure

Columbus benefits from a robust rail infrastructure, with services provided by Norfolk Southern and CSX. Rail access is crucial for heavy industries and those requiring bulk transportation of materials, offering a cost-effective and reliable mode of transport.

Norfolk Southern and CSX are the two primary Class I railroads operating in the Columbus-Phenix City region, facilitating the movement of goods across the Southeast and beyond. These railroads connect Columbus to major markets in the Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, and Midwest, ensuring efficient freight movement essential for local industries, particularly manufacturing and distribution centers. The Columbus & Chattahoochee Railroad, a short line, provides critical links between local businesses and the larger Class I rail networks. Short lines support regional freight, enabling efficient local distribution and access to national and international markets.


There is currently no passenger rail service in the region. Plans are in development for high-speed rail services, which would further enhance connectivity and reduce travel times between key economic hubs, including Columbus.

There are 308 at-grade and 45 grade-separated crossings in the region. These crossings are distributed across various rail lines operated by major carriers such as Norfolk Southern and CSX, as well as the Columbus & Chattahoochee Railroad short line. These crossings also necessitate significant safety measures and infrastructure maintenance to ensure smooth and secure operations for both rail and vehicular traffic



At-grade rail crossing


Figure 11.5. Rail Network and At-Grade Rail Crossings



- Rail Crossing (At Grade)
- Rail Network
- Municipality
- MPO Boundary
- - - County Boundary
- ▭ State Boundary
- MPO Boundary



Figure 11.6. Rail Network and Separated-Grade Rail Crossings



Truck Traffic

In order to derive truck traffic volumes, Replica database was used to examine truck travel patterns and truck volumes. Replica is a data source driven by mobile applications using anonymized location data from mobile devices to track travel patterns. Daily freight volumes are presented in Figure 11.5 on page 165.

Serving as critical links, the bridges connecting to US 80, US 27, and I-185 are heavily used by freight trucks. High-volume roads often act as main corridors within the transportation network. Efficient operations on these routes help absorb and distribute traffic loads, reducing the risk of widespread congestion and improving overall network resilience.


Key highlights of truck traffic analysis include:

1. The highest freight volumes were observed on US 280 and US 80 with 3600–8500 daily trips.
2. There is significant impact of higher freight volumes around US 280 at US 80 with Phenix City experiencing significant daily truck traffic throughout the city.
3. Summerville Road/Broad Street at West 13th Street experiences a significant truck traffic.
4. US 27, between US 80 and US 280 also experiences significant truck traffic (1800–3500) trucks a day.
5. Near the river, most roads are experiencing daily truck traffic.



A truck uses Warren Williams Drive to access local destination in Columbus

Figure 11.7. Freight Truck Volume



KEY FREIGHT TRUCK CORRIDORS

High volumes of freight traffic on I-185 and US Highways indicate significant use for both long-haul and regional deliveries. The Columbus-Phenix City area handles substantial freight volumes, particularly along major highways and rail lines, highlighting their importance for regional and national freight movement. Key corridors experiencing high traffic volumes are likely to face congestion issues.

I-185

A vital **north-south** interstate that connects Columbus to I-85 near LaGrange, GA. This route is essential for **long-distance freight movement**, linking the region to significant economic centers. The Interstate 185 connection to the larger I-85 corridor enhances north-south freight movement, making I-185 a key route for the region. The interstate supports the transportation needs of various industries, and intersects with several important highways, including US 80 and US 27.

I-185 experiences substantial freight traffic, emphasizing its role as a critical freight corridor. The interstate supports a significant volume of truck traffic, necessitating continuous improvements and maintenance to accommodate heavy freight loads. Investments in road widening, pavement upgrades, and bridge improvements are essential to maintaining the interstate's capacity and reliability.

US 80

An important **east-west** corridor that connects Columbus and Phenix City to other key cities and regions, **facilitating the movement of goods to other significant urban centers in Georgia and Alabama**. US 80 enhances the overall network connectivity and enables efficient distribution of goods, ensuring that local businesses can effectively reach broader markets.

US 80 also sees significant freight traffic volumes due to its importance in regional supply chains. Continuous investments in infrastructure improvements, including road widening and maintenance, ensure that US 80 can handle heavy freight traffic and remain a reliable route for transportation. Efforts to address congestion and bottlenecks along US 80 improve the reliability and efficiency of freight movement. Enhancements such as improved signage, traffic signals, and safety measures help reduce delays and enhance the predictability of deliveries.

US 80 is heavily used by commercial vehicles, including trucks transporting goods to and from distribution centers and warehouses. Continuous investments in infrastructure improvements, such as road widening, resurfacing, and maintenance, ensure that US 80 can accommodate heavy freight traffic and maintain operational efficiency. The highway supports a high volume of freight traffic and is integral to regional logistics, with ongoing investments in infrastructure to maintain its capacity and efficiency.

US 27

Another **north-south** route that supports significant freight traffic between Columbus and other parts of Georgia and Alabama creating **efficient long-distance freight movement**, which is crucial for regional commerce. The highway intersects with major routes such as I-185 and I-85, enhancing the region's accessibility and enabling seamless integration into the broader national freight network

US 27 experiences substantial freight traffic and needs ongoing maintenance and infrastructure improvements to support freight demand. Efforts to address congestion along US 27, including traffic management systems and infrastructure upgrades, help minimize delays and improve the predictability of freight deliveries.

US 280

A major **east-west** transportation route that passes through Columbus. This highway extends from Blitchton, GA, near Savannah, to Birmingham, AL, making it an important link for **interstate travel and commerce**. The highway is also essential for **daily commuter traffic**, linking residential areas with commercial and industrial zones. US 280 is integral to the freight network in Columbus, providing a reliable route for trucks and commercial vehicles.

SR 22

Important for **local and regional distribution**, supporting the movement of goods within the area and connecting to larger interstate systems. It serves as a major east-west route, linking Columbus and Phenix City, and facilitating the movement of goods between these two significant urban areas.

SR 22 handles a significant volume of freight traffic, indicating its importance for regional logistics. The route is extensively used by commercial vehicles, including trucks transporting goods to and from warehouses and distribution centers.

SR 85

Provides essential connections **between local industrial areas and major highways**, ensuring efficient local distribution. This route directly links Georgia and Alabama, enhancing **interstate commerce and supporting cross-border trade** activities between Columbus and Phenix City. The connectivity facilitates the movement of goods between local, regional, and national markets, ensuring the smooth flow of commerce and integration into broader transportation networks. The areas surrounding SR 85 are **home to various industrial parks, manufacturing facilities, and commercial centers**, underscoring its importance for regional economic activity.

Page Intentionally Blank

12

Resiliency

In the context of a MTP, “resiliency” refers to the ability of the transportation system to anticipate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from adverse events. This concept encompasses more than just the physical infrastructure; it also includes the services and operations that are part of the transportation network. Enhancing resiliency in an MTP involves several key components including risk assessment and mitigation strategies.

Risk Assessment

The transportation system in the Columbus-Phenix City area faces a variety of potential risks and hazards from both natural disasters and man-made events. Assessing the vulnerability of the area’s transportation infrastructure and services involves a thorough examination of how these risks could influence various components of the system.

Natural disasters that could impact transportation include flooding, extreme heat, hurricanes, and severe storms and tornadoes. Climate change is intensifying these threats, leading to more frequent and severe weather events that exacerbate risks like

flooding, heat waves, and storms. Although the region is inland, rising sea levels could still indirectly affect transportation by altering upstream river systems and increasing flood risks. The heightened frequency and severity of these events put additional strain on the resilience of transportation infrastructure, necessitating more frequent repairs and maintenance.

The region is particularly vulnerable to flooding due to heavy rainfall, river overflow, and inadequate drainage systems. It is also susceptible to severe thunderstorms and tornadoes, which can cause extensive damage to infrastructure and disrupt transportation services. Additionally,

high temperatures can compromise road surfaces and railway tracks, leading to potential disruptions and escalating maintenance costs.

Man-made events also present significant risks. The area hosts various industrial facilities, making it prone to incidents like chemical spills that can jeopardize transportation infrastructure and public safety. Moreover, the increasing reliance on technology within the transportation system exposes it to vulnerabilities such as cyber-attacks, which could disrupt operations and compromise safety.

Bridges

Bridges maintain connectivity across diverse geographical features like rivers, valleys, and key transportation routes. Regular assessment of their condition is needed to identify necessary maintenance and upgrades, ensuring the transportation network remains uninterrupted.

The National Bridge Inventory (NBI) database was utilized to evaluate the condition of bridges in the Columbus-Phenix City region. According to the Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures final rule, each bridge is assigned a condition rating of Good (G), Fair (F), or Poor (P). This rating is based on the lowest condition rating among the Deck, Superstructure, Substructure, or Culvert components from the most recent inspection. Bridges scoring 7 or higher are classified as Good, those scoring 4 or lower are deemed Poor, and those with scores of 5 or 6 are categorized as Fair.

In the Columbus-Phenix City region, out of 586 bridges, only one is rated as Poor, located on 28th Avenue near US 80. There are 347 bridges rated as Fair, indicating a heightened vulnerability to risks such as structural damage from fast-moving floodwaters and impacts from debris. Additionally, tornadoes and severe storms can particularly damage older or less robust bridge structures.


Bridges in good condition are more capable of withstanding extreme weather events like floods, earthquakes, or hurricanes, without significant damage. This stability is essential not only

for emergency response but also for maintaining critical transportation routes during and after disasters. Well-maintained and robustly designed bridges are also better equipped to handle the increased stresses from climate change, including heavier loads due to more intense and frequent storms, extreme heat, rising temperatures affecting structural materials, and evolving flood risk profiles. After a disaster, a resilient transportation network featuring well-conditioned bridges can recover more swiftly, helping to restore normalcy and mitigate long-term socio-economic impacts.



In the Columbus-Phenix City region, out of 586 bridges, only one is rated as Poor, located on 28th Avenue near US 80.

Figure 12.1. Bridge Condition



Bridge Condition


- Good
- Fair
- Poor

■ Municipality

□ MPO Boundary

- - - County Boundary

▭ State Boundary



Flooding

Flooding in the Columbus-Phenix City area, situated along the Chattahoochee River, can manifest through various mechanisms, heavily influenced by the river, local weather patterns, and the geographical layout of the region. Areas particularly vulnerable to flooding include those at lower elevations near the river or situated within flood plains. The types of flooding experienced here include:

- Riverine Flooding
- Flash Flooding
- Urban Flooding
- Dam and Levee Failures

The Chattahoochee River plays a central role in the region's flood risk. Heavy rainfall upstream can swell the river and cause it to overflow, affecting adjacent areas. Despite the regulation of the river's flow by several dams, including the Walter F. George Lake dam and the West Point Lake dam, extreme weather can still prompt overflow conditions. Smaller creeks and tributaries can overflow during intense rainstorms, contributing to

Floodwaters can erode pavement, weaken structural foundations, and necessitate road closures.

Local flooding. Major creeks in Columbus are:

- Bull Creek: This creek runs through Columbus and is a significant tributary to the Chattahoochee River. It is known for its greenway that provides recreational opportunities.
- Standing Boy Creek: Located in the northern part of Columbus, this creek also drains into the Chattahoochee River. It is surrounded by natural areas that offer outdoor activities.
- Heiferborn Creek: Another important creek in Columbus, contributing to the watershed in the Columbus area
- Mill Creek: This creek flows into the Chattahoochee River and is part of the broader network of streams and creeks that support the local ecology and provide stormwater management
- Upatoi Creek: flows primarily through eastern Columbus and part of a larger watershed.



Flash flooding often results from short, intense periods of rainfall, especially in urban areas where impervious surfaces hinder water absorption, leading to rapid runoff. This swift runoff can quickly inundate streets, overwhelm storm drains, and flood lower-lying areas. If stormwater infrastructure is outdated or poorly maintained, these heavy rains can swiftly exceed the system's capacity, resulting in localized flooding.


Infrastructure such as roads near rivers or in low-lying areas are particularly vulnerable to flooding. Floodwaters can erode pavement, weaken structural foundations, and necessitate road closures. Flooded streets may disrupt bus routes, and transit stations in flood-prone zones could become temporarily inoperative. Railway tracks

near bodies of water are also at risk of flooding and washouts, potentially causing service interruptions and requiring significant repairs.

Though the region is inland, rising sea levels can still amplify flood risks by influencing upstream river systems and water tables, impacting nearby infrastructure. Moreover, while infrequent, the potential for critical dam or levee failures exists, particularly during extreme weather events or due to inadequate maintenance. Such failures could result in catastrophic downstream flooding.

Climate change is poised to worsen these flooding risks further by increasing both the frequency and intensity of storms, leading to more severe and unpredictable flooding patterns.

Figure 12.2. High Risk Flood Areas



Severe Storms and Tornadoes

Severe storms and tornadoes pose significant challenges to the resilience of the Columbus-Phenix City area, affecting everything from infrastructure to emergency services and community preparedness. **Enhancing resilience against these natural disasters involves a multifaceted approach that includes strengthening buildings and transportation networks, improving emergency response capabilities, and fostering community awareness and preparedness.**

High winds and flying debris can severely damage road surfaces, signs, and traffic signals. Tornadoes can obstruct routes by scattering extensive debris, making some paths impassable. Additionally, these powerful winds can derail trains, damage railway tracks, and disrupt signaling systems, severely affecting transportation.

Severe weather can inflict significant damage on residential and commercial structures, as well as critical infrastructure like roads and bridges. High winds are capable of ripping roofs off buildings, uprooting trees, and transforming loose debris into hazardous projectiles. This debris, along with fallen trees, can damage transportation infrastructure, disrupting both vehicle and public transit and complicating evacuation and emergency response efforts.

Moreover, strong winds and debris can break power lines and poles, resulting in widespread and potentially prolonged electricity outages. The economic impact is also substantial; businesses may have to shut down either temporarily or permanently, causing economic strain and job losses.

Extreme Heat

Extended periods of extreme heat can significantly impact transportation infrastructure and operations. In such conditions, asphalt can soften and expand, leading to the formation of ruts and potholes, while concrete pavements may also expand, causing buckling or cracking as they push against each other. Similarly, the expansion joints in concrete roads and bridges can fail under high temperatures, potentially causing structural damage or misalignment over time. Rail tracks are particularly susceptible to extreme heat, which can cause them to expand and distort, forming what are known as “sun kinks.” These distortions significantly increase the risk of derailments and often necessitate speed

restrictions or temporary track closures for safety repairs.

The comfort and safety of passengers and staff can also be compromised in high temperatures, possibly resulting in decreased ridership and presenting operational challenges. Furthermore, the increased temperatures can escalate the risk of tire blowouts, especially for heavy vehicles or those traveling at high speeds, as the hot roads can exacerbate tire wear and failure.

Overall, high temperatures not only lead to deterioration in road quality but also pose safety risks in rail and road transport, requiring increased maintenance and vigilant monitoring to mitigate these effects.

Hurricanes

Though Columbus-Phenix City is not directly on the hurricane path due to its inland location, the remnants of hurricanes and tropical storms from the Gulf of Mexico can still significantly impact the area with heavy rains and potential flooding. By the time these remnants reach Columbus-Phenix City, while the winds are not at their peak, they remain strong enough to cause structural damage, fell trees, and disrupt electrical lines. Additionally, as hurricanes move inland, they can generate tornadoes. These, typically less intense, tornadoes can nevertheless inflict considerable damage and pose serious risks.

During hurricanes, the demand for emergency services significantly increases, putting considerable pressure on local resources. Proper preparation is essential to manage

these situations effectively. This includes strengthening emergency response systems and ensuring that evacuation routes and shelters are clearly established and well-known to residents. Additionally, those living in flood-prone areas may be required to evacuate, which can lead to temporary displacement and necessitates access to sufficient sheltering options.

Although the Columbus-Phenix City region is not directly on the coast and thus less vulnerable to the full brunt of hurricanes, the area has proactive measures in place, including designated hurricane evacuation routes (Figure 12.3 on page 177). On the west side of the Chattahoochee River, the evacuation route includes taking US 431 to US 280 and heading northeast on US 280 to US 27 in Columbus.


Man-made Events

The Columbus-Phenix City region, like any urban area, is vulnerable to a variety of man-made events that can test its resilience. The area's **industrial facilities pose significant risks, such as chemical spills, which can impact water bodies, land, and air quality.** Chemical spill incidents on major roadways not only lead to closures but also necessitate extensive hazardous material cleanup and carry the risk of long-term environmental contamination. Additionally, the region's railway lines

are prone to significant accidents that can cause extensive disruptions and potentially dangerous spills of hazardous materials.

With the increasing dependence on digital infrastructure, **the threat of cyber attacks looms larger, capable of crippling essential services including transportation networks, power grids, and communication systems.** Although less common, the potential for terrorist attacks targeting public spaces or critical infrastructure can be a serious security concern.

Figure 12.3. Evacuation Routes



Preparedness and Mitigation Strategies

To mitigate the risks associated with natural disasters, Columbus-Phenix City must continue to invest in comprehensive flood management strategies. This includes enhancing stormwater systems, maintaining dams and levees, stabilizing riverbanks, and enforcing stringent land use planning in areas prone to flooding. Additionally, community awareness and preparedness programs are vital to minimize the human and economic impacts when floods occur.

Building resilience against severe storms and tornadoes is also critical for the region. This can be achieved by implementing building codes that require tornado-resistant features for new constructions and retrofitting existing buildings. Developing and maintaining advanced meteorological

tracking and warning systems will provide timely information to residents and businesses, enabling them to prepare effectively for severe weather. Strengthening local emergency response capabilities, including the rapid deployment of rescue teams and clear disaster response protocols, is crucial for an effective emergency response. Additionally, established debris management strategies can speed up cleanup and recovery efforts, helping to restore normalcy more quickly.

For infrastructure improvements, it is essential to propose upgrades and reinforcements for critical infrastructure to withstand identified risks. Urban heat can be reduced by planting more trees and creating parks, as well as by installing green roofs and walls on buildings. Using

paving materials that reflect more sunlight and absorb less heat can lower surface and ambient air temperatures. It's also necessary to integrate climate resilience into all levels of planning and policy-making, focusing on adapting to and mitigating the effects of extreme heat. Offering incentives like tax breaks or grants for building renovations that incorporate cooling features can further support these efforts.

To protect against man-made risks, strengthening cybersecurity protocols is essential. This includes conducting regular security audits and training personnel in cybersecurity best practices to safeguard sensitive data and critical operations. Through these combined efforts, Columbus-Phenix City can enhance its resilience to both natural and man-made challenges.



Well-maintained levees provide a layer of defense between flooding and transportation infrastructure.

13

Revenues and Funding Sources

Introduction

This section overviews potential funding sources at the federal, state, and local levels that could be utilized for transportation infrastructure improvements in the Columbus-Phenix City region. Its purpose is to be informative and facilitate decision-making by equipping stakeholders with the knowledge needed to access and leverage financial resources. This information will provide the baseline for developing the overall work program for the 2050 C-PCTS MPO MTP.

Federal Funding Sources and Grant Programs

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 focuses on safety, resilience, carbon reduction, bridges, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, reconnecting communities, and wildlife crossings.

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

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM (NHS) FUNDS

These funds are closely tied to GDOT's performance targets for the statewide NHS network. Consequently, they are often directed towards major interstate facilities.

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 of Federal-aid funds in highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a state's asset management plan for the NHS².

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. It now allows states to use up to 30% of funds on freight intermodal 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.

¹ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/docs/BIL_overview_update_2022-11-8b.pdf

² NHPP - Federal-aid Programs - Federal-aid Programs and Special Funding - Federal Highway Administration (dot.gov)

HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP)

Allows for non-infrastructure safety projects such as those related to emergency services and safe routes to schools for funding, as well as 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 annual set-aside will be \$245 million from FY 2022 through FY 2026³.

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.

PROMOTING, RESILIENT OPERATIONS FOR TRANSFORMATIVE, EFFICIENT, AND COST-SAVING TRANSPORTATION (PROTECT)

A newly introduced formula program administered by FHWA, PROTECT focuses on promoting resilience planning, community resilience, evacuation routes, and improvements to at-risk coastal infrastructure. It offers a higher federal share if the state develops a resilience improvement plan incorporated into its long-range transportation plan.

NATIONAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE FORMULA PROGRAM (NEVI)

Another recently introduced FHWA formula program, this initiative seeks to deploy EV charging infrastructure and establish an interconnected network to facilitate data collection, access, and reliability. Eligibility for these funds is contingent on GDOT's plan submission outlining fund allocation and the designation of alternative fuel corridors.

CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM

Administered by FHWA, these funds are allocated to GDOT on a lump-sum basis for projects that support the reduction of transportation emissions, including bicycle and pedestrian projects and electric vehicle charging stations.

³ [Railway Highway Crossing Program Overview | FHWA \(dot.gov\)](#)

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

SAFE STREETS AND ROADS FOR ALL (SS4A)

This program 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.

NATIONAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) FORMULA PROGRAM - DISCRETIONARY

Under the BIL, a portion of this program's funding (10%) is designated for discretionary grants to state and local governments requiring additional assistance to strategically deploy EV charging infrastructure.

CHARGING AND FUELING INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

This discretionary initiative aims to deploy EV charging and alternative fueling infrastructure along designated alternative fuel corridors, in communities, or in public locations such as parks, schools, and public parking facilities. To utilize this program, corridors must first be designated as alternative fuels corridors, and a process for redesignating these corridors must be in place. Eligible projects include the acquisition and installation of publicly accessible EV charging or alternative fueling infrastructure, operating assistance for the first five years post-installation, and the acquisition and installation of traffic control devices.

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 GRANTS

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.

COMMUNITY BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GRANT (CBDG) PROGRAM

This grant provides communities with resources to address a wide range of unique community development needs, including transportation infrastructure improvements.

State Funding Sources and Grant Programs

This section highlights state funding programs available for transportation projects for Georgia and Alabama available through the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) and Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT), respectively.

GEORGIA

The state of Georgia also features numerous opportunities for the C-PCTS MPO to pursue funding for transportation infrastructure projects. Potential state revenue sources, competitive GDOT funding programs, and relevant policies are listed below.

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.

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 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.

ALABAMA

ALDOT also offers grant programs that could be used for funding projects on the Alabama side of the C-PCTS MPO. They include:

ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (ATRIP)

This is an ALDOT that allows for municipalities and counties to submit for transportation projects of local interest on the state-maintained highway system, which may also include work on local roads essential to the proper functioning of the project on the state road. Projects of local interest on the state-maintained highway system shall include improvements benefiting the state highway system with an emphasis on the economic growth, public safety, and stability of this state. ATRIP-II is an annual program providing not less than \$30,000,000 and not more than \$50,000,000 of project funding, with the final amount each year determined by the Director of ALDOT. The maximum funding amount to be provided to an individual project under ATRIP-II in FY 2024 shall be \$2,000,000. The Total ATRIP-II funds to be allocated in FY 2024 is programmed to be \$40,000,000.

ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE BANK (ATIB)

Assists in financing major qualified projects by providing loans to government units for constructing and improving highway and transportation facilities necessary for public purposes. Projects are rated by the level of local support, benefits, the ability of the applicant to repay the loan, and economic development potential. The minimum amount of an ATIB loan is \$1 million.

ALABAMA CONTINUED

REBUILD ALABAMA ANNUAL (RAA) GRANT PROGRAM

This is a competitive grant program eligible for local governments for improvements to any classified public road or bridge owned and maintained by the applicant that is open to public traffic. \$10 million of the FY 2024 allocation will be awarded with no local match required. The maximum amount of funding that can be requested per project with no match required will be \$250,000.

INDUSTRIAL ACCESS PROGRAM

Industrial access funds are intended to provide adequate public access for eligible projects that provide access to major industrial sites committed to new investment and the creation of new jobs. The new access must be on public right-of-way, must allow normal public use, and must comply with standards for design and construction accompanying the use of state funds. The project sponsor will assume maintenance responsibilities for the completed facility consistent with the use of state funds, unless the improvements occur on facilities currently maintained by the state.

LOCAL ROADWAY SAFETY INITIATIVE

This initiative is available to cities and counties for both rural and urban non-state maintained roadways with significant safety risks. Applications submitted through this initiative must be in accordance with the most recent Alabama Strategic Highway Safety Plan and applicable Local Road Safety Plans if one has been developed by the county that the location falls within. Project applications will be accepted for projects designed to reduce the number of fatal and serious injury lane departure and run-off-road crashes and prioritized in descending order:

- Projects designed to reduce the potential of drivers leaving their lane.
- Projects designed to reduce the potential of a crash in the event a driver does leave their lane.
- Projects designed to minimize the severity of a crash in the event that a crash does occur.

Local Funding Sources

GEORGIA

There are two primary local sources that fund transportation improvements in the Georgia portion of the MPO:

LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX (LOST)

An additional 1-cent sales tax levied by jurisdictions upon approval by public referendum. Typically, a portion of a local jurisdiction's LOST is used to fund transportation improvements. A LOST program must include a specific list of projects to be completed using the revenues.

SPECIAL LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX (SPLOST) FROM THE TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT ACT (TIA)

The Transportation Investment Act (TIA) was passed in July 2012 by voters in the River Valley region. The tax provides a one percent regional sales tax to fund a specific list of projects.

ALABAMA

The jurisdictions of Phenix City, Smiths Station, Lee County, and Russell County contribute various funds that primarily match the federal and discretionary programs administered by ALDOT.

Projected Federal, State, and Local Funding for Transportation


The following section describes the set revenue sources for transportation funding in the Columbus-Phenix City region. Georgia and Alabama have different funding levels for improvements.

GEORGIA

The primary revenue sources assumed for transportation funding within the Georgia portion of the MPO are as follows:

- **GDOT Formula Funding**—An estimate of federal formula funds projected for the Georgia portion of the C-PCTS MPO region.
- **GDOT Transportation Alternative Program**—The allocated funding to the C-PCTS MPO through 2027 from this program.
- **GDOT Carbon Reduction Program Funds**—The allocated funding to the C-PCTS MPO through 2027 from this program.
- **The Columbus-Muscogee Local Option Sales Tax (LOST)**—The amount of the local option sales tax allocated for transportation improvements.
- **The TIA SPLOST**—Revenues anticipated from the SPLOST through 2033 allocated for specific projects in the TIA work program.

2025-2050 GDOT FORMULA FUNDING PROJECTIONS



GDOT FORMULA FUNDING

The projected formula funds between 2025 and 2050 Columbus funding projections estimate a total of **\$966,079,669**, with **\$902,067,260** allocated for projects and **\$64,012,409** for maintenance. The projections account for a 2% annual growth rate during the IIJA/BIL period (through 2025), tapering to 1% after 2026. Section 15 contains further details on the allocation of these formula funds to specific project types (roadway, active transportation, etc.).

Table 13.1. *GDOT Formula Funding 2025-2050 C-PCTS MPO Funding Projections*

Year	Projects Estimate	Maintenance Estimate	Total Estimate
2025	\$30,250,826	\$2,167,819	\$32,418,645
2026	\$30,868,189	\$2,189,716	\$33,057,906
2027	\$31,176,871	\$2,211,613	\$33,388,485
2028	\$31,488,640	\$2,233,729	\$33,722,370
2029	\$31,803,526	\$2,256,067	\$34,059,593
2030	\$32,121,562	\$2,278,627	\$34,400,189
2031	\$32,442,777	\$2,301,414	\$34,744,191
2032	\$32,767,205	\$2,324,428	\$35,091,633
2033	\$33,094,877	\$2,347,672	\$35,442,549
2034	\$33,425,826	\$2,371,149	\$35,796,975
2035	\$33,760,084	\$2,394,860	\$36,154,945
2036	\$34,097,685	\$2,418,809	\$36,516,494
2037	\$34,438,662	\$2,442,997	\$36,881,659
2038	\$34,783,049	\$2,467,427	\$37,250,476
2039	\$35,130,879	\$2,492,101	\$37,622,980
2040	\$35,482,188	\$2,517,022	\$37,999,210
2041	\$35,837,010	\$2,542,192	\$38,379,202
2042	\$36,195,380	\$2,567,614	\$38,762,994
2043	\$36,557,334	\$2,593,291	\$39,150,624
2044	\$36,922,907	\$2,619,223	\$39,542,130
2045	\$37,292,136	\$2,645,416	\$39,937,552
2046	\$37,665,057	\$2,671,870	\$40,336,927
2047	\$38,041,708	\$2,698,589	\$40,740,296
2048	\$38,422,125	\$2,725,574	\$41,147,699
2049	\$38,806,346	\$2,752,830	\$41,559,176
2050	\$39,194,410	\$2,780,358	\$41,974,768
TOTAL	\$902,067,260	\$64,012,409	\$966,079,669

GDOT TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM (TAP)

Per information provided by GDOT, the C-PCTS MPO has **\$4,710,486** of these funds available through 2027, with **\$3,428,642** needing to be authorized by 2025. The remaining funds were allocated evenly in 2026 and 2027. These funds have been incorporated into the MTP work program for active transportation projects. The estimated funding from the GDOT TAP program is presented in Table 13.2.

Table 13.2. *GDOT TAP Funding*

Year	GDOT	Local	Total
2025	\$3,428,642	\$857,161	\$4,285,803
2026	\$640,922	\$160,231	\$801,153
2027	\$640,922	\$160,231	\$801,153
TOTAL	\$4,710,486	\$1,177,622	\$5,888,108

GDOT CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM (CRP)

Per information provided by GDOT, the C-PCTS MPO has **\$1,581,234** available through 2027, with **\$523,069** needing to be authorized by 2025. The remaining funds were allocated evenly in 2026 and 2027. These funds have been incorporated into the MTP work program to develop an EV infrastructure plan for the C-PCTS MPO and active transportation on projects. The estimated funding from the GDOT CRP program is presented in Table 13.3.

Table 13.3. *GDOT CRP Funding*

Year	GDOT	Local	Total
2025	\$523,069	\$130,767	\$653,836.25
2026	\$529,083	\$132,271	\$661,353.13
2027	\$529,083	\$132,271	\$661,353.13
TOTAL	\$1,581,234	\$395,309	\$1,976,543

LOST FUNDING

Based on input from the Columbus Consolidated Government, the LOST is anticipated to contribute **\$25,000,000** to transportation projects through the year 2050. For programming purposes, it was assumed that \$1 million per year would be received from 2026-2050.

TIA FUNDING

Based on information provided by the Columbus Consolidated Government, the breakdown of available TIA funding through 2033 by project type is shown in Table 13.4.

Table 13.4. *TIA Funding*

Category	Funding
Roadway	\$192,039,348
Active Transportation	\$48,140,000
Maintenance	\$12,500,000
TOTAL	\$252,679,348

ALABAMA

The primary revenue sources for transportation projects are ALDOT funding and a combination of different funding sources from local governments to match these funds. Funding from three programs are allocated to the Alabama portion of the C-PCTS MPO.

- **ALDOT Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds**—An estimate of STP formula funds projected for the Georgia portion of the C-PCTS MPO region.
- **ALDOT Transportation Alternative Program**—The allocated funding to the C-PCTS MPO through 2027 from this program.
- **ALDOT Carbon Reduction Program Funds**—The allocated funding to the C-PCTS MPO through 2027 from this program.

ALDOT STP FUNDS

ALDOT provided the STP funds allocated to the C-PCTS MPO from 2024–2025. Table 13.5 summarizes these sources along with the assumed local match. Given these totals, it is assumed that **\$212,426,856** from the STP program, which includes **\$42,485,371** of local match funds, will be available to fund transportation improvements within the Alabama portion of the C-PCTS MPO through 2050.

2025-2050 ALDOT STP FUNDING PROJECTIONS




Table 13.5. 2024-2050 ALDOT Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding Projections for the C-PCTS MPO

Year	ALDOT	Local Match	Total Estimate
2024	\$6,073,608	\$1,518,402	\$7,592,010
2025	\$5,528,464	\$1,382,116	\$6,910,580
2026	\$3,798,181	\$949,545	\$4,747,726
2027	\$4,270,228	\$1,067,557	\$5,337,785
2028	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2029	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2030	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2031	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2032	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2033	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2034	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2035	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2036	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2037	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2038	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2039	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2040	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2041	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2042	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2043	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2044	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2045	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2046	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2047	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2048	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2049	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
2050	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
TOTAL	\$169,941,485	\$42,485,371	\$212,426,856

ALDOT TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM

Per information provided by ALDOT, the C-PCTS MPO has **\$1,664,064** of these funds available through 2027. With a local match, this program presents an additional **\$1,996,877** for active transportation projects through 2027. Because of carryover from previous years, \$1,040,280 of funding is available in 2024. The remaining funds were allocated evenly from 2025 through 2027. The estimated funding from the GDOT TAP program is presented in Table 13.6.

Table 13.6. ALDOT TAP Funding

Year	ALDOT	Local	Total
2024	\$1,040,280	\$208,056	\$1,248,336
2025	\$207,928	\$41,586	\$249,514
2026	\$207,928	\$41,586	\$249,514
2027	\$207,928	\$41,586	\$249,514
TOTAL	\$1,664,064	\$332,813	\$1,996,877

ALDOT CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM (CRP)

Per information provided by ALDOT, the C-PCTS MPO has \$1,247,839 available through 2027. The remaining funds were allocated evenly in 2026 and 2027. These funds have been allocated for active transportation projects. The estimated funding from the ALDOT TAP program is presented Table 13.7.

Table 13.7. ALDOT CRP Funding

Year	GDOT	Local	Total
2025	\$523,069	\$130,767	\$653,836.25
2026	\$529,083	\$132,271	\$661,353.13
2027	\$529,083	\$132,271	\$661,353.13
TOTAL	\$1,581,234	\$395,309	\$1,976,543

Transit Funding

In order to project funding levels for transit service throughout the region through 2050, historical data from the two agencies responsible for transit service, METRA and Lee-Russell Council of Governments, was requested. The following is a summary of these sources.

METRA

Starting in FY2024, the Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study details funding for transportation improvements in the Georgia portion (METRA) through FY2027. Projected revenues for 2027-2050 are estimated by applying a 2% annual growth rate to each funding source.

The program encompasses federal, state, and local sources:

FEDERAL FUNDING

Includes contributions from Title 49 U.S.C. Section 5307, with additional support from Sections 5303, 5339, and one-time allocations from ARPA and CDS/TIG-Community Project.

STATE MATCH

Primarily from the Transit Trust Fund Program.

LOCAL MATCH

Comprises city funds invested in capital, planning, and operating costs.

Table 13.8. METRA Funding Projections 2024-2050

Year	Federal	State	Local	Total Estimate
2024	\$7,881,380	\$765,253	\$3,753,858	\$ 12,400,491
2025	\$2,369,835	\$17,591	\$2,728,728	\$5,116,154
2026	\$2,937,861	\$17,591	\$2,978,427	\$5,933,879
2027	\$3,050,206	\$17,943	\$3,166,732	\$6,234,881
2028	\$3,111,210	\$18,302	\$3,230,066	\$6,359,578
2029	\$3,173,434	\$18,668	\$3,294,668	\$6,486,770
2030	\$3,236,903	\$19,041	\$3,360,561	\$6,616,505
2031	\$3,301,641	\$19,422	\$3,427,772	\$6,748,835
2032	\$3,367,674	\$19,810	\$3,496,328	\$6,883,812
2033	\$3,435,027	\$20,207	\$3,566,254	\$7,021,488
2034	\$3,503,728	\$20,611	\$3,637,579	\$7,161,918
2035	\$3,573,802	\$21,023	\$3,710,331	\$7,305,156
2036	\$3,645,278	\$21,443	\$3,784,538	\$7,451,259
2037	\$3,718,184	\$21,872	\$3,860,228	\$7,600,285
2038	\$3,792,548	\$22,310	\$3,937,433	\$7,752,290
2039	\$3,868,399	\$22,756	\$4,016,182	\$7,907,336
2040	\$3,945,767	\$23,211	\$4,096,505	\$8,065,483
2041	\$4,024,682	\$23,675	\$4,178,435	\$8,226,792
2042	\$4,105,176	\$24,149	\$4,262,004	\$8,391,328
2043	\$4,187,279	\$24,632	\$4,347,244	\$8,559,155
2044	\$4,271,025	\$25,124	\$4,434,189	\$8,730,338
2045	\$4,356,445	\$25,627	\$4,522,873	\$8,904,945
2046	\$4,443,574	\$26,139	\$4,613,330	\$9,083,044
2047	\$4,532,446	\$26,662	\$4,705,597	\$9,264,705
2048	\$4,623,095	\$27,195	\$4,799,709	\$9,449,999
2049	\$4,715,556	\$27,739	\$4,895,703	\$9,638,999
2050	\$4,809,868	\$28,294	\$4,993,617	\$9,831,779
TOTAL	\$105,982,022	\$1,346,289	\$105,798,892	\$213,127,203

Based on this projection, it is assumed that **\$213,127,203** will be available to fund transit operations within METRA's service area through 2050.

LEE-RUSSELL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (LRCOG)

No funding data was available from the LRCOG at the time of this report. However, within its Transportation Development Plan (TDP) completed in September 2023 indicated the annual costs for operating the current PEX system was \$420,976. While an alternative service option for PEX that would reduce the annual cost to \$193,474 (a \$227,502 reduction) was recommended, that service option has not yet been implemented. Therefore, it is assumed that the LRCOG will continue to fund the current service option through 2050. Assuming a 2% increase in costs annually from 2023, an estimate of these costs is provided in Table 13.9. As shown, a total of **\$15,176,694** is estimated to be needed to maintain the current PEX service through 2050.

Table 13.9. PEX Funding Projections 2024-2050

Year	Funding
2024	\$429,396
2025	\$437,983
2026	\$446,743
2027	\$455,678
2028	\$464,792
2029	\$474,087
2030	\$483,569
2031	\$493,240
2032	\$503,105
2033	\$513,167
2034	\$523,431
2035	\$533,899
2036	\$544,577
2037	\$555,469
2038	\$566,578
2039	\$577,910
2040	\$589,468
2041	\$601,257
2042	\$613,283
2043	\$625,548
2044	\$638,059
2045	\$650,820
2046	\$663,837
2047	\$677,113
2048	\$690,656
2049	\$704,469
2050	\$718,558
TOTAL	\$15,176,694

Page Intentionally Blank

14

**Project
Identification &
Prioritization**

Introduction

This section outlines the process for identifying and prioritizing capacity, operational, and active transportation projects. The goal of project identification and prioritization is to create a list of impactful projects across the region from a number of sources and provide general order for implementation.

Project Identification Process

Projects were identified through several sources and analyses, including:

- **2045 MTP**—Projects from the previous MTP were assessed for inclusion in this 2050 update.
- **GDOT/ALDOT Work Program**—Projects in the current GDOT work program.
- **TIA Projects**—Projects currently funded in the TIA program.
- **Congestion Management Process (CMP) Analysis**—The analysis of bottlenecks (travel time delays) and safety hot spots identified key operational improvements.
- **2050 E+C Travel Demand Model results**—Potential capacity projects were identified through modeling results that projected congestion conditions (LOS F).
- **Active Transportation Projects**—Complete Streets and needed sidewalk connections were identified through the Active Transportation needs analysis (detailed in Section 8).
- **Project solicitation from member governments**—Projects submitted from local governments via a form created by the MTP project team.

Table 14.1. Project Types by Identification Method

		GDOT/ALDOT WORK PROGRAM	TIA (GA ONLY)	CMP ANALYSIS	CAPACITY ANALYSIS	ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS	PROJECT SOLICITATION
 ROADWAY		●	●	●	●		
 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION		●	●			●	
 MAINTENANCE		●					●
 EV PROJECTS		●					
 SPECIAL STUDIES		●				●	

It should be noted that projects in the GDOT, ALDOT, and TIA work programs with dedicated funding were not subject to the prioritization process detailed in the following sections.

Project Prioritization Process

CAPACITY AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIZATION

With a number of capacity and operational project recommendations throughout the region, prioritization of projects helps to determine a general order of project implementation. While the prioritization results suggest the order in which to implement projects to maximize the benefit to the region, the prioritization process is meant to be an advisory process to inform decision-makers on how to develop their work program.

PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK

Capacity and operational projects were scored based on eight criteria related to existing and future roadway characteristics in order to understand the potential benefit of each project's implementation. The chosen criteria utilize data focus on roadway functioning, safety, and equity. The possible points within each criteria varied, with the lowest score of each being 0 and the highest possible score shown in the table below. Scores for each criteria were summed to create a total prioritization score for each project.


TIA projects were not scored in the prioritization model because they are already programmed to be complete.

Table 14.2. Project Types by Identification Method

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	HIGHEST POSSIBLE SCORE
 PROJECT STATUS	Scores given to projects that have recent or continuous funding	5
 SAFETY	Scores given to projects based on the top 20 high crash cluster locations	5
 V/C RATIO	Scores given to projects based on the results of the Future (2050 E+C) Model	5
 TRANSPORTATION EQUITY	Scores given to projects supporting investment in historically disadvantaged communities and roadways with existing transit service in these areas	5
 EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES	Scores given based on existing AADT volumes	5
 FUTURE YEAR TRAFFIC VOLUMES	Scores given based on volumes reported in the Existing plus Committed Model Network	3
 FREIGHT NETWORK	Scores given based on existing truck traffic volumes.	5
 CONGESTION REDUCTION	Project includes bottleneck or unreliable location identified in CMP	5

Figure 14.1. Capacity Prioritization Results Map

CAPACITY PRIORITIZATION RESULTS



Only new roadway projects identified through the MTP and those carried forward from the previous MTP were subject to the prioritization exercise.


Table 14.3. Capacity Projects Prioritization Scoring

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Description	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score
					Project Status	V/C Ratio	Safety	Transportation Equity	Existing AADT	Future Traffic Volumes	Freight Network	Congestion Reduction	
GC-2	US 80 Widening	GA 22 Connector	Bradley Park Dr	Widen from 4 - 6 Lanes	0	5	4	3	5	5	5	0	27
GC-3	River Rd Widening	Mountainbrook Dr	Bradley Park Dr	Widen 2 to 4 lanes	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	6
GC-4	54th Street Widening	GA 219	I-185	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	0	3	5	5	3	5	0	5	26
GC-5	Whitesville Rd Widening	Bradely Park Dr	US 27	Widen from 4 - 6 Lanes	0	3	4	5	3	3	0	0	18
GC-6	Blackmmon Rd Widening	Access Rd N	Warm Springs Rd	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	6
GC-7	Reese Rd Widening	Gentian Blvd	Primrose Rd	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	9
GC-8	Military Drive New Roadway	Infantry Drive	Hampton Inn	New 2-lane roadway from Infantry Drive to Hampton Inn	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
GC-9	St. Mary's Road Widening	Robin Road	Northstar Drive	Widening from 2 to 4 lanes.	3	5	3	5	3	5	0	0	24
GC-10	CR 2228 / Buena Vista Road Widening	Lindon Circle	Floyd Road	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes. Project would add a raised median and sidewalk along Buena Vista Road from Linden Lane to Floyd Road. Operational and safety improvements would be developed at all intersections.	0	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	25
GC-11	Miller Road Widening	Warm Springs Road	Macon Rd	Widen from 2 to 3 or 4 lanes from Warms Springs to Macon Rd.	3	3	3	3	0	3	0	0	15
GC-12	Whittlesey Road Widening	Whitesville Road	Bradley Park Road	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.	3	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	9
AC-1	River Chase Dr Widening	Summerville Rd	US 80	Widen 2 to 4 lanes	0	5	0	0	3	3	0	0	11

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Description	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score
					Project Status	V/C Ratio	Safety	Transportation Equity	Existing AADT	Future Traffic Volumes	Freight Network	Congestion Reduction	
AC-2	South Railroad Street Widening	18th Ave	Lakewood Dr	Split Into 3 Segments - widen to 4 lanes	0	3	3	3	0	3	0	0	12
AC-3	Summerville Rd/Broad St Improvements	Railroad St	13th Street	Capacity Improvement Needed	0	0	3	3	3	5	0	0	14
AC-4	Lee Road 430/Opelika Road Widening	Stafford Road/Cute Rate Road	US 80/280 Bypass	Widen 2 to 4 lanes	0	5	3	3	3	3	0	3	20
AC-5	US 431 Widening	5th St	US 280	Widen from 4 - 6 Lanes	0	3	0	5	5	5	3	0	21
AC-6	US 80 Improvements	Summerville Rd	GA 22 Connector	Split Into 2 Segments - Capacity Improvement	0	5	0	3	5	5	5	0	23

Figure 14.2. Operational Prioritization Results Map

OPERATIONAL PRIORITIZATION RESULTS



Only new roadway projects identified through the MTP and those carried forward from the previous MTP were subject to the prioritization exercise.

Table 14.4. Operational Projects Prioritization Scoring

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Description	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score
					Project Status	V/C Ratio	Safety	Transportation Equity	Existing AADT	Future Traffic Volumes	Freight Network	Congestion Reduction	
GO-9	US 80 at Bradley Park Dr Ramp Improvements	US 80	Bradley Park Dr	Interchange Modification	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	8
GO-10	Buena Vista Road at 13th Street Improvements	Buena Vista Road	13th Street	Restripe NB shared thru and right to be shared thru and left. Reconfigure existing WB thru as WB to SB left and shared thru. Replace existing signal heads and retime signal. Conduct engineering traffic study to identify potential alternative intersection design solution: One potential option might include a quadrant intersection design utilizing Warren Williams Road, Relocate NB to EB right turns and WB to SB left turns to Warren Williams Road and 13th Street intersection.	0	0	5	5	3	3	0	5	21
GO-11	US-27 at Airport Thruway/54th Street Improvements	US-27	Airport Thruway / 54th Street	Reconfigure existing WB thru as WB to SB left and shared thru. Replace existing signal heads and retime signal. Long Term Consideration (ROW Impacts should be anticipated): Reconfigure EB and WB approaches to add additional lanes, Dual WB to SB left, Separate EB to SB right from EB thru	0	0	0	5	3	3	0	5	16

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Description	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score
					Project Status	V/C Ratio	Safety	Transportation Equity	Existing AADT	Future Traffic Volumes	Freight Network	Congestion Reduction	
GO-12	Shatluga Road at Corporate Ridge Parkway Improvements	Shatluga Road	Corporate Ridge Parkway	Conduct traffic study and revisit original intent for constructing roundabout. Conduct outreach to employers to begin or expand demand management strategies such as carpooling or transit vouchers. Survey existing transit riders to identify potential service improvements to increase ridership.	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	5	13
GO-13	Technology Pkwy at US 80/ Macon Road Improvements	Technology Pkwy	US 80/ Macon Road	Continue monitoring location to evaluate future needs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
GO-13	Farr Road Improvements	Old Cusseta Road	St. Marys Road	Widen from 2 to 3 lanes	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	9
GO-15	US 80 at River Rd Ramp Improvements	US 80	River Rd	Interchange Modification	0	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	8
GO-17	US 80 at I-185 Ramp Improvements	US 80	I-185	Interchange Modification	0	5	0	0	3	3	0	0	11
GO-20	Woodruff Farm Road New Roadway	Miller Road	Milgen Road	New 4 lane roadway	0	0	3	3	3	3	0	0	12
GO-21	Warm Springs Rd Connector Improvements	Milgen Road and Miller Road	Warm Springs Rd	Interchange Modification	0	0	1	5	3	5	0	5	19
GO-23	Passing Lanes on SR 26	Passing Lanes on SR 26 from SR 1/SR 520 to Marion County at 2 Locations	SR1/SR520	Marion County	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	6

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Description	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score
					Project Status	V/C Ratio	Safety	Transportation Equity	Existing AADT	Future Traffic Volumes	Freight Network	Congestion Reduction	
GO-24	US 80 at US 27 Ramp Improvements	US 80	US 27	Interchange Modification	0	3	5	0	3	3	5	0	19
GO-25	US 80 at GA 22 Ramp Improvements	US 80	GA 22	Interchange Modification	0	0	1	3	0	3	5	0	12
GO-26	US 27 at Lindsey Creek Pkwy Ramp Improvements	US 27	Lindsey Creek Pkwy	Interchange Modification	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	0	13
AO-1	US 280 at US 80 Improvements	US 80	US 280	Interchange Modification	0	0	5	5	5	5	3	3	26
AO-2	US 280 at General Colin Powell Pkwy Ramp Improvements	US 280	General Colin Powell Pkwy	Interchange Modification	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	6
AO-3	5th Avenue Improvements	Airport Road	22nd Street	Identify streetscaping and neighborhood traffic calming measures to deter pass through and regional traffic. Install multimodal infrastructure for safe pedestrian and bicyclist access.	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	8
AO-4	US-280 North Off Ramp Improvements	Broad Street Extension	Seale Road	Conduct Traffic Study of the Off Ramp Connector and 4th Place. Potential options may include Dual-roundabout configuration at US 280 ramps, One-way pair configuration for Off Ramp and 4th Place	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	8
AO-5	US 80 at SR 61 Ramp/ Summerville Rd Improvements	US 80	SR 61 / Summerville Rd	Interchange Modification	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	8

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Description	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score
					Project Status	V/C Ratio	Safety	Transportation Equity	Existing AADT	Future Traffic Volumes	Freight Network	Congestion Reduction	
AO-6	Brickyard Road Improvements	Dillingham Street	South Of Fontaine Rd	Conduct origin-destination study of truck traffic based on land uses and high truck traffic. Conduct traffic study at Dillingham intersection to determine turning movements. Consider operational restrictions at Dillingham intersection to eliminate thru movement from Brickyard into Courthouse Parking Lot and left turn onto Dillingham. Re-route NB left turning traffic at Dillingham to use 7th Street to access Broad Street. Would require upgrades and enhancements to 7th Street.	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	5	11
AO-7	US 80 at River Chase Dr Ramp Improvements	US 80	River Chase Dr	Interchange Modification	0	5	3	0	0	3	0	0	11

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Corridors that were identified as best candidates for Complete Streets were prioritized to understand priority projects that can provide the greatest benefit through implementation. While all of these projects are important, this tiered system provides the MPO a baseline for priorities to be considered for upcoming Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Action Plans for both Columbus and Phenix City as well as the Columbus Trails and Sidewalk Master Plan.

The active transportation results presented in this section serve to inform the development of the MTP work program following the completion of local planning efforts, including the Columbus Trails and Sidewalks Study, Columbus Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Action Plan, and the Phenix City Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Action Plan.

PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK

Eight prioritization criteria were determined to score corridors, each worth one point, giving a max score of eight points. The graphic at right lists each scoring criteria with a description of the threshold that resulted in a one point score. The highest scoring roadways were identified as priority or Tier 1 corridors for Complete Street improvements. The lower scoring roadways were identified as Tier 2 and 3 for lower-priority projects.

PRIORITIZATION RESULTS

Corridors with a total score of 6 or 7 are identified as Tier 1, high priority, Complete Street corridor recommendations. Corridors with a total score of 4-5 are considered Tier 2 recommendations. The remaining corridors scoring 1-3 points are Tier 3 recommendations.

Prioritization Criteria



High Active Trip Volumes

Corridor has a segment with modeled active trip volumes of > 18,000 trips/mi



High Active Transportation Crash History

More than 4 crashes occurred along the corridor from 2018-2022



Access to Zero Vehicle Households

Corridor touches a block group with > 25% zero vehicle households



Access to Transit

A bus stop is located along the corridor



Access to Community Destination

Corridor is within 1/4 mile of a park, school, or other activity center



Access to Major Retail Corridor

Corridor has major commercial zoning along both sides of street



Access to Multi-Family Housing


Corridor is within 1/4 mile of multi-family housing zoning



Public Input

Corridor was called out in Social Pinpoint map comments

Figure 14.3. Complete Street Prioritization Results



- Complete Street Corridor Recommendations**
- Tier 1
 - Tier 2
 - Tier 3
 - TIA or GDOT Project
- Existing Facilities**
- Sidewalk on Both Sides of Street
 - Sidewalk on One Side of Street
 - Complete Paved Trail
 - Planned Paved Trail
- Base Features**
- Municipality
 - MPO Boundary
 - County Boundary
 - State Boundary



Only new roadway projects identified through the MTP and those carried forward from the previous MTP were subject to the prioritization exercise.

Table 14.5. Complete Streets Project Prioritization Scoring

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score	Tier
				High AT Volumes	High AT Crash History	Access to Zero Vehicle Households	Access to Transit	Access to Community Destination	Access to Major Retail Corridor	Access to Multi-family Housing	Public Input		
GA-12	St Marys Rd Streetscape	Buena Vista Rd	Northstar Dr	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	Tier 1
GA-13	US 27 ALT (Manchester Expressway) Streetscape	River Rd	Woodruff Rd	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7	Tier 1
GA-14	Wynnton Road Streetscape	Buena Vista Rd	Edgewood Cir	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7	Tier 1
GA-15	Buena Vista Road Streetscape	Annette Ave	Floyd Rd	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7	Tier 1
GA-16	Victory Dr Streetscape	10th Avenue	Border Drive (I-185)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7	Tier 1
GA-17	Hamilton Rd Streetscape	Manchester Expressway	19th Street	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	Tier 1
GA-18	US 27 (Veterans Pkwy) Streetscape	US 27 ALT (Manchester Expy)	Whitesville Rd	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6	Tier 1
AA-19	Broad Street Streetscape	S Railroad St	Dillingham St	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	6	Tier 1
AA-20	US 280 Streetscape	Crawford Rd	Sandfort Rd	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	6	Tier 1
GA-21	River Road Streetscape	50th St	Hamilton Rd	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	6	Tier 1
GA-22	Armour Road Streetscape	Warm Springs Rd	W Britt David Rd	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	Tier 2
GA-23	Forrest Road Streetscape	SR 22 (Wynnton Rd)	Woodruff Farm Rd	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	Tier 2
AA-24	14th Street/Crawford Rd Streetscape	15th Ave	28th Ave	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	5	Tier 2
GA-25	Airport Thruway Streetscape	US 27 (Veterans Pkwy)	Smoke Dr	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	5	Tier 2
GA-26	N Lumpkin Road Streetscape	Cusseta Rd	US 27 (Victory Dr)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	5	Tier 2

ID	Project Name	From Street	To Street	Prioritization Criteria								Total Score	Tier
				High AT Volumes	High AT Crash History	Access to Zero Vehicle Households	Access to Transit	Access to Community Destination	Access to Major Retail Corridor	Access to Multi-family Housing	Public Input		
AA-27	S Seale Road Streetscape	Dillingham Street	5th Street S	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	Tier 2
GA-28	Miller Road Streetscape	Fall Line Trace	SR 22 (Wynnton Rd)	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	Tier 2
GA-29	23rd Street & Comer Avenue Streetscape	1st Ave	Southern St	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	Tier 2
GA-30	Brown Avenue Streetscape	Wynnton Rd	Cusseta Rd	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	Tier 2
GA-31	Warm Springs Connector Streetscape	Miller Rd	Miligen Rd	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	4	Tier 2
GA-32	38th Street Bike Improvements	Meritas Drive	1st Avenue	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	Tier 2
GA-33	Bradley Park Drive Streetscape	SR 219 (River Rd)	Whitesville Rd	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	Tier 3
GA-34	Schomburg Road Streetscape	Hancock Rd	Warm Springs Rd	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	Tier 3
AA-35	Stadium Drive Streetscape	Phenix City Intermediate School	13th Avenue	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	Tier 3
GA-36	Woodruff Road Streetscape	Devonshire Dr	Camille Dr	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	Tier 3
GA-37	Britt David Road Streetscape	US 27 (Hamilton Rd)	Airport Thruway	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	Tier 3
GA-38	Whittlesey Road & Whittlesey Boulevard Streetscape	Bradley Park Dr	Moon Rd	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	Tier 3
AA-39	US 80 Streetscape	Coffield Dr	Mimosa Rd	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	Tier 3
AA-40	Mullin Road Streetscape	Lee Road 728	Lee Road 243	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	Tier 3
GA-41	Broad Street (Cusseta) Streetscape	Anderson Road	Osteen Street	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	Tier 3

Page Intentionally Blank

15

Work Program

Introduction

This section presents the overall work program for the C-PCTS MPO. Because the available funding and program allocations vary between Georgia and Alabama, this section is organized by state.

Georgia Work Program

PROJECTED FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR PROJECT TYPES

Based on the needs identified through the MTP process and the current commitments within the GDOT and TIA work programs. Within Georgia, the available formula funds through 2050 were allocated as follows:

Table 15.1. GDOT Formula Funding Allocation by Project Type

Improvement Type	Pct Split	Formula Funds	Local Match	Total
 Roadway	65%	\$585,834,118	\$146,458,530	\$732,292,648
 Major Maintenance	10%	\$90,128,326	\$22,532,081	\$112,660,407
 Active Transportation	19%	\$171,243,819	\$42,810,955	\$214,054,774
 EV	5%	\$45,064,163	\$11,266,041	\$56,330,204
 Special Studies	1%	\$9,012,833	\$2,253,208	\$11,266,041
TOTALS	100%	\$901,283,260	\$225,320,815	\$1,126,604,074

In addition to the formula funds noted in Table 15.1, the following additional funding sources were integrated into the MTP work program.

Table 15.2. GDOT Formula Funding Allocation by Project Type

Improvement Type	Pct Split	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Carryover STBG Funds				
Roadway	100%	\$45,564,928	\$11,391,232	\$56,956,160
TOTALS	100%	\$45,564,928	\$11,391,232	\$56,956,160
Unallocated TAP Funds (2024-2027)				
Active Transportation	100%	\$4,710,486	\$1,177,622	\$5,888,108
TOTALS	100%	\$4,710,486	\$1,177,622	\$5,888,108
Unallocated CRP Funds (2024-2027)				
Active Transportation	66.1%	\$1,058,165	\$264,541	\$1,322,706
EV	33.9%	\$523,069	\$130,767	\$653,836
TOTALS	100%	\$1,581,234	\$395,309	\$1,976,543

PROJECT COST ESTIMATES

Costs associated with GDOT, ALDOT, and TIA projects were carried forward from their respective work programs. However, the MTP analysis process derived planning-level cost estimates for new projects identified through the MTP analysis process. Baseline estimates were developed from the following unit costs and the characteristics of the proposed improvements. These estimates were derived by escalating unit costs from the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) Cost Estimation tool.

Based on the overall construction costs, the following percentages were applied to derive planning-level cost estimates for other phases:

- **Preliminary Engineering (PE)**—10% of Construction Costs
- **Right-of-Way Acquisition (ROW)**—20% of Construction Costs
- **Utility Coordination (UTL)**—15% of Construction Costs

Table 15.3. Unit Cost Estimates

Improvement Type	Assumptions	Unit	Cost Estimate
Single Lane Widening (TWLTL/ Passing Lane, etc.)	Per total lane miles	LM	\$3,154,000.00
Capacity Widening (without median)	Per lane in each direction (ex. 2 to four-lane widening over a mile =1 unit cost	LM	\$6,309,000.00
Capacity Widening (with median)	Per lane in each direction (ex. 2 to four-lane widening over a mile =1 unit cost	LM	\$10,106,000.00
New roadway (two lane)	Assumes no median	LM	\$5,262,000.00
New roadway (four lane)	Assumes median	LM	\$14,321,000.00
	Assumes median		
Intersection Improvement (Minor)	Assumes single right turn lane (250')	EA	\$568,000.00
Intersection Improvement (Major)	Assumes new signal, left and right turn lanes on four approaches (250')	EA	\$2,281,000.00
Interchange Project	Assumes new diamond interchange	EA	\$28,703,000.00
Multiuse path	Assumes 12' wide - concrete in one direction	LM	\$1,542,000.00
Sidewalk	Assumes 5' in each direction	LM	\$1,494,000.00
Bike Lanes	Assumes one bike lane in each direction	LM	\$696,000.00
Complete Street	Assumes multiuse path, sidewalk in one direction, bike lanes in each direction	LM	\$2,986,000.00

In addition, a 20% contingency was applied to the cost estimates for each phase of a given project. While these project cost estimates were initially derived in 2024 dollars, they were escalated based on their programmed year of expenditure at 3% per year.

More detail on the cost estimates by phase and year of expenditure are provided in Appendix F.

*All costs are in 2025 values.



GEORGIA ROADWAY WORK PROGRAM

The following is a breakdown of the cost-feasible work program for roadways in the 2050 MTP. Roadway improvements relieve congestion and improve roadway systems. They include capacity improvements and operational improvements (ITS, signalization, turn lanes, etc.).

FUNDING FOR ROADWAY PROJECTS

The available funds by funding source are provided in Table 15.4.

Table 15.4. Projected Georgia Roadway Funds – 2025-2050

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Carryover STP Funds	\$45,564,928	\$11,391,232	\$56,956,160
Formula Funds (2025-2050) – 65%	\$585,834,118	\$146,458,530	\$732,292,648
TIA Funds	\$0	\$192,039,348	\$192,039,348
TOTALS	\$631,399,046	\$349,889,110	\$981,288,156
Total Work Program Costs	\$623,192,366	\$338,247,439	\$961,409,805
Surplus	\$8,206,680	\$11,641,670	\$19,878,351

PRIORITIZED ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

The projects programmed within the 2050 MTP are organized by the following funding bands:



Short-Term Roadway Projects

Table 15.5 shows the short-term roadway projects. Most of these projects are currently in the GDOT and TIA work programs.

Mid-Term Roadway Projects

The mid-term roadway projects, shown in Table 15.6, contain the remaining TIA projects and several projects identified through the MTP analysis, including a set of ramp improvements along US 80.

Long-Term Roadway Projects

The long-term roadway projects, shown in Table 15.7, consist of the more costly capacity and operational improvements identified throughout the MTP analysis and the previous 2045 MTP.

NOTE
Roadway improvements identified in the MTP process will be re-evaluated after the Columbus-Muscogee County Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Action Plan is completed. The \$1.2 million effort will include a more detailed assessment of safety and operational roadway needs.

Table 15.5. Short-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2025-2029)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Tpe	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0006446	GC-1	SR 1 / US 27 - Veteran's Parkway Widening	Road Widening	TIA	2025	\$-	\$33,699,348	\$33,669,348
0019531	GO-4	Double Churches Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2025	\$-	\$12,200,000	\$12,200,000
0019519	GO-5	Steam Mill Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2025	\$-	\$22,500,000	\$22,500,000
0017690	GO-6	13th Ave/17th St/Linwood Blvd Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	TIA	2025	\$-	\$6,650,000	\$6,650,000
0019523	GO-2	Forrest Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2025	\$-	\$15,400,000	\$15,400,000
0019526	GO-3	Morris Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2025	\$-	\$15,400,000	\$15,400,000
0017688	GO-14	Whitesville Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2026	\$-	\$12,800,000	\$12,800,000
0019518	GO-22	Interchange at SR 85 and County Line Road	Interchange	TIA	2026	\$-	\$800,000	\$800,000
0019527	GO-16	Buena Vista Road Corridor Improvements	Corridor Improvements	TIA	2027	\$-	\$10,700,000	\$10,700,000
0019532	GO-18	Brennan Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2027	\$-	\$9,200,000	\$9,200,000
0019529	GO-27	Andrews Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2027	\$-	\$6,800,000	\$6,800,000
0017138	GC-8	Military Drive		GDOT	2028	\$928,000	\$232,000	\$1,160,000
0350860	GO-13	Farr Road Improvements	Road Improvements	GDOT	2028	\$5,212,766	\$1,303,192	\$6,515,958
0005749	GC-12	Whittlesey Road Widening	Road Widening	2045 MTP	2029	\$9,452,879	\$2,363,220	\$11,816,099
N/A	GC-6	Blackmon Rd Widening	Road Widening	Capacity Analysis	2029	\$9,711,566	\$2,427,892	\$12,139,458
N/A	GO-20	Woodruff Farm Road New Roadway	New Roadway	2045 MTP	2029	\$3,509,468	\$877,367	\$4,386,836
0019535	GO-7	JR Allen (US 80) Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	TIA	2029	\$9,040,000	\$2,260,000	\$11,300,000
0019517	GO-8	Manchester Expy (US 27 Alt) Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	TIA	2029	\$29,320,000	\$7,330,000	\$36,650,000

*All costs are in 2025 values.

Figure 15.1. Short-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2025-2029)




Table 15.6. Mid-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2030–2039)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0019520	GO-1	Williams Road at I-185 NB Exit Ramp Improvements	Ramp Improvements	TIA	2032	\$-	\$18,700,000	\$18,700,000
0019522	GO-19	Cusseta Road Improvements	Road Improvements	TIA	2032	\$-	\$17,600,000	\$17,600,000
0008483	GC-10	CR 2228 / Buena Vista Road Widening	Road Widening	2045 MTP	2034	\$11,344,370	\$2,836,092	\$14,180,462
N/A	GC-5	Whitesville Rd Widening	Road Widening	Capacity Analysis	2034	\$5,428,523	\$1,357,131	\$6,785,654
N/A	GO-11	US 27 at Airport Thruway/54th Street Improvements	Interchange Improvements	CMP Project	2034	\$3,975,880	\$993,970	\$4,969,850
N/A	GO-12	Shatluga Road at Corporate Ridge Parkway Improvements	Interchange Improvements	CMP Project	2034	\$3,989,818	\$997,455	\$4,987,273
N/A	GO-15	US 80 at River Rd Ramp Improvements	Ramp Improvements	Capacity Analysis	2034	\$49,947,881	\$12,486,970	\$62,434,852
	GO-17	US 80 at I-185 Ramp Improvement	Ramp Improvements	Capacity Analysis	2034	\$49,947,881	\$12,486,970	\$62,434,852
N/A	GO-25	US 80 at GA 22 Ramp Improvements	Ramp Improvements	Capacity Analysis	2034	\$49,947,881	\$12,486,970	\$62,434,852
0014924	GO-23	Passing Lanes on SR 26	Road Widening	GDOT	2035	\$7,045,775	\$1,761,444	\$8,807,219
N/A	GC-4	54th Street Widening	Road Widening	Capacity Analysis	2034	\$13,648,921	\$3,412,230	\$17,061,151
N/A	GC-2	US 80 Widening	Road Widening	Capacity Analysis	2034	\$42,957,246	\$10,739,311	\$53,696,557
N/A	GC-7	Reese Rd Widening	Road Widening	Capacity Analysis	2030	\$5,065,493	\$1,266,373	\$6,331,867

*All costs are in 2025 values.

Table 15.7. Long-Term Georgia Roadway Projects (2040-2050)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0351200	GC-11	Miller Road Widening	Road Widening	2045 MTP	2044	\$36,496,942	\$9,124,236	\$45,621,178
0332780	GC-9	St. Mary's Road Widening	Road Widening	2045 MTP	2044	\$26,856,118	\$6,714,029	\$33,570,147
N/A	GO-24	US 80 at US 27 Ramp Improvements	Ramp Improvements	Capacity Analysis	2044	\$64,425,441	\$16,106,360	\$80,531,801
N/A	GO-26	US 27 at Lindsey Creek Pkwy Ramp Improvements	Ramp Improvements	Capacity Analysis	2044	\$64,425,441	\$16,106,360	\$80,531,801
N/A	GO-21	Warm Springs Rd Connector Improvements	Connector Improvements	Capacity Analysis	2044	\$13,648,921	\$3,412,230	\$17,061,151
N/A	GO-10	Buena Vista Road at 13th Street Improvements	Street Improvements	CMP Project	2044	\$5,105,890	\$1,276,472	\$6,382,362

*All costs are in 2025 values.

Table 15.8. Aspirational Roadway Projects

Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year
GO-9	US 80 at Bradley Park Dr Ramp Improvements	Interchange Modification	2045 MTP	ASP
GC-3	River Rd Widening	Road Widening	Capacity Analysis	ASP
GC-6	Blackmon Rd Widening	Road Widening	Capacity Analysis	ASP



GEORGIA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORK PROGRAM

Active transportation improvements provide better access to the transportation network via bicycles, walking, wheelchairs, or other means of micromobility (scooters, e-bikes, etc.). These improvements also include amenities that serve disabled populations along the transportation network such as ramps, audible pedestrian signals, etc.

FUNDING FOR ACTIVE PROJECTS

The available funds by funding source are provided in the table below.

Table 15.9. Projected Georgia Active Transportation Funds – 2025-2050

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Formula Funds (2025-2050) – 19%	\$171,243,819	\$42,810,955	\$214,054,774
TAP Funds (2024-2027)	\$4,710,486	\$1,177,622	\$5,888,108
CRP Funds (2024-2027)	\$523,069	\$130,767	\$653,836
TIA Funds	\$0	\$48,140,000	\$48,140,000
TOTALS	\$176,477,374	\$92,259,344	\$268,736,718
Total Work Program Costs	\$20,183,936	\$53,185,984	\$73,369,920
Surplus	\$156,293,438	\$39,073,360	\$195,366,798

*All costs are in 2025 values.

PRIORITIZED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

The projects programmed within the 2050 MTP are organized by the following funding bands:



Short-Term Roadway Projects

Table 15.10 shows the short-term active transportation projects. The majority of these projects are trails and streetscape projects currently in the GDOT and TIA work programs. New projects identified through the MTP process include:

Short-Term Sidewalk Improvements

(Phase 1):

- Manchester Expressway sidewalk from the existing sidewalk on Manchester Expressway between Oates Avenue and 3rd Avenue to River Road
- Alexander Street sidewalk from 52nd Street to 14th Avenue
- 47th Street sidewalk from Kolb Avenue to Veterans Parkway
- Kolb Avenue sidewalk from 45th Street to Veterans Parkway
- 5th Avenue sidewalk from 29th Street to 32nd Street
- Hamilton Road sidewalk from Veterans Pkwy to Manchester Expressway
- 54th Street sidewalk from Veterans Parkway to Steve Mar Drive
- Whiteville Road sidewalk from Veterans Parkway to Airport Thruway
- Steam Mill Road sidewalk from Buena Vista Road to existing sidewalk on Steam Mill Rd near I-185 bridge
- Edgewood Road sidewalk from Norris Road to University Avenue

Short-Term Sidewalk

Improvements (Phase 2):

- 13th Street/Buena Vista Road sidewalk from existing sidewalk on 13th Street at Eberhart Avenue to Warren Williams Road
- 18th Street sidewalk from Hamilton Road to 10th Avenue
- Midtown Drive sidewalk from Macon Road to Boxwood Boulevard
- 14th Avenue sidewalk from Hamilton Rd to existing sidewalk on 14th Avenue between 39th Street and 37th Street
- College Drive sidewalk from Lindsey Drive to University Avenue
- 33rd Street sidewalk from 12th Avenue to Hamilton Road
- 13th Street Sidewalk from Wildwood Avenue to Peacock Avenue

A nationwide assessment of ADA

needs throughout the C-PCTS MPO to better serve disabled populations. In addition to the Plan, a set aside of \$1.125 million has been included for short-term improvements resulting from the Plan.

Even with these improvements, there are approximately \$12.5 million of anticipated funding from the GDOT formula funds available for additional active transportation projects through 2029, as shown below.

Table 15.10. Available GDOT Formula Funds for Additional Active Transportation Projects through 2029

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Short-Term	\$29,412,770	\$7,353,193	\$36,765,963
Programmed Non-TIA Projects	\$19,383,936	\$4,845,984	\$24,229,920
Surplus	\$10,028,834	\$2,507,208	\$12,536,042

*All costs are in 2025 values.

Table 15.11. *Short-Term Georgia Active Transportation Projects (2025-2029)*

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0019528	GA-6	South Lumpkin Streetscape	Streetscape Improvements	TIA	2025	\$0	\$10,100,000	\$10,100,000
0019536	GA-7	Liberty Theater Block Enhancement (8th Avenue)	Streetscape Improvements	TIA	2025	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
0019537	GA-8	5th Avenue Trail Connector	Connector Improvements	TIA	2025	\$0	\$690,000	\$690,000
NA	GA-11	ADA Facilities Needs Plan	Plan Development	Policy	2025	\$800,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000
0019534	GA-3	University Avenue Streetscape	Streetscape Improvements	TIA	2026	\$0	\$6,750,000	\$6,750,000
NA	GA-12	ADA Facilities Improvement Program	Program Development	Policy	2026	\$900,000	\$225,000	\$1,125,000
0018352	GA-2	Cherokee Ave & Slade Drive from Garrard Street to Fall Line Trace Trail	Interchange Improvements	GDOT	2028	\$2,800,000	\$700,000	\$3,500,000
NA	GA-9	Short-Term Sidewalk Improvements - Phase I	Sidewalk Improvements	Sidewalk Analysis	2028	\$4,053,807	\$1,013,452	\$5,067,258
0020740	GA-1	Fall Line Trace Extension	Road Extension	GDOT	2029	\$8,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000
0019521	GA-4	Second Avenue Streetscape	Streetscape Improvements	TIA	2029	\$0	\$18,200,000	\$18,200,000
NA	GA-10	Short-Term Sidewalk Improvements - Phase II	Sidewalk Improvements	Sidewalk Analysis	2029	\$3,630,130	\$907,532	\$4,537,662

**All costs are in 2025 values.*

Mid-Term Roadway Projects

There is only one active transportation project programmed in the mid-term timeframe. The Bull Creek Dragonfly Trail Connector is scheduled for construction in 2032 and funded with TIA funds. Between 2030 and 2039, approximately \$80 million of anticipated funding from the GDOT formula funds is available for additional active transportation projects.

Long-Term Roadway Projects

No specific long-term active transportation projects were identified within the MTP update process. Between 2040 and 2050, approximately \$97 million of anticipated funding from the GDOT formula funds is available for additional active transportation projects.

To inform the upcoming Sidewalk and Trails Plan, several corridors were identified for Complete Streets treatments based on their connectivity to underserved populations, transit routes, and connectivity to community facilities. These corridors are identified in Section 10 of this plan. It is assumed that a significant amount of the surplus active transportation funds will be programmed for developing Complete Streets.

NOTE
In Georgia, additional active transportation projects will be identified during the completion of the Columbus-Muscogee County Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Action Plan, an anticipated and the Columbus Trails and Sidewalk Plan. Both efforts will include a detailed assessment of active transportation safety and connectivity needs.

Table 15.12. Mid-Term Georgia Active Transportation Projects (2030-2039)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0019533	GA-5	Bull Creek Dragonfly Trail Connector	Connector Enhancements	TIA	2032	\$0	\$8,400,000	\$8,400,000

*All costs are in 2025 values.

GEORGIA MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

An important element of transportation planning is providing adequate funding for maintaining the existing infrastructure. These improvements include repairs to the roadway and bridge network.

FUNDING FOR MAINTENANCE

The available funds by funding source are provided in the table below. As shown, 10% of the formula funds for capital projects has been reserved for major maintenance projects to ensure the transportation network's good repair.

Table 15.13. *Projected Georgia Maintenance Funds – 2025-2050*

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Formula Funds (2025-2050) – 10%	\$90,128,326	\$22,532,081	\$112,660,407
GDOT Formula Maintenance (2025-2050)	\$64,012,409	\$16,003,102	\$80,015,511
TIA Funds	\$0	\$12,500,000	\$12,500,000
TOTALS	\$154,140,735	\$51,035,183	\$205,175,918
Total Work Program Costs	\$66,154,750	\$29,038,687	\$95,193,437
Surplus	\$87,985,985	\$21,996,496	\$109,982,481

*All costs are in 2025 values.

PRIORITIZED MAINTENANCE IMPROVEMENTS

The projects programmed within the 2050 MTP are organized by the following funding bands:



Short-Term Maintenance Projects

Table 15.13 shows the short-term maintenance projects. All the programmed projects are resurfacing and bridge projects currently in the GDOT and TIA work programs.

Mid-Term Maintenance Projects

Only one maintenance project is programmed in the mid-term timeframe. The I-185 shoulder from CR 62/Old Cusseta Road to SR 22 Spur is scheduled for construction in 2031.

Long-Term Maintenance Projects

No specific long-term maintenance projects were identified during the MTP update process. However, given the surplus reflected above, adequate funding for maintenance projects is expected to be available.

Table 15.14. Short-Term Georgia Maintenance Projects (2024-2029)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0019525	GM-6	Columbus River Repaving and Maintenance	Repaving and Maintenance	TIA	2025	\$0	\$12,500,000	\$12,500,000
0017691	GM-1	City of Columbus Resurfacing @ 8 Locations	Resurfacing	GDOT Work Program	2026	\$1,698,400	\$424,600.00	\$2,123,000
0016508	GM-3	First Division Road over US 27/SR 520 Bridge Replacement	Bridge Replacement	GDOT Work Program	2027	\$3,067,552	\$766,888.00	\$3,834,440
0015559	GM-2	US 280/SR 520 Bridge Over Chattahoochee River	New Bridge	GDOT Work Program	2028	\$33,271,998	\$8,317,999	\$41,589,997
M005022	GM-5	Resurfacing SR 85 from SR 1 to SR 1	Resurfacing	GDOT Work Program	2028	\$16,800,000	\$4,200,000	\$21,000,000

Table 15.15. Mid-Term Georgia Maintenance Projects (2024-2029)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0008376	GM-4	I-185 Shoulder from CR 62/Old Cusseta Road to SR 22 Spur	Road Improvements	GDOT Work Program	2031	\$11,316,800	\$2,829,200	\$14,146,000

*All costs are in 2025 values.

*All costs are in 2025 values.

OTHER GEORGIA PROJECTS

Two other types of projects within the Georgia MTP work program are:
 1) Electric Vehicle (EV) Projects and Plans, and 2) Special Studies

FUNDING FOR EV PROJECTS

The table below provides the available funds by funding source for EV projects.

Table 15.16. *Projected Georgia Funds for EV Projects – 2025-2050*

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Formula Funds (2025-2050) – 5%	\$45,064,163	\$11,266,041	\$56,330,204
CRP Funds (2024-2027)	\$523,000	\$130,750	\$653,750
TOTALS	\$45,587,163	\$11,396,791	\$56,983,954
Total Work Program Costs	\$1,825,620	\$456,405	\$2,282,025
Surplus	\$43,761,543	\$10,940,386	\$54,701,929

**All costs are in 2025 values.*

Short-Term EV Projects

The two projects identified for EV implementation are both short-term projects:

- EV Charging Station at a location to be determined by GDOT following the completion of their National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) plan.
- The development of an EV deployment plan for the C-PCTMS region to identify implementation strategies for the surplus EV funds reserved in this plan.

FUNDING FOR SPECIAL STUDIES

The table below provides the available funds by funding source for special studies.

Table 15.17. *Projected Funds for Georgia Special Studies – 2025-2050*

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Formula Funds (2025-2050) – 5%	\$9,012,833	\$2,253,208	\$11,266,041
CRP Funds (2024-2027)	\$1,600,000	\$400,000	\$2,000,000
TOTALS	\$10,612,833	\$2,653,208	\$13,266,041
Total Work Program Costs	\$1,760,000	\$440,000	\$2,200,000
Surplus	\$43,761,543	\$10,940,386	\$10,066,041

**All costs are in 2025 values.*

Short-Term EV Projects

Three special studies have been identified to take place in 2025:

- Columbus School Traffic Study
- Edgewood Road Corridor Study
- Columbus Trails and Sidewalks Study

Table 15.18. Georgia EV Projects (2025)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0020334	GEV-1	EV Charging Station at 1 Location in Muscogee County	Electric Charging	GDOT	2025	\$1,025,620	\$256,405.00	\$1,282,025
NA	GEV-2	Columbus-Muscogee EV Deployment Study	Electric Charging Study	Policy	2025	\$801,620	\$200,405.00	\$1,002,025

Table 15.19. Georgia Special Studies (2025)

GDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Project Type	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
0020288	GS-1	Columbus School Traffic Impact Study	Traffic Study	GDOT	2025	\$800,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000
0020289	GS-2	Edgewood Road Corridor Study	Corridor Study	GDOT	2025	\$160,000	\$40,000	\$200,000
0020290	GS-3	Columbus Trails and Sidewalks Study	Trails and Sidewalks Study	GDOT	2025	\$800,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000

*All costs are in 2025 values.

Alabama Work Program

PROJECTED FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR PROJECT TYPES

Based on the needs identified through the MTP process and the current commitments within the ALDOT work program. Based on historical expenditures, the available unallocated surface transportation funds from through 2050 were allocated as follows:

Table 15.20. ALDOT Formula Funding Allocation by Project Type

Improvement Type	Pct Split	Formula Funds	Local Match	Total
Roadway	40.0%	\$65,340,448	\$16,335,112	\$81,675,560
Active Transportation	10.0%	\$16,335,112	\$4,083,778	\$20,418,890
Maintenance/Bridge	50.0%	\$81,675,560	\$20,418,890	\$102,094,450
TOTALS	100.0%	\$163,351,120	\$40,837,780	\$204,188,900

In addition to the formula funds noted in Table 15.19, the following additional funding sources were integrated into the MTP work program for active transportation projects.

Table 15.21. Additional funds for Alabama Active Transportation Projects

Improvement Type	Pct Split	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Unallocated TAP Funds (2024-2027)				
Active Transportation	100%	\$1,247,839	\$311,960	\$1,559,799
Unallocated CRP Funds (2024-2027)				
Active Transportation	100%	\$817,303	\$204,326	\$1,021,629

*All costs are in 2025 values.

PROJECT COST ESTIMATES

Cost estimates for new Alabama projects were developed with the same methodology as the Georgia projects.



ALABAMA ROADWAY WORK PROGRAM

The following is a breakdown of the cost-feasible work program for roadways in the 2050 MTP. Roadway improvements relieve congestion and improve roadway systems. They include capacity improvements and operational improvements (ITS, signalization, turn lanes, etc.).

FUNDING FOR ROADWAY PROJECTS

The available funds by funding source are provided in Table 15.22.

Table 15.23. *Projected Alabama Roadway Funds – 2024–2050*

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
ALDOT STP Funds (2025–2050) – 40%	\$65,340,448	\$16,335,112	\$81,675,560

PROPOSED ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

A number of roadway projects were identified based on existing bottlenecks and projected roadway congestion from the regional travel demand model. These projects, along with their respective costs, are presented in Table 15.21. As shown below, the cumulative costs of these projects are projected to surpass \$250 million of available surface transportation funding for the MPO through 2050.

Table 15.22. *Alabama Project Costs vs Available Funding*

	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
Total Costs of Proposed Roadways	\$265,519,817	\$66,379,954	\$331,899,772
Available Funding	\$65,340,448	\$16,335,112	\$81,675,560
DEFICIT	\$200,179,369	\$50,044,842	\$250,224,212


In response to this projected deficit, MPO staff, Alabama TCC members, and ALDOT staff met to discuss how to address it. As a result of the meeting:

- The available funding for roadway projects (\$81,675,560) **will not be allocated to specific projects but reserved for local roadway projects identified through local processes**, including the upcoming Phenix City Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Action Plan.
- Given that \$230.7 million of the costs are for large-scale projects along state roadways, it was determined that **more discussion would take place between ALDOT and the MPO** to discuss alternative funding means other than MPO surface transportation funds for these improvements.
- The ALDOT Statewide Transportation Plan will be updated over the next year. It was discussed that **the MPO will coordinate with ALDOT during the plan’s development to discuss dedicating increased funding to the Alabama portion of the C-PCTS MPO.**

Table 15.24. Identified Alabama MTP Roadway Projects for Future Consideration

Project ID	Project Title	To	From	Source	Federal	Local	Total Cost
AO-1	New Interchange at US 80 and US 280	US 80	US 280	Capacity Analysis	\$41,619,350	\$10,404,838	\$52,024,188
AO-2	US 280 at General Colin Powell Pkwy Ramp Improvements	US 280	General Colin Powell Pkwy	Capacity Analysis	\$41,619,350	\$10,404,838	\$52,024,188
AO-3	5th Avenue Improvements	Airport Road	22nd Street	CMP Project	\$5,210,037	\$1,302,509	\$6,512,547
AO-4	US-280 North Off Ramp Improvements	Broad Street Extension	Seale Road	CMP Project	\$6,614,900	\$1,653,725	\$8,268,625
AO-5	US 80 at SR 61 Ramp/Summerville Rd Improvements	US 80	SR 61/ Summerville Rd	Capacity Analysis	\$41,619,350	\$10,404,838	\$52,024,188
AC-1	River Chase Dr Widening	Summerville Rd	US 80	Capacity Analysis	\$29,561,963	\$7,390,491	\$36,952,454
AO-6	Brickyard Road Improvements	Dillingham Street	South Of Fontaine Rd	CMP Project	\$13,419,326	\$3,354,831	\$16,774,157
AO-7	US 80 at River Chase Dr Ramp Improvements	US 80	River Chase Dr	Capacity Analysis	\$2,896,206	\$724,051	\$3,620,257
AC-2	South Railroad Street Widening	18th Ave	Lakewood Dr	Capacity Analysis	\$21,872,875	\$5,468,219	\$27,341,094
AC-3	Summerville Rd/Broad St Improvements	Railroad St	13th Street	Capacity Analysis	\$2,099,408	\$524,852	\$2,624,261
AC-4	Lee Road 430/Opelika Road Widening	Stafford Road/ Cut Rate Road	US 80/280 Bypass	Capacity Analysis	\$29,866,154	\$7,466,539	\$37,332,693
AC-5	US 431 Widening	5th St	US 280	Capacity Analysis	\$13,741,306	\$3,435,326	\$17,176,632
AC-6	US 80 Improvements	Summerville Rd	GA 22 Connector	Capacity Analysis	\$15,379,592	\$3,844,898	\$19,224,490

Figure 15.2. Identified Alabama MTP Roadway Projects for Future Consideration





ALABAMA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORK PROGRAM

Active transportation improvements provide better access to the transportation network via bicycles, walking, wheelchairs, or other means of micromobility (scooters, e-bikes, etc.). These improvements also include amenities that serve disabled populations along the transportation network such as ramps, audible pedestrian signals, etc.

FUNDING FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

The available funds by funding source are provided in Table 15.24.

Table 15.25. *Projected Alabama Active Transportation Funds – 2024–2050*

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
STP Funds (2025–2050) – 10%	\$16,335,112	\$4,083,778	\$20,418,890
Unallocated TAP Funds (2024–2027)	\$817,303	\$204,326	\$1,021,629
Unallocated CRP Funds (2024–2027)	\$1,247,839	\$311,960	\$1,559,799
TOTAL	\$18,400,254	\$4,600,064	\$23,000,318

Given the projected revenues detailed in Section 13, the amount of unallocated funding by short-term, mid-term, and long-term is as follows:

Table 15.26. *Unallocated Alabama Active Transportation Funds – 2024–2050*

	State	Local	Total
Short-Term Funding (2024–2029)	\$4,679,858	\$1,169,964	\$5,849,822
Mid-Term Funding (2030–2039)	\$6,533,522	\$1,633,380	\$8,166,902
Long-Term Funding (2040–2050)	\$7,186,874	\$1,796,720	\$8,983,594
TOTAL	\$18,400,254	\$4,600,064	\$23,000,318

Table 15.27. *Short-Term Alabama Active Transportation Project (2024–2029)*

ALDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Source	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
100075862	AA-1	Downtown Streetscape Improvements	ALDOT Work Program	2026	\$846,761	\$211,690	\$1,058,451

PRIORITIZED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

The current ALDOT work plan only includes one active transportation project: the downtown streetscapes along 14th Street from 12th Avenue to the existing trail along the Chattahoochee River. Per the ALDOT work program, the project is estimated to cost \$1,058,451. Even with that improvement, there are still \$4,679,858 of federal funds available for active transportation projects in the short term.

Much like roadway projects, the available funding for active transportation projects (\$23,000,318) will not be allocated to specific projects but reserved for local roadway projects identified through local processes, including the upcoming Phenix City Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Action Plan.

To inform the C-PCTS MPO on potential active transportation needs and Complete Streets, several corridors were identified for Complete Streets treatments based on their connectivity to underserved populations, transit routes, and connectivity to community facilities. These corridors are identified in Section 10 of this plan and include:

- Broad Street from South Railroad Street to Dillingham Street
- US 280 from Crawford Road to Sandfort Road
- 14th Street/Crawford Road from 15th Avenue to 28th Avenue
- South Seale Road from Dillingham Street to 5th Street South



ALABAMA MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

An important element of transportation planning is providing adequate funding for maintaining the existing infrastructure. These improvements include repairs to the roadway and bridge network.

FUNDING FOR MAINTENANCE

The available funds by funding source are provided in the table below. As shown, 10% of the formula funds for capital projects has been reserved for major maintenance projects to ensure the transportation network's good repair.

Table 15.28. *Projected Alabama Maintenance Funds – 2024-2050*

Improvement Type	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total
STP Funds (2024-2050) – 50%	\$81,675,560	\$20,418,890	\$102,094,450

Given the projected revenues detailed in Section 13, the amount of unallocated funding by short-term, mid-term, and long-term is as follows:

Table 15.29. *Unallocated Alabama Active Transportation Funds – 2024-2050*

	State	Local	Total
Short-Term Funding (2024-2029)	\$13,073,580	\$3,268,395	\$16,341,975
Mid-Term Funding (2030-2039)	\$32,667,610	\$8,166,902	\$40,834,512
Long-Term Funding (2040-2050)	\$35,934,371	\$8,983,593	\$44,917,963
TOTAL	\$81,675,560	\$20,418,890	\$102,094,450

Short-Term Maintenance Projects

Table 15.29 shows the short-term maintenance projects. Most of the programmed projects are resurfacing and bridge projects currently in the ALDOT work program and have surface transportation funds already been allocated. Projects submitted by Phenix City and Lee County for the short-term include:

- Resurfacing of Riverchase Drive from Airport Road to Summerville Road
- Resurfacing of CR-248 from CR-2118 to Phenix City Limits
- Resurfacing of Knowles Road from US 431 to Phenix City Limits

Mid-Term Maintenance Projects

Mid-term projects include several resurfacing projects submitted by Lee County. Based on the phasing schedule listed above, all are cost-feasible.

Long-Term Roadway Projects

Long-term projects include several resurfacing projects submitted by Phenix City and Lee County. Based on the phasing schedule listed above, all are cost-feasible.

Table 15.30. Short-Term Alabama Maintenance Projects (2024-2029)

ALDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Source	PE Year	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
100067449	AM-1	Seale Road Bridge Replacement	ALDOT		2023	\$1,885,217	\$471,304	\$2,356,521
100067546	AM-2	CR-379 Resurfacing	ALDOT		2023	\$1,300,000	\$325,000	\$1,625,000
100073186	AM-3	Owens Rd and McClendon Rd Resurfacing	ALDOT		2023	\$541,272	\$135,318	\$676,590
100073346	AM-4	Various Street Resurfacing	ALDOT		2023	\$438,020	\$109,505	\$547,525
100073174	AM-5	CR-240 Resurfacing	ALDOT		2024	\$964,432	\$241,108	\$1,205,540
100073177	AM-6	CR-235 Widening and Resurfacing	ALDOT		2024	\$492,844	\$123,211	\$616,055
100073204	AM-7	CR-212 Widening and Resurfacing	ALDOT		2024	\$454,595	\$113,649	\$568,244
100073836	AM-8	4th Ave, Opelika Rd, Seale Rd Resurfacing	ALDOT	2024		\$364,200	\$91,050	\$455,250
100073176	AM-9	4th Ave, Opelika Rd, Seale Rd Resurfacing	ALDOT		2025	\$2,057,600	\$514,400	\$2,572,000
100063093	AM-10	CR-24 Resurfacing	ALDOT		2025	\$463,189	\$115,797	\$578,986
100063094	AM-11	CR-24 Resurfacing	ALDOT		2025	\$373,589	\$93,397	\$466,986
100073184	AM-12	Patterson Rd Resurfacing	ALDOT		2025	\$225,232	\$56,308	\$281,540
100073185	AM-13	Terminal Road Resurfacing	ALDOT		2025	\$341,600	\$85,400	\$427,000
100078610	AM-14	CR-427 (Pierce Road) Resurfacing	ALDOT		2026	\$794,880	\$198,720	\$993,600
100078612	AM-15	CR-427 (Opelika Rd) Resurfacing	ALDOT	2026		\$80,000	\$20,000	\$100,000
100078613	AM-16	CR-427 (Opelika Rd) Resurfacing	ALDOT		2026	\$384,000	\$96,000	\$480,000
100078611	AM-17	14th Street Resurfacing	ALDOT		2027	\$104,000	\$26,000	\$130,000
100078614	AM-18	CR-145 Resurfacing	ALDOT		2027	\$803,520	\$200,880	\$1,004,400
100078616	AM-19	Patterson Road Resurfacing	ALDOT		2027	\$334,376	\$83,594	\$417,970
NA	AM-20	Resurfacing of Riverchase Drive	Phenix City	2026	2027	\$1,104,000	\$276,000	\$1,380,000
NA	AM-21	CR-248 Resurfacing	Lee County	2026	2028	\$644,000	\$161,000	\$805,000
NA	AM-22	Resurfacing of Knowles Rd.	Phenix City	2028	2029	\$722,400	\$180,600	\$903,000

Table 15.31. Mid-Term Alabama Maintenance Projects (2030-2039)

ALDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Source	PE Year	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
NA	AM-23	CR-236 Resurfacing	Lee County	2028	2030	\$390,000	\$37,500	\$487,500
NA	AM-24	CR-208 Resurfacing	Lee County	2030	2032	\$756,000	\$189,000	\$945,000
NA	AM-25	CR-179 Widening and Resurfacing	Lee County	2032	2034	\$884,000	\$221,000	\$1,105,000
NA	AM-26	CR-240 Resurfacing	Lee County	2034	2036	\$1,024,000	\$256,000	\$1,280,000
NA	AM-27	CR-230 Resurfacing	Lee County	2036	2038	\$272,000	\$68,000	\$340,000

* The program years for short-term Alabama maintenance projects reflect what is in the current ALDOT Capital Projects Management System (CPMS) provided by ALDOT.

Table 15.32. Long-Term Alabama Maintenance Projects (2040-2050)

ALDOT PI #	Project ID	Project Title	Source	PE Year	CST Year	Federal	Local	Total Cost
NA	AM-28	CR-197 Resurfacing	Lee County	2038	2040	\$768,000	\$192,000	\$960,000
NA	AM-29	Resurfacing Various Streets - Broad St. and Dillingham St.	Phenix City	2029	2040	\$392,000	\$98,000	\$490,000
NA	AM-30	Resurfacing Various Streets - Colin Powell Pkwy. and 20th Ave.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$741,600	\$185,400	\$927,000
NA	AM-31	Resurfacing Various Streets - Meadowlane Dr. and 10th Ave. S	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$608,000	\$152,000	\$760,000
NA	AM-32	Resurfacing Various Streets - Idle Hour Dr., 36th St. and Opelika Rd.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$960,000	\$240,000	\$1,200,000
NA	AM-33	Resurfacing of Summerville Rd.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$920,000	\$230,000	\$1,150,000
NA	AM-34	Resurfacing of Summerville Rd.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$745,600	\$186,400	\$932,000
NA	AM-35	Resurfacing of Lakewood Dr.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$736,000	\$184,000	\$920,000
NA	AM-36	Resurfacing of Stadium Dr.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$644,000	\$161,000	\$805,000
NA	AM-37	Resurfacing of Seale Rd.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$478,400	\$119,600	\$598,000
NA	AM-38	Resurfacing Various Streets - 16th St. and 5th Ave.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$368,000	\$92,000	\$460,000
NA	AM-39	Resurfacing Various Streets - Martin Luther King, Jr. Pkwy and Broad St.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$244,000	\$61,000	\$305,000
NA	AM-40	Resurfacing of Sandfort Rd.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$782,000	\$195,500	\$977,500
NA	AM-41	Resurfacing of Wright Rd.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$460,000	\$115,000	\$575,000
NA	AM-42	Resurfacing of Broad St.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$328,000	\$82,000	\$410,000
NA	AM-43	Resurfacing of Various Streets - Dillingham St., 14th St. and Fontaine Rd.	Phenix City	2035	2040	\$308,000	\$77,000	\$385,000
NA	AM-44	CR-158 Resurfacing	Lee County	2037	2042	\$1,728,000	\$432,000	\$2,160,000
NA	AM-45	CR-379 Resurfacing	Lee County	2038	2046	\$2,496,000	\$624,000	\$3,120,000
NA	AM-46	CR-318 Resurfacing	Lee County	2045	2048	\$1,536,000	\$384,000	\$1,920,000
NA	AM-47	CR-246 Resurfacing	Lee County	2046	2050	\$986,000	\$246,500	\$1,232,500

Transit Recommendations

The following transit recommendations are sourced from the Lee-Russell Council of Governments (LRCOG) Transit Development Plan (September 2023). Short-mid term recommendations are to occur from 2024-2026, and mid-long term recommendations are to occur from 2026-2033. The PEX recommendations would reduce annual costs by roughly \$227,000, while the LRTP recommendations would increase annual costs by roughly \$196,000.

Table 15.33. PEX Recommendation Operating Cost Comparison

Scenario	Cost
PEX Baseline Annual Cost	\$420,976
PEX Concept 2 Annual Cost	\$193,474
COST DIFFERENCE	-\$227,502

Table 15.34. LRPT Baseline Cost Comparison for Concept 1

Scenario	Cost
LRPT Baseline Annual Cost	\$1,305,947
LRPT Concept 1 Annual Cost	\$1,502,096
COST DIFFERENCE	+\$196,149

Table 15.35. PEX Short- Mid Term and Mid-Long Term Transit Recommendations

Short- to Mid- Term (3-5 years)	Mid- to Long- Term (5-10 years)
Community Involvement	
Community outreach and public meetings	
Coordination with key stakeholders	
Planning	
Service plan refinement	Refine on-demand zone
Test runs and scheduling	Select service delivery model
Title VI equity analysis	Identify and pursue funding
Plan adoption by City Council	Identify potential service contractors
	Plan adoption by City Council
Operations + Capital	
Develop work assignment for workers	Coordinate with service contractor
Train drivers on new routes	Develop work assignment
Prepare for addition/removal of transit stop signs and infrastructure	Train drivers on new service
Purchase new vehicles if required	Purchase additional vehicles if required
Secure technology for on-demand deployment	
Marketing	
Develop marketing plan and schedule	
Update online and paper materials	
Execute marketing campaign	
Conduct kickoff event	
Implementation	
Service changeover	Refine service policies in advance of expansion
Launch short-term plan and begin revenue operations	Launch pilot project, Saturday service, and span expansion
Monitor and evaluate service	Monitor and evaluate service

Policy Recommendations

The policy recommendations outlined in this section serve as essential strategic guidelines for shaping transportation planning and investment decisions within the Columbus-Phenix City Transportation Study (C-PCTS) Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). These recommendations are integral to effectively implementing the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), ensuring that future infrastructure projects align with the evolving needs of all transportation system users.

As the region navigates challenges such as climate change, increasing freight demands, and social equity issues, the transportation system must become more resilient, efficient, and inclusive. These policies support infrastructure improvements and address non-infrastructure needs critical for achieving the comprehensive goals established in Chapter 3.

This section identifies **four key policy areas for the C-PCTS region—resilience, freight, active transportation, and equity**—each with specific recommendations designed to tackle the region's pressing transportation

challenges. Achieving this vision requires collaboration between C-PCTS, ALDOT, GDOT, and local municipalities, each leveraging their unique roles.

C-PCTS plays a key role by prioritizing federal transportation funding, offering technical assistance to regional partners, and bringing together regional leaders to address major policy issues. Local governments, municipal staff, and stakeholders should incorporate these regional priorities into their local policies and infrastructure planning efforts.

A summary of policies and programs is presented in Table 15.35. Since walking and biking are most effective for shorter trips within local areas, local leadership and active community engagement are critical for implementing these policies successfully.

The following policy recommendations are designed to ensure that transportation infrastructure in the Columbus-Phenix City region is resilient, efficient, inclusive, and sustainable, thus creating a safer and more accessible network for all users.

Table 15.36. *Policy Recommendations Summary Table*

EQUITY

Target Underserved Areas for Transit Investment

Expand Affordable Transportation Options

Reduce Transportation Barriers for Disabled and Elderly

Equity in Transportation Funding

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Establish and Enforce Active Transportation Design Standards in Design Guidelines and Engineering Standards

Public Transportation and Active Transportation Integration

Promotion of Safe Routes to School

RESILIENCE

Infrastructure Hardening and Redesign

Use Resilient Materials in Local Government Projects

Redundant Transportation Network

FREIGHT

Optimize Freight Corridor and Bottleneck Reduction

Monitor the Needs for Freight Lanes

Expand and Enhance Freight Rail Infrastructure

Smart Freight Systems

EQUITY

TARGET UNDERSERVED AREAS FOR TRANSIT INVESTMENT

Prioritize expanding and improving transit services in historically underserved and low-income communities. These areas often lack sufficient public transportation infrastructure, which exacerbates inequality in access to employment, healthcare, and education.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

- Expand bus service coverage to areas with lower transit availability.
- Build new transit stops that cater to high-need areas with low vehicle ownership rates.
- Improve last-mile connections by incorporating walking paths and bike lanes that enhance accessibility to transit hubs.

LEAD AGENCY

C-PCTS MPO

MPO ROLE

Assess current funding allocation patterns and propose adjustments to promote equity.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Submit data on transportation gaps in low-income communities and support funding realignments.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Community organizations can aid in identifying underfunded areas.

EXPAND AFFORDABLE TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

Introduce programs and policies that reduce transportation costs for low-income populations, ensuring that affordable options for transit and shared mobility are widely available

INTENDED OUTCOMES

- Fare subsidies and discount programs for underserved populations, such as seniors, low-income residents, and students.
- Shared mobility services, such as bike-sharing and e-scooters, with reduced rates for qualifying residents.
- Low-income individuals are aware of and can access these affordable transportation options.

LEAD AGENCY

METRA and LRCOG

MPO ROLE

Coordinate funding and policy alignment for affordable transportation options.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Support infrastructure expansion for shared mobility services and implement local pricing programs.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Community organizations can help identify transportation cost barriers and connect residents with available programs

REDUCE TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS FOR DISABLED AND ELDERLY

Enhance paratransit services and ensure accessible infrastructure to meet the needs of elderly individuals and people with disabilities. These improvements should align with ADA standards and extend beyond simple compliance to increase the ease and comfort of movement for these populations.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

- Widen sidewalks and remove barriers that limit mobility for wheelchairs and walkers.
- Install ramps and curb cuts at all intersections and transit stops.
- Install accessible crosswalks with audio signals and extended walk times for pedestrians with mobility challenges.
- Ensure key transit stops have shelters, ramps, and adequate space for wheelchair users.
- Upgrade sidewalks to be smooth, wide, and free of obstacles along critical corridors used by vulnerable populations.
- Ensure all public transit vehicles and stations are ADA-compliant and provide real-time updates on accessible routes and services.

LEAD AGENCY

Local Governments, METRA, and LRCOG

MPO ROLE

Conduct a comprehensive audit of major transportation corridors to identify areas in need of ADA upgrades, such as crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and transit stops. Prioritize improvements in areas with high pedestrian traffic or concentrations of elderly and disabled populations.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Implement the physical improvements and monitor compliance with ADA standards.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Disability rights organizations and local accessibility groups can assist with corridor assessments and prioritize improvements.

EQUITY IN TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Establish transparent funding processes that ensure transportation resources are equitably distributed. Investments should focus on regions with the highest needs, such as low-income communities, where transportation infrastructure is insufficient or in disrepair.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

- Redirect resources toward communities with the greatest disparity in access to transportation services.
- Focus on areas where residents rely heavily on public transportation due to limited personal vehicle ownership.
- Establish metrics to measure equitable distribution of funds and outcomes for underserved communities.

LEAD AGENCY

C-PCTS MPO

MPO ROLE

Assess current funding allocation patterns and propose adjustments to promote equity.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Submit data on transportation gaps in low-income communities and support funding realignments.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Community organizations can aid in identifying underfunded areas.

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

ESTABLISH AND ENFORCE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION DESIGN STANDARDS IN DESIGN GUIDELINES AND ENGINEERING STANDARDS

Require local municipalities to incorporate active transportation design standards in their Design Guidelines and Engineering Standards. These standards should align with recognized industry best practices (e.g., NACTO, AASHTO) and include specific guidelines for pedestrian, cycling, and other active modes of transportation. The policy should ensure a structured review process, supported by the MPO, to enforce compliance with these standards during project scoping and design review phases..

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Through project scoping and design review to ensure plans are consistent with industry design standards and best practices.

LEAD AGENCY

Local municipalities

MPO ROLE

Support through project scoping and design review to ensure plans are consistent with design standards and best practices. .

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Incorporation of active transportation elements in local standards and codes.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Local advocates and DOTs can support policy development and adoption.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION INTEGRATION

Coordinate active transportation infrastructure with public transit systems to enhance multimodal commuting.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Install bike racks at transit stations and improve pedestrian access to bus stops.

LEAD AGENCY

Local municipalities.

MPO ROLE

Coordinate integration efforts.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Support facility enhancements.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

METRA and Lee-Russell Council of Governments (LRCOG) for collaboration

PROMOTION OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Collaborate with local governments and school districts to develop safe walking and biking routes for children.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Implement traffic calming measures and raise community awareness around school routes.

LEAD AGENCY

Local governments

MPO ROLE

Facilitate programs for schools.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Enhance infrastructure around schools.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

School boards for planning.

RESILIENCE

Recognizing climate change as a national priority, the C-PCTS MPO is committed to developing policies that foster climate resilience in transportation planning. The MPO will address the impacts of extreme weather events such as flooding, drought, and heatwaves on transportation infrastructure, particularly in vulnerable areas affected by flooding from the Chattahoochee River.

INFRASTRUCTURE HARDENING AND REDESIGN

Implement design standards that enhance the resilience of roads, bridges, and transit facilities against extreme weather events.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Utilize permeable pavement, elevate critical roadways, and integrate green infrastructure approaches.

LEAD AGENCY

ALDOT, GDOT, and Local Municipalities.

MPO ROLE

Provide technical guidelines and funding support.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Adopt resilient design practices in local infrastructure projects.

USE RESILIENT MATERIALS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

Partner with local governments to promote the adoption of durable materials resistant to extreme weather.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Use high-performance concrete and heat-resistant asphalt mixtures.

LEAD AGENCY

Local Municipalities

MPO ROLE

Promote the use of materials in local projects.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Implement material guidelines in public works projects.

REDUNDANT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Establish backup routes and alternative transportation options to maintain mobility during emergencies.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Identify parallel roadways and create dedicated evacuation routes.

LEAD AGENCY

C-PCTS MPO

MPO ROLE

Coordinate planning efforts for redundancy.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Support local routing plans.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Emergency management agencies

FREIGHT

To enhance freight movement and reduce congestion, the C-PCTS MPO recognizes the importance of effective freight policies that streamline goods movement within the region.

OPTIMIZE FREIGHT CORRIDOR AND BOTTLENECK REDUCTION

Identify and prioritize improvements on key freight corridors to alleviate congestion at critical bottlenecks.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Increase lane capacity on major highways and improve access to intermodal freight facilities.

LEAD AGENCY

C-PCTS MPO

MPO ROLE

Prioritize projects that promote freight mobility.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Implement roadway improvements as identified.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Freight companies for input on improvements.

MONITOR THE NEEDS FOR FREIGHT LANES

Collaborate with the ALDOT, GDOT, and local governments to monitor conditions and the need for dedicated freight lanes and supporting infrastructure.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Implement dedicated truck lanes on high-volume routes when necessary.

LEAD AGENCY

C-PCTS MPO

MPO ROLE

Lead collaborative planning initiatives.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Integrate freight lane designs into local plans.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Fort Moore, Industry stakeholders for insights.

EXPAND AND ENHANCE FREIGHT RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

Enhance rail facilities to support increased freight movement and alleviate road congestion.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Construct new intermodal facilities and rail spurs to key industrial areas.

LEAD AGENCY

Railroad operators/Georgia Ports Authority.

MPO ROLE

Monitor freight trends in the region and coordinate with GDOT on needs.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Zone for rail expansion.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Rail companies for collaboration

SMART FREIGHT SYSTEMS

Promote technology-driven solutions for real-time management of freight flows.

INTENDED OUTCOMES

Use of connected vehicle systems to provide real-time congestion and parking information.

LEAD AGENCY

GDOT, ALDOT

MPO ROLE

Coordinate with GDOT and ALDOT for freight initiatives.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES ROLE

Support tech integration.

OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Freight logistics providers

I-14 INITIATIVE

An issue that was raised during the public comment period was the recognition of the I-14 initiative. Based on documentation sent to the project team, the inclusion aligns with the significant support from key stakeholders, including the C-PCTS MPO, Columbus-Muscogee, Phenix City, Russell County, GDOT, and ALDOT through various Letters of Concurrence and Resolutions. The alignment through the C-PCTS MPO would generally follow the US 80 corridor through the region with a connection at some point west of US 280 in Alabama. Congress has officially designated the route through the MPO coverage area, per Pub. L. No. 117-58.

Given its absence of mention in the statewide transportation plans for both GDOT and ALDOT, the I-14 initiative is viewed as more of an aspirational initiative, however, **the C-PCTS MPO does support the following policy initiatives regarding I-14:**

- Continue to monitor and support activities of GDOT and ALDOT to further the development of I-14 within their respective states and the C-PCTS MPO region.
- Promote the development of the proposed projects along US 80 and its interchanges to conform to FHWA interstate standards.

