2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan | MTP

Connect 2050

MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Glossary of Transportation Terms	xi
Authorizing Resolution	xiv
Chapter 1 | Introduction	1
Chapter 2 | Goals & Objectives	13
Chapter 3 | Sociodemographics and Forecasting	24
Chapter 4 | Public Involvement	74
Chapter 5 | Operational & Management Strategies	92
Chapter 6 | Roads and Bridges Projects	97
Chapter 7 | Public Transportation	120
Chapter 8 | Fiscal Assessment	145
Chapter 9 | Safety	160
Chapter 10 | Pedestrians and Bicyclists	176
Chapter 11 | Freight Transportation Network: Trucks, Rail Aviation Ports	197
Chapter 12 | Plan Considerations	255
Chapter 13 | Performance Based Transportation Planning and Programming	295
Appendix A: Data Development Methodology Notes for MATS 2015 Baseline Population and Employment Estimates	310
Appendix B: Data Development Methodology Notes for MATS 2050 Population and Employment Forecasts	327
Appendix C: MATS Connect2050/2022 Year of the Plan Public Outreach Survey Website Front Page	351
Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP JotForm Survey Freeform Comments Summary November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022	353
Appendix E: Sign In and Public Comment Sheets for 2050 MTP Public Information Open Houses	368

Section **Page**

Appendix F: Public Comments on the 2050 MTP Submitted Via E-mail to MATS Staff 387

Appendix G: Public Notices for MATS Public Open Houses and Opportunities to Comment on MATS 2050 MTP 414

Appendix H: Print Articles and Media Postings Related to MATS 2050 MTP Outreach Efforts 422

Appendix I: Public Notice for Final MATS 2050 MTP and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report 427

Appendix J: Completed Freight Surveys 433

Appendix K: Solicitation for Comments from Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Members (and Other Partner Agencies), Log of Received Comments, and MATS Responses 443

List of Tables

Table **Page**

Table 2-1 Comparison of Transportation Planning Goals & Objectives Under FAST Act, Georgia 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan, and MATS 2050 MTP 18

Table 3-1 Total Population, by Race of Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties for 2010, 2015 (Estimated) and 2020 26

Table 3-2 U.S. Census 2020 Total Population, by Race of MATS Area 26

Table 3-3 Marginal Percentages of Educational Attainment in 2015 for the MATS Area Population Age 25 and Over, Overall, and by MATS Sub Area 41

Table 3-4 Distribution of Employment by NAICS Category and GDOT Travel Demand Modeling Category, by County, across the MATS Area 63

Table 3-5 MATS Area Future Land Use Net Acreage, by County, by Category 68

Table 3-6 Anticipated Population Growth in Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties, and Subtotals for MATS Area Portions 70

Table 3-7 Breakdown of Anticipated Population Growth in Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties, and for MATS Area Portions, By Age Group 70

Table		Page
Table 4-1	Distribution of Relative Importance of Strategies for Achieving FAST Act Transportation Goals	81
Table 4-2	Crosstabulation of On-Line Survey Responses per ZIP Code by Age Group	83
Table 4-3	Distribution of Survey Responses by Most Common Mode of Travel	85
Table 6-1	Road Centerline Miles in MATS Area By Type, per County	97
Table 6-2	MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges Projects List (Approved 12/9/2021)	105
Table 6-3	Anticipated Revenues for New Road & Bridge Projects, and for Maintenance: FY 2021 - 2050	110
Table 6-4	Demonstration of Fiscal Balancing for Roads & Bridges Projects	112
Table 6-5	Projects Identified for Further Study and Future Consideration	115
Table 7-1	ADA Service Characteristics for Macon Transit Authority	133
Table 7-2	Macon Transit Authority Vehicle Replacement Schedule	137
Table 7-3	Jones County Yearly Transit Trip Totals, by Program	138
Table 7-4	Projected Daily Ridership for Macon Transit Authority, 2021 - 2029	139
Table 7-5	MTA Capital Improvement Program (5307 Program) FY 2023 – 2028	140
Table 7-6	MTA Capital Improvement Program (5339 Program) FY 2023 – 2028	141
Table 7-7	Summary of Initial GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds	142
Table 7-8:	Detailed Breakdown of GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds, and Proposed FY 2019 TAM Targets	143
Table 8-1	Revenue Projections for MATS Area Roads & Bridge Projects	147
Table 8-2	MATS Highway Capital Projects Revenue Estimates, 2021 – 2050	148
Table 8-3	MATS Highway Capital Projects Revenue Estimates, 2021 – 2050	148
Table 8-4	Projected Transit Capital and Operating Funding for MTA 2022 – 2050	151
Table 8-5	Estimated Capital and Operating Expenses (from Macon Transit Authority)	152
Table 8-6	Transportation Programs Master Balance Sheet	154
Table 9-1	Georgia 2022 Statewide Highway Safety Plan Performance Targets	161
Table 9-2	Accident Summary for MATS Area, by County and Fatality/Injury Coding 2016 – 2020	163

Table		Page
Table 9-3	Traffic Accident Fatalities for MATS Area, by County, with 5 Year Rolling Averages: 2016-2020	164
Table 9-4	Traffic Accident Serious Injuries for MATS Area, by County, with 5 Year Rolling Averages: 2016-2020	165
Table 9-5	Identification of Problem Corridors for Accidents Involving Pedestrians in the MATS Area, based on 2016-2020 GEARS Reporting	170
Table 9-6	Identification of Problem Corridors for Accidents Involving Cyclists in the MATS Area, based on 2016-2020 GEARS Reporting	171
Table 9-7	Description of Contributing Factors for Accidents in MATS Area, by County and Fatality/Injury Coding: 2016 – 2020	173
Table 11-1	Performance Measures for Freight Movement on Interstate Highway System	202
Table 11-2	Freight System Elements by Ownership and System Extent	204
Table 11-3	Key Truck Corridors Supporting Middle Georgia Freight	214
Table 11-4	Freight Companies/Truck Terminals	220
Table 11-5	Operating Route Mileage in Georgia, 2017	227
Table 11-6	Total Class 1 Rail Mileage Operated in Georgia (2019)	229
Table 11-7a	Georgia Railroad National Rankings, 2017	235
Table 11-7b	Georgia Railroad National Rankings Change, 2012 – 2017	235
Table 12-1	Comparison of EJ, the Title VI Statue and the FHWA Title VI Program	261
Table 12-2	Minority Representation on MATS Area Boards and Commissions	264
Table 12-3	Estimate of English Language Proficiency of Population in MATS Counties	266
Table 13-1	Highway Performance Measures, as Identified by FHWA	297
Table 13-2	GDOT Safety Performance (PM1) Targets, 5 Year Rolling Averages	300
Table 13 – 3	Current GDOT Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) Performance Targets	301
Table 13 – 4	GDOT Highway System Performance, Freight Movement, and Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (PM3) Targets	302
Table 13-5	Summary of Initial GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds	303

Table		Page
Table 13-6	Detailed Breakdown of GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds, and Proposed FY 2019 TAM Targets	304

List of Figures

Figure		Page
Fig. 1-1	Overview of the MATS MPO Region	2
Fig. 1-2	Distribution of MPOs Across Georgia	3
Fig. 1-3	Relationship Between LRTP, TIP and UPWP Planning Documents	5
Fig. 1-4	MATS Funding and Reporting Relationships With Federal and State Agencies	6
Fig. 3-1	Bibb County Population Trends, 1960 – 2050	24
Fig. 3-2	Jones County Population Trends, 1960 – 2050	25
Fig. 3-3	Monroe County Population Trends, 1960 – 2050	25
Fig. 3-4	MATS Area Census Block Groups (2010), by County	29
Fig. 3-5	Bibb County Median Age Profile, by Race	30
Fig. 3-6	Jones County Median Age Profile, by Race, for MATS Area	31
Fig. 3-7	Monroe County Median Age Profile, by Race, for MATS Area	32
Fig. 3-8	Median Household Income (in 2015 Inflation Adjusted Dollars), by MATS Sub Area and Race (Where Available)	34
Fig. 3-9	Housing Occupancy by MATS Sub Area	36
Fig. 3-10	Median Home Value and Median Gross Rents in MATS Areas	37
Fig. 3-11	Bibb County Housing Tenure, by Race	38
Fig. 3-12	Jones County Housing Tenure, by Race, MATS Sub Area	39
Fig. 3-13	Monroe County Housing Tenure, by Race, MATS Sub Area	40
Fig. 3-14	Educational Attainment for Population in MATS Area Age 25 Years and Over	43
Fig. 3-15	Summary of Non-English Speaking Population Age 5 and Older, by Language Group, per MATS Area	44
Fig. 3-16a	Workers by Place of Work – State and County Level: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County	47

Figure		Page
Fig. 3-16b	Workers by Place of Work – State and County Level: Jones County MATS Area	48
Fig. 3-16c	Workers by Place of Work – State and County Level: Monroe County MATS Area	49
Fig. 3-17a	Mode of Travel to Work: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County	50
Fig. 3-17b	Mode of Travel to Work: Jones County MATS Area	51
Fig. 3-17c	Mode of Travel to Work: Monroe County MATS Area	52
Fig. 3-18a	Distribution of Commute Times for Persons who Drove Alone: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County	53
Fig. 3-18b	Distribution of Commute Times for Persons who Drove Alone: Jones County MATS Area	54
Fig. 3-18c	Distribution of Commute Times for Persons who Drove Alone: Monroe County MATS Area	55
Fig. 3-19a	Distribution of Commute Times for Persons who Carpooled: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County	56
Fig. 3-19b	Distribution of Commute Times for Persons who Carpooled: Jones County MATS Area	56
Fig. 3-19c	Distribution of Commute Times for Persons who Carpooled: Monroe County MATS Area	57
Fig. 3-20	Distribution of Commute Times for Persons who Used Public Transportation: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County	56
Fig. 3-21a	Median Work Commute Times by Major Travel Mode MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County	59
Fig. 3-21b	Median Work Commute Times by Major Travel Mode Jones County MATS Area	60
Fig. 3-21c	Median Work Commute Times by Major Travel Mode Monroe County MATS Area	61
Fig. 3-22a	Employment by GDOT Modeling Category for MATS MPO Consolidated Area and Bibb County (2015 Base Year, and 2050 Projected)	64

Figure		Page
Fig. 3-22b	Employment by GDOT Modeling Category for MATS Portion of Jones County (2015 Base Year, and 2050 Projected)	65
Fig. 3-22c	Employment by GDOT Modeling Category for MATS Portion of Monroe County (2015 Base Year, and 2050 Projected)	66
Fig. 3-23	MATS MPO Future Land Use	69
Fig. 3-24	MATS Area Anticipated 2050 Population Growth Distribution, By County	72
Fig. 4-1	Distribution of Responses for Importance of Adding and Widening Roads	77
Fig. 4-2	Distribution of Responses for Importance of Deploying Advanced Technology on Roads	77
Fig. 4-3	Distribution of Responses for Importance of Improving Travel Flows	78
Fig. 4-4	Distribution of Responses for Importance of Enhancing Bicycling & Walking Environments	78
Fig. 4-5	Distribution of Responses for Importance of Maintaining Roads	79
Fig. 4-6	Distribution of Responses for Importance of Enhancing Public Transportation Options	79
Fig. 4-7	Distribution of Responses for Importance of Enhancing Travel Safety	80
Fig. 4-8	Areas Covered (by ZIP Code) of responses to MATS 2050 MTP On-Line Survey	84
Fig. 5-1	Distribution of GDOT Traffic Demand Sensors in Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties	96
Fig, 6-1	Road Network for MATS MPO Service Area	98
Fig. 6-2	MATS Area 1st Network: Daily Level of Service MATS Area for 2015 Base Year	100
Fig. 6-3	MATS Area 2nd Network: 2015 Base year (1st Network) + Any Projects Which Either Opened to Traffic Since 2015, Or Currently Under Construction	101
Fig. 6-4	MATS Area 3rd Network: 2nd Network + projects with construction (CST) funded in the STIP years 2021-2024 + local projects with CST funded in the MPO's current TIP	102

Figure		Page
Fig. 6-5	MATS Area 4th Network: 3rd Network + Projects with Preliminary Engineering (PE) and/or Right of Way (ROW) Funded in STIP years 2021-2024 + Local Projects with PE and/or ROW Funded in the MATS Current TIP (FY 2021 – 2024)	103
Fig. 6-6	MATS Area 5th Network: Completion of 4th Network + all projects To Address Future Transportation Needs Through 2050, As Identified Through the MATS MTP Process	104
Fig. 6-7	Road and Bridges Projects Throughout MATS Area	109
Fig. 7-1	MTA Route 1 - Vineville Route/Zebulon Rd.	12
Fig. 7-2a	MTA Route 2 - Bellevue-Log Cabin Route	124
Fig. 7-2b	MTA Route 2 – Bellevue vs. Bellevue Express Route	124
Fig. 7-3	MTA Route 3 - West Macon – Macon Mall	125
Fig. 7-4	MTA Route 4 - North Highlands	126
Fig. 7-5	MTA Route 5 – Ocmulgee – Tom Hill and Ocmulgee Express	127
Fig. 7-6	MTA Route 6 - Westgate/Bloomfield	128
Fig. 7-7	MTA Route 7 - Macon Mall/Chambers Road	129
Fig. 7-8	MTA Route 8 - East Macon/Kings Park	130
Fig. 7-9	MTA Route 9 - Houston Ave/Peach Orchard	131
Fig. 7-10	MTA Route 10 – 2nd St. Corridor	132
Fig. 7-11	MTA Route Master Map	134
Fig. 9-1	Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Cyclists or Pedestrians, 2016-2020	166
Fig. 9-2	Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Pedestrian Fatalities 2016-2020	167
Fig. 9-3	Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Pedestrian Serious Injuries, 2016-2020	168
Fig. 9-4	Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Cyclist Serious Injuries, 2016-2020	169
Fig. 9-5	Impact Speed and a Pedestrian's Risk of Severe Injury or Death	172
Fig. 10-1	Oglethorpe Roundabout	188
Fig. 10-2	Median Refute Islands	189

Figure		Page
Fig. 10-3	FHWA Recommended Pedestrian Safety Countermeasures	190
Fig. 11-1	Georgia Highway System Map	205
Fig. 11-2	Georgia Railway System Map	207
Fig. 11-3	Georgia Ports And Waterways	209
Fig. 11-4	Georgia Aviation System	211
Fig. 11-5	Georgia Designated Freight Corridors	213
Fig. 11-6	Middle Georgia Truck Freight by Flow and Mode, 2013	215
Fig. 11-7	Middle Georgia Truck Freight by Mode, 2013	216
Fig. 11-8	Freight Companies and Truck Terminals Located in the MATS Area	219
Fig. 11-9	Seventh Street Truck Route	223
Fig. 11-10	Proposed I-14 Route from Odessa TX to Augusta, GA	224
Fig. 11-11	Possible Alternative for Eastern Portion of Proposed I-14 Corridor on MATS 2050 Project List	224
Fig. 11-12	I-16/I-75 Interchange Project	226
Fig. 11-13	Georgia Statewide Rail System	228
Fig. 11-14	Georgia CSX Rail Network	230
Fig. 11-15	Georgia Norfolk-Southern Rail Network	232
Fig. 11-16	GDOT Owned Rail Lines (Short Lines)	234
Fig. 11-17	Rail Line Weight Limits for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia	239
Fig. 11-18	Rail Line Vertical Clearances for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia	240
Fig. 11-19	Rail System Throughput Bottlenecks - Class 1 Railroads in Georgia	242
Fig. 11-20	Middle Georgia Rail Freight By Flow and Mode, 2013	243
Fig. 11-21	Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Lane – 2013	244
Fig. 11-22	Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Commodity – 2013	245
Fig. 11-23	Overview of Public Airports by Level Of Service	247
Fig. 11-24	Macon Downtown Airport	249
Fig. 11-25	Middle Georgia Regional Airport	250
Fig. 12-1	Equality vs. Equity	262

Figure		Page
Fig. 12-2	Location of Bridge and Intersection Projects Throughout MATS Area	270
Fig. 12-3	Location of MTP Projects In Relation To Environmental Justice Areas	272
Fig. 12-4	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Community Facilities	274
Fig. 12-5	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Conservation Areas	276
Fig. 12-6: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Watersheds		278
Fig. 12-7	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Ground Water Recharge Areas	280
Fig. 12-8	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Wetland Areas	282
Fig. 12-9	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Floodplain Areas Feb 13 2017	284
Fig. 12-10	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Historic Resources – MATS Area (with Macon Specific Inset)	286
Fig. 12-12	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Archaeologically Sensitive Areas	288
Fig. 12-13	Location of MTP Projects in Relation to River and Stream Corridor Protection	290

The opinions, findings, and conclusions in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the Department of Transportation, State of Georgia, or Federal Highway Administration.

This document was prepared in cooperation with the Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration.

Glossary of Transportation Terms

Below are the full names of some of the acronyms you may come across as you review particular chapters of this document. If you want additional information, please, visit https://www.maconmpo.com/glossary/, or contact MATS staff at mpo@mbpz.org

2021 SSTP	Georgia 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan
2022 SHSP	Georgia 2022 Strategic Highway Safety Plan
2050 SWTP	Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan
23 CFR	U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Section 450
ABS	Automatic Block Signals
ACS	American Community Survey
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
CAC	Citizen's Advisory Committee
CHAMP	Coordinated Highway Assistance Program (Georgia Dept. of Transportation)
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
CSX	CSX Railroad
CTC	Centralized Train Control
CTS	Georgia Coordinated Transportation System Program
DHS	Georgia Department of Human Services
DNR	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
EJ	Environmental Justice
EPD	Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration

FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FY	Fiscal Year
GDOT	Georgia Department of Transportation
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEARS	Georgia Electronic Accident Reporting System
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPA	Georgia Ports Authority
GTFA 2015	Georgia Transportation Financing Act of 2015
GTIB	Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank
JCT/JCTS	Jones County Transit System
IAC	Interagency Coordinating Committee
IIJA/BIL	Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act/BiPartisan Infrastructure Law of 2021
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
LRTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
MAC	Macon Downtown Airport (aka Herbert Smart Airport)
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act
MATS	Macon Area Transportation Study
MCN	Middle Georgia Regional Airport
MGCAA	Middle Georgia Community Action Agency
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTA	Macon Transit Authority
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NACTO	National Association of City Transportation Officials
NAHRGIS	University of Georgia Natural, Archaeological, and Historic Resources GIS database

NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPP	National Highway Performance Program
NPIAS	National Plan of Integrated Airport System
NPRM	Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Federal)
NS	Norfolk Southern Railroad
PC	Policy Committee
PEA	Planning Emphasis Areas
PM 2.5	Particulate Matter 2.5 microns or smaller in diameter
RSA	Road Safety Audit
RRIF	Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SPLOST	Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TAZ	Transportation Analysis Zone
TCC	Technical Coordinating Committee
TEU	20 Ft. Equivalent Container Unit
TIFIA	Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TPM	Transportation Performance Management
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITTEE ADOPTING THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND 2050 AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION REPORT

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs in accordance with the requirements set forth in Title 23, Section 134 of the United States Code (USC); and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP), developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Sections 450.306 and 450.324 are a recognized instrument for achieving that objective; and

WHEREAS, on April 23, 2014, the Governor of the State of Georgia established the MATS planning area to include:

- All of Bibb County;
- That portion of Jones County contained within the area bounded by the Jones County/Twiggs County boundary, Henderson Rd., Garrison Rd., Lite-N-Tie Rd., Homer Roberts Rd., Huckabee Rd., Georgia State Route 18, and the Bibb County/Jones County boundary;
- That portion of Monroe County contained within the area bounded by Interstate 75, Estes Rd., and the Monroe County/ Bibb County boundary;

and

WHEREAS, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) and the FAST Act require that transportation plans and programs conform to air quality goals established by the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for regions in Nonattainment and Maintenance of a National Ambient Air Quality Standard NAAQS (NAAQS); and

WHEREAS, MATS is subject to the air quality conformity requirements under the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS and that an Air Quality Conformity Report was prepared to demonstrate conformity of the 2050 MTP and Re-affirmed Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the MATS 1997 8-Hour Maintenance Area; and

WHEREAS, under CFR Title 23, Section 490.105, as originally directed under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the.21st Century Act (MAP-21), and continued under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015 and Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021, GDOT is required to identify Performance Management Targets in five general topic areas; Safety, Infrastructure Condition, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, and Congestion Reduction; and

WHEREAS, under CFR 49 Section 625.17, as authorized under the MAP-21, FAST Act and IIJA mentioned above, GDOT has adopted Performance Measures related to State of Good Repair for transit assets, and published the final rule establishing Transit Asset Management (TAM) requirements for recipients and sub-recipients of Federal transit funding; and

WHEREAS, under CFR 49 Section 673, as authorized under the MAP-21, FAST Act and IIJA mentioned above, Federal Transit Administration has established rules related to establishing and carrying out the Public Transportation Safety Programs (PTASP) for all Federal transit funding recipients and sub-recipients covered by the Urbanized Area Formula Funding Program (USC Title 49 Section 5307); and

WHEREAS, because both Jones County Transit and Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority are recognized by GDOT Office of Intermodal are identified as Tier II transit service providers, and therefore are covered under the Statewide TAM and PTASP targets published by GDOT; and

WHEREAS, under CFR Title 23 Section 490.105(f)(l), within 180 days after the adoption of Performance Management Targets by GDOT, MATS is required to establish their own Performance Management Targets

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making between locally elected officials in the Macon-Bibb County, Jones County and Monroe County areas, and duly appointed agency representatives from the State of Georgia, does hereby approve the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP) and Re-affirmed FY 2021-2024 TIP and the associated Air Quality Conformity Determination Report (2050 CDR) for the MATS region.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that MATS Policy Committee does hereby adopt any and all required Performance Measures and Performance Targets currently set by the State of Georgia, as required under CFR Title 23 Section 490 and CFR Title 49 Section 673

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, if updates to State and/or MATS area Performance Management Targets on any Performance Measures described under CFR Title 23 Section 490, CFR Title 49 Section 625.17, or CFR Title 49 Section 673 are initiated by GDOT, subsequent to the adoption of this 2050 MTP and 2050 CDR, such revisions to either the 2050 MTP or 2050 CDR may be incorporated under the Administrative Modification process described in the MATS Public Participation Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, if the MATS Policy Committee seeks to subsequently set revised Performance Management Targets on any Performance Measures identified under CFR Title 23 Section 490, CFR Title 49 Section 625.17, or CFR Title 49 Section 673 for the MATS area, outside of guidance from GDOT, such revisions to either the 2050 MTP or 2050 CDR shall follow the Amendment process described in the MATS Public Participation Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 MTP or 2050 CDR themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

So adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on this 3rd day of May, 2022

By: Louis F. Dunlap
MATS Policy Committee Chairman

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITTEE TO AMEND THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN, TO REFLECT AVAILABILITY OF NEW PROJECTS AND FUNDS AVAILABLE UNDER THE INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT & JOBS ACT OF 2021

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs consistent with comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP), developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations Title 23, Section 450.306, is the recognized instrument for accomplishing this objective; and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2022 Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning informed MATS staff that a new project, GDOT PI #0019107 was to be added to the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and 2021 – 2024 TIP, in the amount of $100,000, for the purpose of scoping out a study for truck parking expansion in Bibb, Monroe and Dooly Counties; and

WHEREAS, on March 31, 2022 Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning informed MATS staff that a new project funding in the total amount of $26,055,622 was made available under the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act PROTECT Grant program, for use on two projects in the MATS MPO area (GDOT PI #0014072 and GDOT PI #0014897; bridge replacements on I-16); and

WHEREAS, subsequent to consultation with the MATS Interagency Coordinating Committee, MATS staff was informed via e-mail from FHWA on May 17, 2022 that, under the terms of the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS, which covers the MATS 2050 MTP, the aforementioned amendments do not require an air quality conformity determination review

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making in the Macon urban area, amends the MATS 2050 MTP, as follows;

- Chapter 6: Roads and Bridges Projects
    - Add GDOT Project #0019107 Truck Parking Expansion – Region 2 to Table 6-2: MATS 2050 MTP Roads & Bridges Projects List. Project added at the request of Georgia Dept. of Transportation - **$100,000**

- Chapter 8: Fiscal Assessment
  - Add **$26,055,442** to the revenue estimate for new highway projects, to reflect funds received by State of Georgia under the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act of 2021 – PROTECT Grant program, and assigned to the MATS MPO Area.
  - Update the MATS Transit Program fiscal balancing calculations to reflect a new balance of **$7,733,143.36**, after processing amendments dated June 13, 2022, to the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program. See MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP for full details.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of this amended MATS 2050 MTP itself, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the error has been corrected.

Adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on the 13th day of June 2022.

By: _____
MATS Policy Committee Chairman

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE AMENDING THE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT, THE 2021 – 2024 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, AND THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO REFLECT UPDATES TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES, AS INITIATED BY GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON DECEMBER 21, 2022

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs in accordance with the requirements set forth in Title 23, Section 134 of the United States Code (USC); and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Sections 450.306 and 450.324 are a recognized instrument for achieving that objective; and

WHEREAS, under Code of Federal Regulations Title 23, Section 490.105, (23 CFR, Sec. 450.105), as originally authorized under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the.21st Century Act (MAP-21) and continuing under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is required to identify Performance Management Targets in five general topic areas; Safety, Infrastructure Condition, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, and Congestion Reduction; and

WHEREAS, on or around December 14, 2022, GDOT informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective Federal transportation planning documents; and

WHEREAS, on December 21, 2022, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for categories specified under 23 CFR 490.105. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Pavement and Bridge Condition Targets (PM2) – Calendar Year 2023

Performance Measure	2-Year Rolling Average	4-Year Rolling Average
Percentage of Interstate Pavements in **"Good"** condition	≥50%	≥50%
Percentage of Interstate Pavements in **"Poor"** condition	≤5%	≤5%
Percentage of Non-Interstate Pavements in **"Good"** condition	≥40%	≥40%
Percentage of Non-Interstate Pavements in **"Poor"** condition	≤12%	≤12%
Percentage of National Highway System bridges (by deck area) in **"Good"** Condition	≥60%	≥60%
Percentage of National Highway System bridges (by deck area) in **"Poor"** Condition	≤10%	≤10%

System Performance/Freight Movement (PM3) – Calendar Year 2023

Performance Measure	2-Year Rolling Average	4-Year Rolling Average
Percentage of person-miles on Interstate system that are "reliable"	≥73.9	≥68.4%
Percentage of person-miles on non-Interstate system that are "reliable"	≥87.3%	≥85.3%
Truck Travel Time Reliability Index	≤1.62	≤1.65
Total Emissions Reduction	VOC: 157.200 kg/day; NOx: 510.900 kg/day	VOC: 257.100 kg/day; NOx: 904.200 kg/day

and;

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(l), within 180 days after the adoption of a specific performance target by GDOT, MATS is required to establish their own targets; and

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of current Performance Measure targets is reflected in the System Performance Report, which is incorporated by reference into the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the current performance targets adopted by the MATS MPO are recorded in Chapter 13 of the MATS 2050 MTP

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making between locally elected officials in the Macon-Bibb County, Jones County and Monroe County areas, and duly appointed agency representatives from the State of Georgia, does hereby amend the System Performance Report and the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP documents to reflect all Statewide Performance targets described in the GDOT Office of Planning e-mail to the Georgia Association of MPOs on December 21, 2022.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that MATS Policy Committee does hereby amend Chapter 13 of the 2050 MTP to reflect same said measures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan or 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

So adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on this 3rd day of May, 2023

By: _____
MATS Policy Committee Chairman

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE AMENDING THE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT, THE 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, AND THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO REFLECT UPDATES TO PERFORMANCE MEASURES, AS INITIATED BY GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON AUGUST 31, 2023

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs in accordance with the requirements set forth in Title 23, Section 134 of the United States Code (USC); and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program, developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Sections 450.324 and 450.326 are a recognized instrument for achieving that objective; and

WHEREAS, under Code of Federal Regulations Title 23, Section 490.105, (23 CFR 490.105), as originally authorized under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the.21st Century Act (MAP-21) and continuing under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is required to identify Performance Management Targets in five general topic areas; Safety, Infrastructure Condition, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, and Congestion Reduction; and

WHEREAS, on or around August 31, 2023, GDOT informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective Federal transportation planning documents; and

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2023, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated Statewide performance measure targets for categories specified under 23 CFR 490.105. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Georgia Statewide Safety Targets (PM1) – Calendar Year 2024

Performance Measure	4-Year (2020 – 2024) Rolling Average
Number of Fatalities	1,680
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	8,966
Number of Serious Injuries	1.36
Rate of Serious Injury per 100 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	7.679
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	802

and;

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(l), within 180 days after the adoption of a specific performance target by GDOT, MATS is required to establish their own targets; and

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of current Performance Measure targets is reflected in the System Performance Report, which is incorporated by reference into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the current performance targets adopted by the MATS MPO are recorded in Chapter 13 of the MATS 2050 MTP

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making between locally elected officials in the Macon-Bibb County, Jones County and Monroe County areas, and duly appointed agency representatives from the State of Georgia, does hereby amend the System Performance Report and the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP documents to reflect all Statewide Performance targets described in the GDOT Office of Planning e-mail to the Georgia Association of MPOs on September 28, 2023.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that MATS Policy Committee does hereby amend Chapter 13 of the 2050 MTP to reflect same said measures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP or 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

So adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on this 1st day of May, 2024

By: Valerie F Wynn
Valerie Wynn
MATS Policy Committee Chairman

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE APPROVING PROJECT AMENDMENTS TO THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND FY 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs consistent with comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP), developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Section 450.324, (23 CFR 450.306) and the FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (FY 2024 – 2027 TIP), developed under the requirements of CFR Title 23, Section 450.326, are the recognized instrument for accomplishing this objective; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the adoption of the original MATS 2050 MTP on May 3, 2022, and the original MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP on September 28, 2023, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), between February 22, 2024 and March 11, 2024, identified the following phases of projects for inclusion, amendment in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP and 2050 MTP, as well as projects to be removed because they have been identified as redundant or unnecessary:

Projects to be Removed from MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and FY 2024 – 2027 TIP	*Projects to be Added or Amended in MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan*	*Project Phases to be Added or Amended in MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP*
○ GDOT Project # 0019088 – SR 11/SR 22/US 129 @ Sand Creek) in the amount of $515,000. This project is being consolidated into GDOT Project #0017231	○ GDOT Project #0019933 – I-75 @ Rocky Creek New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$19,400,000** ○ GDOT Project #0019934 – I-475 Southbound & Northbound @ Tobesofkee Creek 3 Miles South of Macon New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$23,000,000**	○ GDOT Project #0013712 I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Walnut Creek – Increase from **$15,158,410** ($12,126,728 Federal; $3,031,682 State) to **$19,021,722.74.** ($15,217,378.19 Federal; $3,804,344.55 State), for Utilities and Construction project phases in FY 2024. ○ GDOT Project #0014072 I-16 Eastbound &

- GDOT Project #0019935 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ CSX #636057K & Boggy Branch, 1.5 miles East of Macon
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$29,000,000**
- GDOT Project #0019936 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$13,000,000**
- GDOT Project #0019945 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$13,600,000**
- GDOT Project #0020056 – Bondsview Rd. from West of Stone Creek to SR 87
  New Project (Roadway Project), to be added at GDOT and Macon-Bibb County Request– **$490,000**
- GDOT Project #0019935 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ CSX #636057K & Boggy Branch, 1.5 miles East of Macon
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$29,000,000**
- GDOT Project #0019936 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$13,000,000**
- GDOT Project #0019945 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request – **$13,600,000**
- GDOT Project #0020056 – Bondsview Rd. from West of Stone Creek to SR 87
  New Project (Roadway Project), to be added at GDOT and Macon-Bibb County Request– **$490,000**
- GDOT Project #0019934 – I-475 Southbound & Northbound @ Walnut Creek – Reinstate project in the amount of **$19,636,645.00**. ($15,709,316 Federal; $3,92,7329 State) for Construction project phase in FY 2024. This project was originally included in the MATs FY 2021 - 2024 TIP, and is being amended into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP as a continuation of the existing project.
- GDOT Project #0019933 – I-75 @ Rocky Creek – New Project in the amount of **$1,100,000** ($880,000 Federal; $220,000 State), for Preliminary Engineering phase in FY 2024 and anticipated Right Of WayAcquisition phase in FY 2027
- GDOT Project #0019934 – I-475 Southbound & Northbound @ Tobesofkee Creek 3 Miles South of Macon – New Project in the amount of **$1,700,000** ($1,360,000 Federal; $340,000 State) for Preliminary Engineering phase in FY 2024 and anticipated Right Of Way in FY 2027

GDOT Project #0019935 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ CSX #636057K & Boggy Branch 1.5 Miles East of Macon – New Project in the amount of **$1,700,000** ($1,360,000 Federal; $340,000 State) for Preliminary Engineering phase in FY 2024 and anticipated Right Of Way in FY 2027

- GDOT Project #0019936 – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ CSX #636057K & Boggy Branch 1.5 Miles East of Macon – New Project in the amount of **$1,700,000** ($1,360,000 Federal; $340,000 State) for Preliminary Engineering phase in FY 2024 and anticipated Right Of Way in FY 2027
- GDOT Project #0019945 – SR 19/SR 87 Southbound & Northbound @ Walnut Creek – New Project in the amount of **$1,700,000** ($1,360,000 Federal; $340,000 State) for Preliminary Engineering phase in FY 2024 and anticipated

Right Of Way in FY 2027
- GDOT Project #0020056 – Bondsview Rd. from West of Stone Creek to SR 87
New Project (Roadway Project), in the amount of **$490,000** ($490,000 Federal; $0 State) for Construction phase in FY 2024

and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iii) and 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv), the MATS 2050 MTP must continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2050 MTP planning horizon; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326(j), the MATS 2024 – 2027 must similarly continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2024 – 2027 planning period; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to fulfilling the requirements of 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11) and 23 CFR 450.326(i), the adoption of the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP after the adoption of the 2050 MTP creates a need to update the MATS 2050 MTP to reflect project costs associated with the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, in order to continue demonstrating fiscal constraint and preserve the ability to amend both the 2050 MTP and FY 2024 – 2027 TIP as needed; and

WHEREAS, on March 15, 2024, Georgia Department of Transportation – Office of Planning sent an e-mail to MATS MPO staff verifying that the marginal costs increases associated with the proposed projects and project phases described above shall be covered with increased Federal and State match revenues for both the MATS 2050 MTP and MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, as appropriate; and

WHEREAS after adjusting for the project cost updates from the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, this assurance results in the MATS 2050 MTP maintaining a fiscal balance surplus of **$117,224,670.16** for Highway Capital Projects, **$154,902,999.37** for Highway Maintenance Projects, and **$33,020,776.25** for Transit Projects

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making in the Macon urban area does hereby approve the project and project phase

amendments described above to the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 6 (Road and Bridge Projects) and MATS FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program – Chapter 2 (Road and Bridge Projects); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, hereby amends the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 6 (Roads and Bridge Projects) and to reflect the incorporation of the updated project costs described in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, including the adoption of the projects described above and the verification of additional funds available pursuant to the e-mail from Georgia Department of Transportation – Office of Planning on March 15, 2024; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee hereby amends the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 8 (Fiscal Assessment) and the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP – Chapter 3 (Funding) to demonstrate continued fiscal constraint.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, or the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

Adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on the 1st day of May 2024.

By: Valerie F. Wynn
Valerie Wynn
MATS Policy Chairman

Macon Area Transportation Study

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE APPROVING PROJECT AMENDMENTS TO THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND FY 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs consistent with comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP), developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Section 450.324, (23 CFR 450.306) and the FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (FY 2024 – 2027 TIP), developed under the requirements of CFR Title 23, Section 450.326, are the recognized instrument for accomplishing this objective; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the adoption of the original MATS 2050 MTP on May 3, 2022, and the original MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP on September 28, 2023, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), on May 10, 2024, identified the following phases of projects for inclusion, amendment in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP and 2050 MTP

:

Projects to be Added or Amended in MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

- GDOT Project #0020213 –
  (SR 247/US 129 Southbound & Northbound at Norfolk Southern Bridge #729382R)
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request– **$22,650,000**
- GDOT Project #0020345 –
  (I-16 from SR 22 in Bibb County to SR 96 in Twiggs County)
  New Project (Electric Vehicle Infrastructure), to be added at GDOT Request – **$425,000**

Project Phases to be Added or Amended in MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP

- GDOT Project #0020213 –
  (SR 247/US 129 Southbound & Northbound at Norfolk Southern Bridge #729382R)
  New Project (Bridge Replacement), to be added at GDOT Request
  Preliminary Engineering Phase FY 2025 - $1,400,000
  Right of Way Phase FY 2027 - $750,000
  FY 2024 – 2027 Total: – **$2,150,000**
- GDOT Project #0020345 –
  (I-16 from SR 22 in Bibb County to SR 96 in Twiggs County)
  New Project (Electric Vehicle Infrastructure), to be added at GDOT Request
  Construction Phase FY 2025 - **$425,000**
  FY 2024 – 2027 Total: – **$425,00**

- Macon-Bibb County Neighborhood Access and Equity (NAE) Planning Grant - Pleasant Hill Reconnection and Commercial Planning
  FY 2024 – 2027 Total: – **$600,00**

and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iii) and 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv), the MATS 2050 MTP must continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2050 MTP planning horizon; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326(j), the MATS 2024 – 2027 must similarly continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2024 – 2027 planning period; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to fulfilling the requirements of 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11) and 23 CFR 450.326(i), the adoption of the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP after the adoption of the 2050 MTP creates a need to update the MATS 2050 MTP to reflect project costs associated with the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, in order to continue demonstrating fiscal constraint and preserve the ability to amend both the 2050 MTP and FY 2024 – 2027 TIP as needed; and

WHEREAS, in the original notification of May 10, 2024, Georgia Department of Transportation – Office of Planning verified that the marginal costs increases associated with the proposed projects and project phases described above shall be covered with increased Federal and State match revenues for both the MATS 2050 MTP and MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, as appropriate; and

WHEREAS after adjusting for the project cost updates from the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, this assurance results in the MATS 2050 MTP maintaining a fiscal balance surplus of **$117,224,670.16** for Highway Capital Projects, **$154,902,999.37** for Highway Maintenance Projects, and **$33,020,776.25** for Transit Projects

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making in the Macon urban area does hereby approve the project and project phase amendments described above to the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 6 (Road and Bridge Projects) and MATS FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program – Chapter 2 (Road and Bridge Projects); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, hereby amends the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 6 (Roads and Bridge Projects) and to reflect the incorporation of the updated project costs described in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, including the adoption of the projects described above and the verification of additional funds available pursuant to the e-mail from Georgia Department of Transportation – Office of Planning on May 10, 2024; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee hereby amends the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 8 (Fiscal Assessment) and the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP – Chapter 3 (Funding) to demonstrate continued fiscal constraint.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, or the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

Adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on the 7th day of August 2024.

By: Valerie F Wynn

Valerie Wynn

MATS Policy Chairman

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE AMENDING THE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT AND THE 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, TO REFLECT UPDATES TO SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURE TARGETS, AS INITIATED BY GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2024

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs in accordance with the requirements set forth in Title 23, Section 134 of the United States Code (USC); and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Sections 450.306 and 450.324 are a recognized instrument for achieving that objective; and

WHEREAS, under Code of Federal Regulations Title 23, Section 490.105, (23 CFR, Sec. 450.105), as originally authorized under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the.21st Century Act (MAP-21) and continuing under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is required to identify Performance Management Targets in five general topic areas; Safety, Infrastructure Condition, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, and Congestion Reduction; and

WHEREAS, on or around August 31, 2024, GDOT informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective Federal transportation planning documents; and

WHEREAS, on September 12, 2024, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for categories specified under 23 CFR 490.105. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1) – Calendar Year 2025

Performance Measure	GA 5 Year Rolling Average (2021 – 2025)
Number of Fatalities	1,600
Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)	1.25
Number of Serious Injuries	7,109
Serious Injury Rate (per 100 million VMT	5.711
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	799

and;

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(l), within 180 days after the adoption of a specific performance target by GDOT, MATS is required to establish their own targets; and

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of current Performance Measure targets is reflected in the System Performance Report, which is incorporated by reference into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making between locally elected officials in the Macon-Bibb County, Jones County and Monroe County areas, and duly appointed agency representatives from the State of Georgia, does hereby amend the System Performance Report and the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP documents to reflect all Statewide Performance targets described in the GDOT Office of Planning e-mail to the Georgia Association of MPOs on December 21, 2022.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that MATS Policy Committee does hereby amend Chapter 13 of the 2050 MTP to reflect same said measures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan or 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

So adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on this 6th day of November, 2024

By: Valerie F Wynn

MATS Policy Committee Chairman

Macon Area Transportation Study

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE APPROVING PROJECT AMENDMENTS TO THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND FY 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs consistent with comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP), developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Section 450.324, (23 CFR 450.306) and the FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (FY 2024 – 2027 TIP), developed under the requirements of CFR Title 23, Section 450.326, are the recognized instrument for accomplishing this objective; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the adoption of the original MATS 2050 MTP on May 3, 2022, and the original MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP on September 28, 2023, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning, on November 13, 2024, identified the following phases of projects for inclusion, amendment in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP:

- GDOT Project #0020345 – EV Charging Stations @ 1 Location in Bibb/Twiggs County – Preliminary Engineering phase to be added to FY 2025 - $10,200

and;

WHEREAS, subsequent to the adoption of the original MATS 2050 MTP on May 3, 2022, and the original MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP on September 28, 2023, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Intermodal, on November 20, 2024, advised MATS that the following updates required in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP in order for Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) to obtain sub-recipient funding for projects covered under the FTA 5307 and 5339(a) formula funding program for FY 2025 through FY 2027:

- Update GDOT Project #T008412 – 5307 Capital grant in the amount of $555,200 ($444,178 Federal; $55,522 State; $55,522 Local) for FY 2025
- Provide an itemized list of projects to be acquired under GDOT Contract T008412 for the 5307 Capital grant:
  - Purchase mobile cameras $9,750.00
  - Preventative Maintenance $400,000.00
  - ADP Hardware Lease (Annual Upkeep) $19,320.00
  - ADP Software (Annual License) $61,152.00

o Purchase Radios	$18,500.00
o Acquire ADP Software (TripSpark, recurring)	$40,000.00
o Signage	$6,500.00
Total	**$555,222.00**

- Update GDOT Project #T008412 – 5339(a) Capital grant in the amount of $4,172,000 ($3,337,600 Federal; $834,400 Local) for FY 2025
- Provide an itemized list of projects to be acquired under GDOT Contract T008412 for the 5339(a) Capital grant:

o Purchase electric busses	$2,940,000.00
o Farebox	$75,000.00
o Paratransit busses (less than 30 ft., gasoline engine)	$300,000.00
o Miscellaneous Bus Station Equipment	$500,000.00
o Support Equipment	$291,000.00
o Signage	$36,500.00
o Security Cameras (Mobile)	$30,000.00
Total	**$4,172,000.00**

- Update GDOT Project #T008412 – 5307 Operating Assistance grant in the amount of $6,599,286 ($3,299,643 Federal; $3,299,643 Local) for FY 2025
- Update GDOT Project #T008413 – 5307 Capital grant in the amount of $1,504,000 ($1,203,200 Federal; $150,400 State; $150,400 Local) for FY 2026
- Provide an itemized list of projects to be acquired under GDOT Contract T008413 for the 5307 Capital grant:

o Terminal Station Maintenance & Renovation	$200,000.00
o Bus Maintenance Parts & Supplies for Fleet	$275,000.00
o Replace & Refurbish Bus Shelters & Benches	$70,000.00
o Office Equipment & Furniture	$20,000.00
o Purchase Paratransit Bus (Less than 30 ft., conversion from diesel to Electric)	$500,000.00
o ADP Hardware Lease (Annual Upkeep)	$85,000.00
o ADP Software (Annual License)	$65,000.00
o Purchase Radios	$100,000.00
o Support Equipment – Fareboxes	$20,000.00
o GPS Tables with Kits	$50,000.00
o Rehab and Renovate Bus Yards & Shops	$100,000.00
o Acquire ADP Software (TripSpark, recurring)	$50,000.00
Total	**$1,504,000.00**

- Update GDOT Project #T008413 – 5339(a) Capital grant in the amount of $5,526,000.00 ($4,420,800 Federal; $1,105,200 Local) for FY 2026
- Provide an itemized list of projects to be acquired under GDOT Contract T008413 for the 5339(a) Capital grant:

o Purchase electric busses	$4,740,000.00
o Farebox	$136,000.00

o Paratransit busses	$300,000.00
o Support Equipment	$350,000.00
Total	**$5,526,000.00**

- Update GDOT Project #T008413 – 5307 Operating Assistance grant in the amount of $7,150,000 ($3,575,000 Federal; $3,575,000 Local) for FY 2026
- Update GDOT Project #T008414 – 5307 Capital grant in the amount of $1,585,000 ($1,268,000 Federal; $158,500 State; $158,500 Local) for FY 2027
- Provide an itemized list of projects to be acquired under GDOT Contract T008414 for the 5307 Capital grant:

o Terminal Station Maintenance & Renovation	$100,000.00
o Bus Maintenance Parts & Supplies for Fleet	$300,000.00
o Replace & Refurbish Bus Shelters & Benches	$70,000.00
o Office Equipment & Furniture	$15,000.00
o Purchase Paratransit Bus (Less than 30 ft., conversion from diesel to Electric)	$800,000.00
o ADP Hardware Lease (Annual Upkeep)	$70,000.00
o ADP Software (Annual License)	$50,000.00
o Purchase Radios	$20,000.00
o Support Equipment – Fareboxes	$30,000.00
o GPS Tables with Kits	$20,000.00
o Rehab and Renovate Bus Yards & Shops	$50,000.00
o Acquire ADP Software (TripSpark, recurring)	$60,000.00
Total	**$1,585,000.00**

- Update GDOT Project #T008414 – 5339(a) Capital grant in the amount of $3,790,000.00 ($3,032,000 Federal; $758,000 Local) for FY 2027
- Provide an itemized list of projects to be acquired under GDOT Contract T008413 for the 5339(a) Capital grant:

o Purchase electric busses	$2,940,000.00
o Paratransit busses	$600,000.00
o Support Equipment	$250,000.00
Total	**$3,790,000.00**

- Update GDOT Project #T008414 – 5307 Operating Assistance grant in the amount of $7,770,500 ($3,885,250 Federal; $3,885,250 Local) for FY 2027

and:

WHEREAS, on January 3, 2024, Macon-Bibb County received a direct award from U.S. Dept. of Transportation, under the Safe Streets For All grant program, for planning and construction activities related to pedestrian and non-motorized improvements in the area around Gray Highway, Clinton Rd. and Boulevard (formal project title: Gray Highway and East Macon Loop) in the amount of $7,038,050 ($5,630,440.00 Federal; $1,407,610.00 Local Match) allocated in FY 2024 ; and

WHEREAS, on August 29, 2024, the Middle Georgia Regional Commission received a direct award from U.S. Dept. of Transportation, under the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure grant program, for planning and construction activities related to installation of approximately 200 publicly available electric vehicle chargers at 100 sites across Middle Georgia in the 11-county geographical area of Baldwin, Bibb, Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe, Peach, Pulaski, Putnam, Twiggs, and Wilkinson counties (formal project title: Middle GA Community Charging Program) in the amount of $18,750,000 ($15,000,000.00 Federal; $3,750,000.00 Local Match) allocated in FY 2022; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iii) and 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv), the MATS 2050 MTP must continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2050 MTP planning horizon; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326(j), the MATS 2024 – 2027 must similarly continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2024 – 2027 planning period; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to fulfilling the requirements of 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11) and 23 CFR 450.326(i), the adoption of the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP after the adoption of the 2050 MTP creates a need to update the MATS 2050 MTP to reflect project costs associated with the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, in order to continue demonstrating fiscal constraint and preserve the ability to amend both the 2050 MTP and FY 2024 – 2027 TIP as needed; and

WHEREAS after adjusting for the project cost updates from the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, this assurance results in the MATS 2050 MTP maintaining a fiscal balance surplus of **$10,330,736.25** for Transit Projects; and

WHEREAS, as both the Gray Highway and East Macon Loop project and the Middle GA Community Charging Program are direct awards from U.S. Dept. of Transportation to the recipient organizations, neither project has any effect on fiscal balancing requirements for either the MATS 2050 MTP or the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP. However, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326(e), all capital and non-capital surface transportation projects within the MATS area funded under 23 USC and 49 USC must be reflected in the TIP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making in the Macon urban area does hereby approve the project and project phase amendments described above to the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program – Chapter 2 (Road and Bridge Projects) and Chapter 4 (Mass Transit) as appropriate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, hereby amends the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 8 (Fiscal Assessment) and the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP – Chapter 3 (Funding) to demonstrate continued fiscal constraint.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, or the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

Adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on the 5th day of February 2025.

By: Valerie F Wynn

MATS Policy Committee Chair

Macon Area Transportation Study

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE APPROVING PROJECT AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs consistent with comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP), developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Section 450.324, (23 CFR 450.306) and the FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (FY 2024 – 2027 TIP), developed under the requirements of CFR Title 23, Section 450.326, are the recognized instrument for accomplishing this objective; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the adoption of the original MATS 2050 MTP on May 3, 2022, and the original MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP on September 28, 2023, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning, on January 9, 2025, identified the following phases of projects for inclusion, amendment in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP:

- GDOT Project #311400 – I-75 From I-16 To CR 478/Pierce Ave. - Phase VI– Utilities and Construction phases to be added to FY 2026

and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326(j), the MATS 2024 – 2027 must continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2024 – 2027 planning period; and

WHEREAS, on March 5, 2025, GDOT Office of Planning informed MATS MPO that the following budge adjustments and increases in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP were being requested in support of the amendment for GDOT PI #311400:

GDOT Fund Y001:	
Utilities	
Federal contribution:	$3,347,625.31
State of Georgia Contribution:	$836,906.33
Construction	
Federal contribution:	$11,756,384.24
State of Georgia Contribution:	$2,939,096.06
GDOT Fund Y001 Total for FY 2026:	$18,880,011.94

GDOT Fund SGF-C	
Construction	
Federal contribution:	$0.00
State of Georgia Contribution:	$105,106,000.00
GDOT Fund SGF-C Total for FY 2026:	$105,106,000.00
Total Project Cost **Increase**:	**$123,986,011.94**

and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iii) and 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv), the MATS 2050 MTP must similarly continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2050 MTP planning horizon; and

WHEREAS after adjusting for the project cost updates from the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, this assurance results in the MATS 2050 MTP maintaining a fiscal balance surplus of **$189,269,599.24** for Highway projects.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making in the Macon urban area does hereby approve the addition of GDOT Project #311400 – I-75 From I-16 To CR 478/Pierce Ave. - Phase VI, including Utilities and Construction phases to be added to the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program – Chapter 2 (Road and Bridge Projects) and Chapter 3 (Funding) as appropriate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, hereby amends the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 6 (Roads and Bridges Projects) and Chapter 8 (Fiscal Assessment) the to demonstrate continued fiscal constraint.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, or the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

Adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on the 7th day of May 2025.

By: Valerie Wynn

MATS Policy Committee Chair

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE APPROVING PROJECT AND FUNDING PROGRAM AMENDMENTS TO THE 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND FY 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs consistent with comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP), developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Section 450.324, (23 CFR 450.306) and the FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (FY 2024 – 2027 TIP), developed under the requirements of CFR Title 23, Section 450.326, are the recognized instrument for accomplishing this objective; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the adoption of the original MATS 2050 MTP on May 3, 2022, and the original MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP on September 28, 2023, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning, on July 23, 2025, identified the following, amendments in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP:

- Chapter 2
  - Add GDOT Project #0020763 – SR 11/SR49 @ SR 247 – Project Scoping phase to be added to FY 2026 - **$500,000**
- Chapter 3
  - Reflect the addition of **$1,212,393** in Federal funding for the Congestion Management & Air Quality(CMAQ) program to the STIP Matched Funds table for FY 2026

and;

WHEREAS, based on the most recent information available from GDOT, the anticipated total cost of Project #0020763 is **$6,250,000,** with a completion date sometime in FY 2032; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326(a) and 23 CFR 450.326(i), projects listed in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP must "...reflect the investment priorities established in..." and "...be consistent with..." the MATS 2050 MTP; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iii) and 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv), the MATS 2050 MTP must continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2050 MTP planning horizon; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326(j), the MATS 2024 – 2027 must similarly continue to demonstrate that adding the proposed projects and project phases will not exceed the anticipated revenues available for the 2024 – 2027 planning period; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to fulfilling the requirements of 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11) and 23 CFR 450.326(i), the adoption of the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP after the adoption of the 2050 MTP creates a need to update the MATS 2050 MTP to reflect project costs associated with the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, in order to continue demonstrating fiscal constraint and preserve the ability to amend both the 2050 MTP and FY 2024 – 2027 TIP as needed; and

WHEREAS after adjusting for the project cost updates from the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, the MATS 2050 MTP maintains a fiscal balance surplus of **$183,019,599.24** for Highway Capital Projects

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making in the Macon urban area does hereby approve the project, project phase and funding program amendments described above to the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program – Chapter 2 (Road and Bridge Projects) and Chapter 3 (Funding) as appropriate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, hereby amends the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Chapter 6 (Roads and Bridge Projects) and Chapter 8 (Fiscal Assessment) to reflect the addition of GDOT Project #0020763, and remain in accordance with the requirements in 23 CFR 450.324 and 23 CFR 450.326, described above.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, or the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

Adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on the 5th day of November 2025.

By: Valerie T Wynn

MATS Policy Committee Chair

A RESOLUTION OF THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY POLICY COMMITEE AMENDING THE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT AND THE 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, TO REFLECT UPDATES TO SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURE TARGETS, AS INITIATED BY GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON SEPTEMBER 26, 2025

WHEREAS, it is the objective of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) to maintain a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process which results in plans and programs in accordance with the requirements set forth in Title 23, Section 134 of the United States Code (USC); and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, developed under the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 23, Sections 450.306 and 450.324 are a recognized instrument for achieving that objective; and

WHEREAS, under Code of Federal Regulations Title 23, Section 490.105, (23 CFR, Sec. 450.105), as originally authorized under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the.21st Century Act (MAP-21) and continuing under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is required to identify Performance Management Targets in five general topic areas; Safety, Infrastructure Condition, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, and Congestion Reduction; and

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2025, after petitioning the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration GDOT was permitted to change the target setting from a 5-year rolling average to a single calendar year metric (Reference: 90 Fed. Register 731,734); and

WHEREAS, on or around August 31, 2025, GDOT informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective Federal transportation planning documents; and

WHEREAS, on September 25, 2025, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for categories specified under 23 CFR 490.105; and

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2025, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Office of Planning informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of corrections to the performance measure targets specified in the September 25, 2025 presentation. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1) – Calendar Year 2026

Performance Measure	
Number of Fatalities	1,5740
Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)	1.245
Number of Serious Injuries	8,103
Serious Injury Rate (per 100 million VMT	6.408
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	1,312

and;

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(l), within 180 days after the adoption of a specific performance target by GDOT, MATS is required to establish their own targets; and

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of current Performance Measure targets is reflected in the System Performance Report, which is incorporated by reference into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the MATS Policy Committee, the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making between locally elected officials in the Macon-Bibb County, Jones County and Monroe County areas, and duly appointed agency representatives from the State of Georgia, does hereby amend the System Performance Report and the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP documents to reflect all Statewide Performance targets described in the GDOT Office of Planning e-mail to the Georgia Association of MPOs on December 21, 2022.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that MATS Policy Committee does hereby incorporate these same Performance Measure updates into Chapter 13 of the 2050 MTP by Administrative Modification.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in the event scrivener's errors are discovered in this Resolution, in the body of either the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan or 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report themselves, or any examples or appendices thereto, the MATS Policy Committee

authorizes and directs the MATS staff to correct any and all such errors, to post corrected documents as needed, and inform such parties and organizations requiring notice that the errors in question have been corrected.

So adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on this 5th day of November, 2025

By: Valerie F Wynn

MATS Policy Committee Chairman

Chapter 1 | Introduction

A Brief Introduction to Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Georgia is growing rapidly. Based on the 2020 U.S. Census, Georgia had just over 10.7 million people and the State is on pace to grow to almost 14 million by 2050. That's over 30% more people in 30 years![1]

More people mean more housing, more trips to work and school, and more trucks and trains keeping our store shelves stocked and sending things we make out to customers. But, how do we do that in a way that is environmentally friendly, and everyone has a chance to participate in the decision process?

The solution is, to form an organization where elected officials, public agencies, and the people work together to plan for future traffic needs. This organization is called a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

MPOs are the forum where city and county governments, the State, and Federal agencies coordinate on regional transportation projects. This includes developing new transportation projects, serving as the forum for public participation, coordinating on environmental review, air quality and performing financial analysis. The Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) is the MPO for Macon metropolitan area, covering all Macon-Bibb County, southwest Jones County, and a small portion of Monroe County. Figure 1-1 provides a map of the MATS MPO area, and Figure 1-2 shows all the MPOs across Georgia, as of 2012.



Source:
Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission

Figure 1-1: Overview of the MATS MPO Region



Figure 1-2: Distribution of MPOs Across Georgia

MPOs aren't unique to Georgia; there are over 400 MPOs nationwide.[2] MPOs were created in response to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962. As a result of this act, all Urbanized Areas[4] with populations exceeding 50,000 persons were required to maintain a "continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive" transportation planning process involving all the local, State and Federal government partners. Over time, this mandate has grown to include monitoring and mitigation of impacts from transportation projects (e.g., maintaining clean air and water, protection of endangered species, environmental justice, etc.). A detailed discussion on MPO roles and activities can be found in The Transportation Planning Process Briefing Book, published by U.S. Federal Highway Administration.

How Did the MATS MPO Get Started?

MATS was originally founded on February 21, 1964, by designation of the Governor and adoption of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The City of Macon, the County of Bibb, the Municipality of Payne City, the Georgia State Highway Department (now the Georgia Department of Transportation) and the Macon-Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission. The roles and responsibilities of MATS are covered by the MOU.

Over the years, MATS has expanded geographically to include portions of Jones County and Monroe County as a result of the region's growth. Additionally, other agency partners such as the Middle Georgia Regional Commission and the Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority have also been added.

What Does the MATS MPO Do?

Federal regulations call for an MPO to carry out a process for the metropolitan planning area that provides for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services that will:

- Support the economic vitality of the United States, the States, nonmetropolitan areas and metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
- Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
- Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for 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 throughout the State for people and freight;
- Promote efficient system management and operation; and
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system

As part of this process, MATS staff (with input from Georgia DOT, U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Macon Transit Authority, and U.S. Federal Transit Administration) develops the **Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)**, the **Transportation Improvement Program**

(TIP), and the **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**. Figure 1-3 below provides a visual overview of the relationship between these documents.



Figure 1-3: Relationship Between MTP, TIP and UPWP Planning Documents

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP**)** are, respectively, long and short term lists of specific transportation projects for the MATS planning area. The MTP is designed to forecast demand for transportation services at least 20 years into the future, taking into account anticipated population growth, housing needs and employment goals for the region. The MTP serves as the official list of transportation projects and priorities eligible for federal support throughout the MPO region. The number and priority of projects on that list can be altered, based on the procedures laid out in the MATS Public Participation Plan.

At the State level, all MTP project lists throughout Georgia feed into the Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan (SSTP). As the name suggests, the SSTP is a statewide plan that addresses projected travel demand for at least 20 years, taking into account State policies and strategies for promoting efficient development, protection of natural resources, and employment.

In contrast to the 20-year time horizon, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) covers a period of 4 fiscal years. Any project that is listed in the TIP receiving federal funding must already be listed in the MTP. If a brand new project is to be added to the TIP, it must simultaneously be added to the MTP.

The main difference between the TIP and the MTP is that where the MTP is a list of all projects, TIP projects are active and at various stages of execution (i.e., Preliminary Engineering, Right Of Way acquisition, or Under Construction). The federally required update period for the TIP is every 4 years, although States and MPOs can have policies to update more frequently if they see fit.

Finally, the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the list of federally funded studies and ongoing activities, plus any supplementary planning projects identified by Georgia DOT and the MATS board members. This set of planning projects is revised each fiscal year.[3] Among the usual tasks supported in the UPWP, MATS develops demographic data, land use information, and analyses necessary for the development and monitoring of the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program.

The UPWP, TIP, and MTP are all public documents, available to the public on the MATS website (https://www.maconmpo.com/) and the Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning Commission.

How is MATS Funded?

MATS is funded through local, State and Federal funding sources. At the Federal level, MATS is supported by annual grants from the Federal Highway Administration (through the "PL Grant" program) and the Federal Transit Administration (through the "5303 Grant" program).[4] These funds are authorized by the U.S. Congress, administered locally through Georgia Dept. of Transportation (Georgia DOT), and constitute 80% of the MATS budget. The remaining 20% is made up through State and local matching funds. In the case of 5303 Grant funds, there is an additional requirement that the 20% local match be split evenly between the State and local government (i.e., 10% each).

As with any type of federal funding, MATS is required to report on its activities supported by the funds on a regular basis. Each quarter, MATS submits grant activity reports to the Georgia DOT. Figure 1-3 describes the relationships between Federal funding, MPO activities, and reporting requirements.



Figure 1-4: MATS Funding and Reporting Relationships With Federal and State Agencies

Who Runs MATS?

Since inception, MATS has been composed of three committees; the Policy Committee (PC), the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), and the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). The full MATS bylaws (and amendments) for all committees can be found on line at the main MATS website (www.maconmpo.com).

All MATS meetings are open to the public. Meeting notifications are posted on the MATS website, as well as at the Macon-Bibb Government Center, and the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission Office. Meetings are held quarterly, in the following sequence:

- CAC – Second Wednesday of the month immediately before a Policy Committee (PC) meeting;
- TCC – Third Wednesday of the month immediately before a Policy Committee (PC) meeting;
- PC – First Wednesday of the month in which the quarterly meeting is called

In addition to regularly scheduled meetings, specially called meetings may take place, at the discretion of the PC chair or the Director of the MPO. In the event of a special call meeting, notice will be posted on this website, as well as the Macon-Bibb Government Center and the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission Office.

The staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission provides the technical support and planning expertise for MATS and its committees.

Policy Committee (PC) – The purpose of the PC is to "carry out a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive multimodal transportation planning process that includes the development of the Long Range Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program which serve to develop a safe and efficient surface transportation system for all modes of travel." The PC is the board that formally adopts the MTP, TIP and any other documents or positions that officially lay out MATS policies or directs staff activities.

The voting membership of the PC is comprised of the following:

- Elected Officials
    - Macon-Bibb County – Mayor, plus 3 commissioners
    - Jones County – Commission Chair
    - Monroe County – Commission Chair
- Government Agency Representatives
    - Chairman, Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority
    - Chairman, Middle Georgia Regional Commission
    - Chairman, Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission
    - Chairman, Macon-Bibb County Water Authority
    - Director of Planning, Georgia Department of Transportation
    - Chairman, Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC)
    - Chairman, Macon-Bibb County Industrial Authority

In addition to the voting members, the following participants are ***non***-voting members:

- Eighth District Representative, Georgia State Transportation Board
- Second District Representative, Georgia State Transportation Board
- Executive Director, Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission
- Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration
- Chairman, Macon-Bibb County Urban Development Authority
- County Manager, Macon-Bibb County
- Macon-Bibb County Engineer
- Executive Director, Middle Ga. Regional Commission
- Local State Representative, State of Georgia

Regular meetings of the MATS Policy Committee are held quarterly. Meetings will be held on the first (1st) Wednesday of the month in which they are called. The usual meeting time and place for this meeting is:

Bibb County Engineering Annex Board Room

200 Cherry St., Suite 300

Macon, GA 31201

9:30 a.m.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) – As the name suggests, this committee was created as the primary forum for citizen engagement, to gauge community values and public attitudes in the planning process. The membership of the CAC is currently set at 20 members:

- one from each of the 9 Macon-Bibb County Commission districts
- one member from Jones County
- one member from Monroe County
- one member from American Association of Retired Persons
- one member from Macon Housing Authority
- one member from Bibb County Board of Education
- one member from The League of Women Voters
- one member each from the following interest areas
    - Pedestrian/bike user
    - Transit user
    - Environmental interest group
    - Disabled population
    - Disabled transportation user

One special consideration of the CAC is that the chair of this committee *also* has a voting seat on the MATS Policy Committee (PC: described above), and a non-voting seat on the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC: described below).

The regular meetings of the MATS CAC is the second (2nd) Wednesday of the month in which it is called. This is one week immediately preceding a normal Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) meeting. The usual meeting time and place for this meeting is:

Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission Office

200 Cherry St., Suite 300

Macon, GA 31201

6:00 p.m.

Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) – This committee is comprised of agency staff from the MATS member jurisdictions, "to assist the MATS Policy Committee with collecting information, performing technical reviews, formulating recommendations, setting priorities, drafting MPO documents, maintaining MPO processes, and other matters as directed by the MATS Policy Committee." The voting membership of the TCC is comprised of the following:

- Project Director, Macon Area Transportation Study
- Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission - Planning Director
- Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission - Transportation Planner
- Jones County Zoning Enforcement Officer
- Monroe County Zoning Enforcement Officer
- Macon-Bibb County Traffic Engineer
- Macon-Bibb County Sheriff's Department
- Macon-Bibb County Engineer
- Macon-Bibb County Attorney
- Manager of Middle GA Regional Airport
- Macon-Bibb County Director of Facilities Management
- Macon-Bibb County Director of Economic and Community Development
- Transportation Planner, Georgia DOT Planning Office
- Transportation Planner, Georgia DOT Intermodal Office
- Pre-Construction Engineer, Thomaston District Office, Georgia DOT
- Planning Director, Middle Georgia Regional Commission
- Executive Director, Middle Georgia Regional Commission
- Director, Macon-Bibb Co. Water Authority
- Executive Director, Macon-Bibb County Industrial Authority
- Director, Macon Transit Authority
- Executive Director, Macon-Bibb County Urban Development Authority
- Representative, Transportation Committee, Chamber of Commerce
- Executive Director, Macon-Bibb Co. Business Development Dept.
- Chief, Macon-Bibb Co. Fire Department

In addition to the voting members, the following participants are ***non***-voting members:

- Intermodal Planning Engineer, Federal Highway Administration

- Area Engineer, Georgia DOT
- Chairman, Citizens Advisory Committee
- Urban Designer, Georgia DOT
- Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration

The regular meetings of the MATS TCC is the third (3rd) Wednesday of the month in which it is called. This is two weeks immediately preceding a normal Policy Committee meeting. The usual meeting time and place for this meeting shall be:

Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission Office

200 Cherry St., Suite 300

Macon, GA 31201

10:00 a.m.

Significant Changes Since the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Adoption

This 2050 MTP document is a successor to the previous MATS transportation plan, the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (2040 LRTP) The most significant change since the adoption of the original MATS 2040 LRTP is the improvement in our air quality status as determined by U.S. EPA and Georgia Environmental Protection Division (Georgia EPD).

The original MATS 2040 LRTP was adopted on November 20, 2013. At that time, the MATS area was already designated under the U.S. EPA 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as a "non-attainment" area, and subsequently a "maintenance" area, for ground-level ozone and fine particular matter (PM 2.5) criteria pollutants. On April 6, 2015 the 1997 NAAQS for ozone was revoked and replaced with the new 2008 standard, and on October 24, 2016, the 1997 NAAQS for PM 2.5 was replaced with the 2012 NAAQS standards. U.S. EPA Division 4 office notified MATS staff via e-mail on October 24, 2016, that the 1997 NAAQS PM 2.5 rule was no longer in effect, and that demonstration for transportation conformity for was no longer binding. The MATS 2040 LRTP Update was adopted on May 3, 2017, without the transportation conformity requirement for either ozone or PM 2.5.

Subsequent to these designations, on February 16, 2018, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *South Coast Air Quality Mgmt. District v. EPA* ("*South Coast II*," 882 F.3d 1138) held that transportation conformity determinations must be made in areas that were either nonattainment or maintenance for the 1997 ozone national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) and attainment for the 2008 ozone NAAQS when the 1997 ozone NAAQS was revoked. Since the MATS area was a "maintenance" area at the time of the 1997 ozone NAAQS revocation, the "maintenance" designation was administratively reinstated for the 1997 ozone NAAQS, pursuant the *South Coast II* decision.

Due to the progress MATS, GDOT and Georgia EPD had made under the State Implementation Plan (SIP), the MATS area meets even the newest (more stringent) 2015 NAAQS standards for ozone.

Organization of This Document

The remaining sections of this document are organized as follows:

Chapter 2 describes the updated goals and objectives for the 2050 MTP, in relation to the new federal emphasis on performance measures. This section provides an overview of relevant federal legislation and anticipated metrics that will be used to evaluate specific types of projects.

Chapter 3 describes the population and land use forecasts used to identify and prioritize transportation projects throughout the region. This section includes identification of zones where future population and job growth are anticipated.

Chapter 4 describes the public participation processes employed and observations collected as part of this MTP development process.

Chapter 5 describes the operations and management strategies employed throughout the MATS area, to make the most efficient and safe use of existing road infrastructure.

Chapter 6 describes lists the prioritized **Road and Bridge** projects identified in this 2050 MTP update. This includes estimates of project costs and anticipated revenue sources, and demonstration of fiscal balancing

Chapter 7 describes the **Transit** projects identified in this 2050 MTP update. This includes estimates of project costs and anticipated revenue sources, and demonstration of fiscal balancing.

Chapter 8 provides a detailed fiscal plan for the projects identified in Chapter 6 and 7.

At this time, the **Road and Bridge projects** account has an identified **surplus of $153,736,961.38.** The **Transit projects** account has an identified **surplus of $8,298,818.36**

Chapter 9 describes the Safety assessment of the MATS travels network in the 2050 MTP update. This includes discussions of forthcoming safety performance measures.

Chapter 10 describes the bicycle and pedestrian strategies identified in the 2050 MTP update.

Chapter 11 describes the freight improvement and aviation projects identified in the 2050 MTP.

Chapter 12 describes the Planning Considerations applicable to this 2050 MTP update for minority and disabled communities. This includes identification of populations which have been marginalized historically (e.g., Environmental Justice population groups, Limited English Proficiency) and discussion of all relevant civil rights legislation and Executive Orders bearing on protections for these groups.

Chapter 13 describes how MATS reflects the Performance Based Transportation Planning and Programming described in the FAST Act, including adoption of the Statewide Performance Measure targets set annually by Georgia Dept. of Transportation.

[1] Based on population values from the U.S. 2020 Census Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for the United States, Regions, States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 (NST-EST2021-POP) and Georgia Governor's Office of Planning and Budget State and Residential Population Projection, 2020 - 2065

[2] https://www.planning.dot.gov/mpo/

[3] MATS fiscal year (FY) runs from July 1 of the previous year through June 30 of the current year. For example, FY 2022 runs from July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2022. FY 2023 will begin July 1, 2022.

[4] "PL Grant" and "5303 Grant" are shorthand for the federal processes that guide how MATS is funded. "PL" indicates that the funding is tied to the Public Law process, meaning the funding is part of Congress passing a new federal transportation bill or re-authorizing an existing law. "5303" is a reference to U.S. Code Title 49, Sub. III Sec. 5303, which covers planning for public transportation systems as they relate to national policy goals.

Chapter 2 | Goals & Objectives

Introduction

This section provides an overview of the goals and objectives adopted for the updated MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). It discusses the emphasis on performance measures, which are quantifiable metrics of how well MATS is progressing towards the adopted goals and objectives. As discussed in greater detail below, and in Chapter 13, the emphasis on performance measures is an outcome of the two most recent federal highway acts, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21, adopted in 2012), and the Fixing American's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act, adopted in 2015).

MATS 2050 – A Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the Macon Area

The purpose of a MTP is to assess future transportation infrastructure needs and opportunities over a minimum 20-year planning horizon for an urbanized area known as a metropolitan planning area. The MTP planning process helps coordinate how the region addresses transportation needs with the end goal of fostering an efficient, convenient, safe, secure, and sustainable transportation system.

Recognizing both the challenges and opportunities that the region faces, the *MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan* anticipates future conditions and outlines issues that should be considered when confronting those conditions. Most importantly, the plan identifies broad policy goals and objectives associated with strategic actions to improve accessibility, mobility, and regional connectivity in ways that support sustainability and economic growth.

As a community transportation policy document, the *MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan* will help set the direction for future transportation investments in our region, and coordinate them with the goals and objectives expressed in the Georgia *2050 Statewide Transportation Plan* and *2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan*. The *MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan* continues the previous work done under the *MATS 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan*, building on the public input received at that time to define the region's transportation issues and identify a future vision along with strategies to realize it.

The *MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan* was developed by the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) - the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Macon urbanized area, which includes all of Macon-Bibb County, a small

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

A GOAL is a broad statement that describes a desired end state: "Foster livable communities that increase transportation choices."

AN OBJECTIVE is a specific, measurable statement that supports achievement of a goal: "Increase access to jobs and housing via transit."

A PERFORMANCE MEASURE monitors progress toward long-term goals and objectives: "Have additional transit routes been implemented."

(Source: FHWA (2014) Model Long Range Transportation Plans: A Guide for Incorporating Performance-Based Planning)

portion of southern Monroe County and the southern half of Jones County. Full details of the area covered by MATS and how MATS is organized can be found in Chapter 1.

Origins of Performance-Based Transportation Planning

In 2012, Congress passed the **Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act.** MAP-21 introduced a new emphasis in the MPO transportation planning process, towards measurable performance and outcome-based metrics in the evaluation of projects and programs receiving federal support. MAP-21 focuses on 7 performance goal areas:

- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition
- Congestion Reduction
- System Reliability
- Freight Movement and Economic Vitality
- Environmental Sustainability
- Reduced Project Delivery Delays

Since there are always more projects than funding, MATS must prioritize transportation projects. One of the first questions asked is whether and how a proposed project addresses federal, state and regional transportation goals.

Setting Our Transportation Goals

The *MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan* supports national transportation planning factors and goals, state transportation goals, and local economic and community development priorities. These goals, planning factors, and priorities help prioritize projects and assess progress in implementing the transportation vision outlined in *MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan*.

Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act)

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed the **Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act** into law—the first federal law in over a decade to provide long-term funding certainty for surface transportation infrastructure planning and investment. The FAST Act maintained the Federal Highway Authority's (FHWA) focus on safety, kept intact the established structure of the various highway-related programs managed by FHWA, continued efforts to streamline project delivery, and, for the first time, provides a dedicated source of federal dollars for freight projects.

In addition, the FAST Act continued the emphasis raised in MAP-21 on performance-based outcomes, requiring that the metropolitan transportation planning process "*shall be continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive, and provide for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services that will address the following 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 for 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; and*
- *Enhance travel and tourism.*" [23 USC 450.306]

The FAST Act also requires federally funded transportation projects to support national goals for the transportation system by focusing on projects that:

- Achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- Maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.
- Achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.
- Improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.
- Improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
- Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
- Reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices. [23 U.S. Code § 150]

Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan & 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan

The 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan (SWTP) and 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan (SSTP) provide a comprehensive look at transportation issues and investment needs in Georgia now and through the year 2050. It forecasts available funding for transportation investment and develops a set of strategic, financially constrained investment recommendations to meet the transportation demands of the State.

Georgia's transportation system is planned and constructed by several agencies across the State, including the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), individual cities and counties, and port, airport, and transit authorities. GDOT shares responsibility for planning and programming transportation funding with 16 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in urbanized areas

across the State. GDOT has the responsibility to maintain and operate the roadways that it owns in urban areas.

While the 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP focuses on the transportation assets owned and operated by GDOT, it touches upon all of the transportation facilities in the State, which include roadways, public transportation, railroads, airports, marine ports, and bicycle/pedestrian facilities. It presents statewide economic and transportation demand forecasts given expected population and employment growth and assesses the current and future performance of all these modes over the planning horizon.

The 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP continues the practices first established in the 2040 SWTP/2015 SSTP, combining the traditional transportation analyses of the federally required metropolitan transportation plan with the strategic business case for transportation investment required by the State. The plan strategic goals include:

- Building on prior performance-based approaches and continue to incorporate Federal TPM requirements;
- Highlighting catalytic investments in system expansion for economic development, including deployment of new technologies and adoption of innovative business practices, including public/private partnerships;
- Increase rural broadband access;
- Improve safety and security;

Previous 2040 LRTP Goals

In addition to federal and state transportation goals, MATS is guided by local transportation goals and recommendations included in the *MATS 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan*, which was adopted in 2017. The *MATS 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan* included broad goals to guide transportation and land use planning, improve bicycle and pedestrian amenities, and a recommendation to incorporate Complete Streets concepts into all MATS region roads (see column).

Integrating Federal, State, and Local Priorities into the MTP

The vision, goals, objectives, and performance measures developed for the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan reflect national and state transportation goals and planning factors, local development needs, and input from the public. Furthermore, as a “living document” the MTP is developed and updated in the context of the social, financial, and political environment, through which local planning officials and other decision-makers must constantly navigate in a way that respects and supports the overarching framework of democratic governance while striving to fulfill the best interests of the local community that the plan is based on. Some current challenges facing the Macon region include:

- Pressures from sprawling development and population movement within the MPO and private economic disinvestment in large portions of the historic core of Macon result in a mismatch of infrastructure capacity and maintenance

- Community expectations for economic development which are integrally tied to transportation improvements
- Fulfilling important investment commitments in the context of fiscal strain at all levels of government
- Unresolved transportation funding challenges within national, state, and local political environments.

2050 MTP Goals and Objectives

As part of the 2050 MTP, MATS staff reviewed the originally adopted 2040 LRTP goals and reconciled them with the national and state goals identified in the FAST Act and the Georgia 2050 SWTP, respectively. The MATS staff also proposed transportation related objectives for which future performance measures can be developed. Table 2-1 shows how the updated goals and objectives approved by the MATS Policy Committee build upon the general goals areas specified in MAP-21, FAST Act, the Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan and 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan, and the MATS specific goals and objectives adopted as part of the original 2040 LRTP. These goals and objectives are summarized individually below.

FAST Act National Planning Factors	FAST Act National Goals	MATS 2040 LRTP Update/ 2050 MTP Goals	MATS 2040 LRTP Update/ 2050 MTP Objectives	Related GA 2050 SWTP/ 2021 SSTP State Strategies
Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight	**To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System** **To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system**	**Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices**	**A. Enhance transit services, amenities and facilities** **B. Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities** **C. Increase utilization of affordable non-auto travel modes** **D. Improve efficient movement of goods and services within and through the region** **E. Support the development of passenger**	**Continue strategic coordination with MPOs and regional commissions on expanding capacity and connecting investments to support economic development in emerging metros and rural areas.**
Promote efficient system management and operation	**To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System** **To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system** **To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.**	**Manage Congestion & System Reliability**	**A. Allow people and goods to move with minimal congestion and time delay, and greater predictability.** **B. Promote ride sharing, such as carpool, vanpool and park-and-ride.** **C. Enhance Intelligent Transportation Systems (dynamic signal phasing and vehicle detection systems)**	**Provide planning support for rural infrastructure investments, including exploring State-provided technical support to rural communities modeled after the U.S. DOT's "ROUTES" initiative.**
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.	**To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.**	**Improve Air Quality, Protect the Environment, Improve Quality of Life, and Promote Good Land Use Planning**	**A. Reduce mobile source emissions, GHG, and energy consumption** **B. Reduce the impact on the natural and cultural environment** **C. Link land use and transportation**	**Finalize multi-agency assessment regarding Georgia's level of risk and resiliency to natural, technological, and manmade disasters, and use the results of the assessment to inform future statewide planning decisions.**

Table 2-1: Comparison of Transportation Planning Goals & Objectives Under FAST Act, Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan, and MATS 2050 MTP

				Build on the work of GDOT's Interagency Office of Environmental Quality and Planning and Environmental Linkages Task Force to enhance environmental review processes and promote environmental stewardship as part of future investment planning.
Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight	**To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System** **To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system**	**Access to Essential Services**	**A. Connect people to jobs, education and other important destinations using all modes**	**Evaluate Georgia Ready for Accelerated Development (GRAD) sites for their ability to support targeted industries; identify connectivity needs to meet Rural Strike Teams' timelines.** **Identify high priority rural corridor projects, drawing from the Governor's Road Investment Program (GRIP), freight corridors, and evacuation route networks.**
Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.	**To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.**	**Improve Infrastructure Condition**	**A. Increase proportion of highways and highway assets in 'Good' condition** **B. Maintain transit vehicles, facilities and amenities in the best operating condition.** **C. Improve the condition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities** **D. Improve response time to infrastructure repairs**	
Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.	**To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.** **To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System** **To improve the efficiency of the**	**Support Economic Vitality**	**A. Improve freight movement** **B. Increase funding and funding sources for all transportation modes** **C. Improve project delivery for all modes**	

Table 2-1 (Cont.): Comparison of Transportation Planning Goals & Objectives Under FAST Act, Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan, and MATS 2050 MTP

		Ensure Equity	**A. Ensure transportation needs are met for all populations (especially the aging and youth, economically disadvantaged, mobility impaired, and minorities).** **B. Enhance public participation among**	**Explore potential GDOT partnerships for strategic investments on regional Transportation Investment Act (TIA) project lists.** **Strengthen the emphasis on rural safety including support for local road safety plans and rail grade crossing action plans.**
Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users. **Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.**	**To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.**	**Increase Safety, Health and Security**	**A. Increase safety of travelers and residents** **B. Promote public health through transportation choices (particularly for school age populations)**	
Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.	**To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.** **To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.**	**Improve Resiliency and Reduce Storm Water Impacts**	**A. Reduce the number of bridges and roadways vulnerable to natural disaster.** **B. Enhance environmental mitigation related to storm water management and habitat connectivity.**	**Finalize multi-agency assessment regarding Georgia's level of risk and resiliency to natural, technological, and manmade disasters, and use the results of the assessment to inform future statewide planning decisions.**
Enhancing travel and tourism	**To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade**	**Enhance Travel and Tourism**	**A. Increase funding and identify greater variety of funding sources for transportation projects such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities,**	**The 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP does not directly address this National Planning Factor.**

Table 2-1 (Cont.): Comparison of Transportation Planning Goals & Objectives Under FAST Act, Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan, and MATS 2050 MTP

Goal: Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan recognizes that the region's transportation network is intended to equitably serve all of the region's residents and visitors whether walking, bicycling, riding public transit, driving or riding in a private automobile, or hauling freight.

Objectives

1. Enhance transit services, amenities, and facilities
2. Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities
3. Increase utilization of affordable non-auto travel modes
4. Improve efficient movement of goods and services within and through the region
5. Support the development of passenger rail between downtown Macon and Atlanta

Goal: Manage Congestion & System Reliability

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan implements cost-effective strategies to reduce unproductive congestion.

Objectives

1. Allow people and goods to move with minimal congestion and time delay, and greater predictability
2. Promote ride sharing, such as carpool, vanpool, and park-and-ride.
3. Enhance Intelligent Transportation Systems (dynamic signal phasing and vehicle detection systems)

Goal: Improve Air Quality, Protect the Environment, Improve Quality of Life, and Promote Good Land Use Planning

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan supports coordinating land use planning with transportation planning to help improve air quality and the environment as well as the quality of life for all of the region's residents.

Objectives

1. Reduce mobile source emissions, GHG, and energy consumption
2. Reduce the impact on the natural and cultural environment
3. Link land use and transportation

Goal: Access to Essential Services

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan recognizes that mobility of people and freight is the backbone of economic development and private investment in the community.

Objectives

1. Connect people to jobs, education and other important destinations using all modes

Goal: Improve Infrastructure Condition

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan recognizes the tremendous value of the region's existing transportation assets and prioritizes the improvement and maintenance of these existing assets.

Objectives

1. Increase proportion of highways and highway assets in 'Good' condition
2. Maintain transit vehicles, facilities and amenities in the best operating condition.
3. Improve the condition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities
4. Improve response time to infrastructure repairs

Goal: Ensure Equity

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan focus on the transportation needs of the region's most vulnerable populations is a critical element of the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Objectives

1. Ensure transportation needs are met for all populations (especially the aging and youth, economically disadvantaged, mobility impaired, and minorities).
2. Enhance public participation among all communities

Goal: Increase Safety, Health and Security

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan identifies the safety of the transportation system as of utmost importance and recognizes the value of a transportation system that can help improve the community's health by providing easily accessible active transportation opportunities.

Objectives

1. Increase safety of travelers and residents
2. Promote public health through transportation choices

Goal: Support Economic Vitality

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan promotes workforce mobility, efficient movement of freight, and timely implementation of transportation improvement projects.

Objectives

1. Improve freight movement
2. Increase funding and funding sources for all transportation modes
3. Improve project delivery for all modes

Goal: Improve resiliency and reduce stormwater impacts

The MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan recognizes that the long-term economic health and welfare of the region demands transportation infrastructure with minimal exposure to natural and man-made hazards and that mitigates the negative stormwater impacts that degrade the region's valuable gray and green infrastructure.

Objectives

1. Reduce the number of bridges and roadways vulnerable to natural disaster

Goal: Enhance travel and tourism

Attractive travel corridors enhance the travel experience for residents and visitors alike and can support economically beneficial tourism in the region.

Objectives

1. Increase funding and funding sources for transportation enhancement projects

Chapter 3 | Sociodemographics and Forecasting

Introduction

This section of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2050 MTP describes the sociodemographic profile of the MATS region. Based on the observed historic population and employment patterns of the 2010 and 2020 U.S. Census, and the predicted trends through the 2050 plan year, this MTP also addresses anticipated development scenarios for the region. These anticipated development scenarios guide the assessments of the transportation needs and opportunities for the MATS region.

Due to the unavailability of the 2020 Census results during the development of the 2050 MTP, and the use of the 2015 base year for as per guidance from Georgia Dept. of Transportation, the reference years for the discussion below will either be the 2015 base year or the 2050 planning horizon year, unless specifically otherwise noted.

Historic Population Trends

Figures 3-1 through 3-3 demonstrate the anticipated general countywide population trends in Macon-Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties, starting in 1960 and continuing through to the plan year of 2050. The orange and pink columns are projected total population values for each county from the estimates produced by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget for the plan horizon year 2015 (Population Projection 2015 – 2050) or 2020 (Population Projection 2020 – 2065). The estimated population for 2020 (in pink) stands in contrast to the actual population value for 2020 from the decennial U.S. Census (in blue).

For years 2025 through 2050, population values are projected based on the annualized growth rate observed between the 2010 and 2020 U.S. Census. For details on how this rate was calculated, please see Appendix A



Figure 3-1: Bibb County Population Trends, 1960 – 2050



Figure 3-2: Jones County Population Trends, 1960 – 2050



Figure 3-3: Monroe County Population Trends, 1960 – 2050

As of the 2020 U.S. Census, the total population of the MATS area is 171,285. In terms of ethnographic composition, the three counties vary significantly. Macon-Bibb County has the highest composition of the non-white population in all ethnic categories (except American Indian/Alaskan Native, where Jones County has the highest proportion). Macon-Bibb County is an African-American majority county. This pattern is maintained when focusing on just that sub-area of each county that is covered by the MATS jurisdiction. One notable change is that in Jones County, the proportion of the population that is served by MATS that is African American is noticeably higher than Jones County as a whole.

Area	Bibb County			Jones County			Monroe County		
	2010	*2015 (Est)*	2020	2010	*2015 (Est)*	2020	2010	*2015 (Est)*	2020
Total Population	155,547	*153,945*	157,346	28,669	*28,441*	28,347	26,424	*26,708*	27,957
Percentage	100.00%	*100.00%*	100.00%	100.00%	*100.00%*	100.00%	100.00%	*100.00%*	100.00%
African American	80,744	*83,756*	85,234	6,977	*6,993*	6,739	6,249	*6,241*	6084
Marginal %	51.91%	*54.41%*	54.17%	24.34%	*24.59%*	23.77%	23.65%	*23.37%*	21.76%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	287	*364*	281	61	*82*	46	64	*65*	34
Marginal %	0.18%	*0.24%*	0.18%	0.21%	*0.29%*	0.16%	0.24%	*0.24%*	0.12%
Asian	2,492	*2909*	3,209	186	*159*	138	209	*235*	239
Marginal %	1.60%	*1.89%*	2.04%	0.65%	*0.56%*	0.49%	0.79%	*0.88%*	0.85%
Native Hawaiin/ Pacific Islander	74	*122*	42	2	*1*	7	4	*0*	0
Marginal %	0.05%	*0.08%*	0.03%	0.01%	*0.00%*	0.02%	0.02%	*0.00%*	0.00%
White (non-Hispanic)*	65,494	*62,383*	56,787	20,830	*20,746*	20,074	19,101	*19,584*	19954
Marginal %	42.11%	*40.52%*	36.09%	72.66%	*72.94%*	70.82%	72.29%	*73.33%*	71.37%
Other	215	*1,958*	602	25	*97*	73	14	*220*	86
Marginal %	0.14%	*1.27%*	0.38%	0.09%	*0.34%*	0.26%	0.05%	*0.82%*	0.31%
2 or more races	1,852	*2,595*	4,454	273	*357*	794	248	*354*	846
Marginal %	1.19%	*1.69%*	2.83%	0.95%	*1.26%*	2.80%	0.94%	*1.33%*	3.03%
Hispanic/ Latino*	4,389	*4,737*	6,737	315	*396*	476	535	*613*	714
Marginal %	2.82%	*3.08%*	4.28%	1.10%	*1.39%*	1.68%	2.02%	*2.30%*	2.55%

Source: U.S. Census 2010 SF 1 Dataset, Table P9: Population-Hispanic or Latino, And Not Hispanic or Latino, By Race
U.S. Census 2020 Redistricting Dataset, Table P2: Population-Hispanic or Latino, And Not Hispanic or Latino, By Race
* 2015 marginal populations values will not sum to exact population totals, due to double counting of Hispanic/Latino populations in other race categories.

Table 3-1: Total Population, by Race of Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties for 2010, 2015 (Estimated) and 2020

Area	Bibb County			Jones County			Monroe County		
	2010	*2015 (Est)*	2020	2010	*2015 (Est)*	2020	2010	*2015 (Est)*	2020
Total Population	155,547	*153,945*	157,346	11,800	*11,700*	12244	1,707	*1,749*	1,695
Percentage	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
African American	80,744	*83756*	85,234	3,549	*3522*	3729	80	*80*	102
Marginal %	51.91%	54.41%	54.17%	30.08%	30.10%	30.46%	4.69%	4.57%	6.02%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	287	*364*	281	24	*34*	16	8	*5*	3
Marginal %	0.18%	0.24%	0.18%	0.20%	0.29%	0.13%	0.47%	0.29%	0.18%
Asian	2,492	*2909*	3,209	104	*84*	82	27	*27*	47
Marginal %	1.60%	1.89%	2.04%	0.88%	0.72%	0.67%	1.58%	1.54%	2.77%
Native Hawaiin/ Pacific Islander	74	*122*	42	-	-	2	-	-	-
Marginal %	0.05%	0.08%	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
White (non-Hispanic)*	65,494	*62,383*	56,787	7,861	*7,856*	7794	1,560	*1,613*	1482
Marginal %	42.11%	40.52%	36.09%	66.62%	67.15%	63.66%	91.39%	92.22%	87.43%
Other	215	*1,958*	602	15	*39*	38	-	*12*	2
Marginal %	0.14%	1.27%	0.38%	0.13%	0.33%	0.31%	0.00%	0.69%	0.12%
2 or more races	1,852	*2,595*	4,454	126	*178*	354	9	*13*	26
Marginal %	1.19%	1.69%	2.83%	1.07%	1.52%	2.89%	0.53%	0.74%	1.53%
Hispanic/ Latino*	4,389	*4,737*	6,737	121	*155*	229	23	*25*	33
Marginal %	2.82%	3.08%	4.28%	1.03%	1.32%	1.87%	1.35%	1.43%	1.95%

Source: U.S. Census 2010 SF 1 Dataset, Table P9: Population-Hispanic or Latino, And Not Hispanic or Latino, By Race
U.S. Census 2020 Redistricting Dataset, Table P2: Population-Hispanic or Latino, And Not Hispanic or Latino, By Race
* 2015 marginal populations values will not sum to exact population totals, due to double counting of Hispanic/Latino populations in other race categories.

Table 3-2: U.S. Census 2020 Total Population, by Race of MATS Area

The results of the above tables support the following conclusions:

- The population growth in Bibb and Monroe Counties was stronger than originally projected. Where Bibb County was anticipated to lose population, it actually saw a small, but non-trivial increase from the previous decade.
  Monroe County actually significantly exceeded expected growth as a whole, although it lost a small amount of population in the MATS area. For reasons that will be discussed later, this loss is likely to be reversed before the 2050 plan horizon is reached.
- The vast majority of the population in each county continue to fall into either White or African American ethnic groups. This is a continuation of a trend observed in the MATS 2040 LRTP/2010 U.S. Census
- For all the counties, and the MATS sub areas, there has been a reduction in the percentage of population classified as Non-Hispanic White. Upon further review of the marginal percentages for each group in the U.S. Census 2010 vs. 2020:
  - Bibb County (the largest component of the MATS jurisdiction) has increased the proportion of the population identifying as African American. Still, that does not mean all the growth since 2010 has come from that demographic cohort. Substantial population increases are evident in the Hispanic/Latino community (+2,348), the Asian community (+717), and those persons identifying as belonging to Two or More Races (+2,602). Indeed, without the growth in these communities, the growth in the African American population (+4,490) would not have been able to offset the loss of Non-Hispanic White population (-8,707).
  - In Jones County, for groups other than African American and/or Non-Hispanic White, the net effect of the absolute growth is effectively to offset any minor losses in the African American and Non-Hispanic White groups. While the net result is slightly negative (i.e., -322, or -0.11% per annum) for the county as a whole, the difference is so small as to be effectively "noise." In addition, the 2020 Census indicates that there was actually substantial growth (+424; 0.37% per annum) in the MATS portion of Jones County during the same 10 year period.
  - For Monroe County, the observed growth between the 2010 and 2020 Census appears to be primarily due to increases in the Non-Hispanic White and/or Two or More Races groups (+853 and +598, respectively). The Hispanic/Latino population is small in absolute terms, but increasing substantially. While traditionally the MATS portion of Monroe County is significantly more Non-Hispanic White than the rest of the County generally, the area reported actually losing population in this group between the 2010 and 2020 Census (-78); the differences are almost total counterbalanced by growth in the African American (+22), Asian (+20), Two or More Races (+17) and Hispanic/Latino (+10) groups.

Overall, the Census results indicate that the MATS area is starting to grow, and becoming more ethnographically diverse in the process.

Base Year Demographic Analyses

This section describes some basic parameters of the MATS Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) for the 2015 planning base year, using data from the American Community Survey (ACS).

Unlike the U.S. Census, the ACS is a sample of a population, rather than a full 100% count. Samples, by definition, contain variability (i.e., mathematically quantified levels of instability) in their estimates. This variability can, in some cases, make it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about differences or patterns between population groups (e.g., Counties) and sub-groups (e.g., ethnic groups, or sub-areas vs. Counties as a whole).[i]

An important distinction should be noted up front about the data sources used in this discussion. Unless otherwise noted:

- the source data for the Macon-Bibb County portion of the MATS MPA area comes from the 2015 ACS 1-Year Estimate;
- the source data for the Jones County and Monroe County portions of the MATS MPA come from the 2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimate;

The distinction between the two data sources is that the ACS 5-Year Estimates use a 5 year rolling average for the various parameter measures, whereas the 1-Year Estimates are a true annual estimate. The reasons for the use of two separate datasets are:

- The ACS does not provide population measures based on the MPO boundaries, but rather on Census supported geographies like Counties, Census Tracts and Census Block Groups.
- ACS 1-Year Estimates are not available for areas with populations under 50,000; neither Jones County nor Monroe County meet that threshold (see Figures 3-2 and 3-3 above). And even if they were, the MATS MPA only contains portions of Jones and Monroe Counties;
- Data for areas below the County level of geography (i.e., Census Tracts and Census Block Groups) are only released as part of the ACS 5-Year Estimates

Using the two separate data sources helps ensure that the ACS data for the various planning areas is as contemporary as possible with the 2015 Base Year for all MATS MPA sub areas. Figure 3-4 shows the overlap between the 2010 Census Block Groups and the current MATS Boundaries.



Figure 3-4: MATS Area Census Block Groups (2010), by County

Age Distribution

Figures 3-5 through 3-7 show the distribution of age by gender for Bibb County and the MATS sub-areas for Jones and Monroe County. All age information values are taken from the American Community Survey, Tables B01002 (for County overall values) and Tables B01002B through B01002I (for values associated with individual ethnic groups).



Figure 3-5: Bibb County Median Age Profile, By Race



	Jones County Census Tract 301.01 Block Group 1			Jones County Census Tract 301.03 Block Group 1			Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1			Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 2			Jones County Census Tract 303.01 Block Group 2			Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
African American	52.4	52.1	58.8	32.3	41.4	31.3	38.7	34.1	42.6	28.5	18.4	38.6	38	31.4	46.5	47	44.9	47.2
Asian	38.5	42.1	34.5							32.5	13.6							
White	40.8	47.1	39.1	35.4	35.6	33.3	34.2	35.7	32.5	45.5	39.3	49.2	42.1	37.4	44.6	42.3	42.6	39.9
2 or more races				4.1		2.9							10.9		16.8			
Hispanic/Latino	42.9	19	42.9				56.5		56.5									

Figure 3-6: Jones County Median Age Profiles, By Race, for MATS Area



	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3			Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
African American	52.3	34.5	62.2	25.2	25.7	23.3
White	51.3	53.2	50.6	44.3	50.4	35.7
Hispanic/Latino	73.7			65.1		

Figure 3-7: Monroe County Median Age Profiles, By Race, for MATS Area

Comparing the median ages by racial group in Bibb County, it appears that the median age for both men and women in the African American, Asian and Hispanic/Latino communities are all lower than the median age for Bibb County population overall (Population Overall: 36 years old; Men: 34.6; Women 37.8) . For the MATS area population in Jones County (Population Overall: 39.4 years old; Men: 37.8; Women 40.7), the African American, Non Hispanic White, and Hispanic populations skew older than the county population as a whole, The Asian population diverges; it skews slightly younger overall and for women in particular, but slightly older for men.

In Monroe County, ((Population Overall: 41.9 years old; Men: 39.9; Women 43.9) the MATS area population is decidedly older for the Non Hispanic White and Hispanic populations overall. For African Americans in the MATS portion of Monroe County, the general trend is for the population to be younger than the county overall.

Household Income

Figure 3-8 shows the median household incomes in Bibb, Jones and Monroe counties, both overall and by racial sub-groups (where available). All income values are taken from the American Community Survey 2015, Tables B19013 (for County overall values) and Tables B19013B through B19013I (for values associated with individual ethnic groups).

The results show that in Bibb County, African American households continue to have median incomes well below the county as a whole ($27,486 ± $2,892 vs. $38,605 ± $3,220), while Non-Hispanic White ($55,626 ± $5,521) and Asian households ($81,059 ± $39,484) have household incomes substantially higher than the county median. However, the 90% confidence interval for each estimate (represented by the red error bars) indicates which estimates can be said to be statistically significantly different from each other; where bars overlap between two estimates, they cannot be reliably said to be different from each other.

When examining the block groups for the MATS areas specifically, several additional pieces of information come to light:

- The northwest section of the Jones County MATS area have *higher* median incomes (Tract 301.01, Block Group 1 - $82,698 ± $5,561; Tract 301.03, Block Group 1 - $79,792 ± $15,026) than either Bibb County ($38,605 ± $3,220) or Jones County ($51,857 ± $3,748) in general.
  The southeast section of the Jones County MATS area (Tract 301.04, Block Groups 1 and 2) have median incomes that are *lower* than Jones County in general ($38,303 ± $3,542 and $36,412 ± $16,157 respectively, vs. $51,857 ± $3,748).
- The median incomes for the MATS areas of Monroe County (Tract 503.01, Block Group 3 - $66,528 ± $35,926; Tract 503.02, Block Group 3 - $78,009 ± $39,753) are substantially higher than for Monroe County overall ($48,744 ± $3,540). However, the wide margins of error on these estimates indicate that these income values are likely driven higher by a few very high income household outliers in each sub-area. This would be consistent with the observed character of the area, which is populated with several large single family households, and a few gated communities, in the middle of predominantly rural areas.



Figure 3-8: Median Household Income (In 2015 Inflation Adjusted Dollars), by MATS Sub Are and Race (Where Available)

Housing and Household Characteristics

Figures 3-9 through and 3-13 show the household and housing stock characteristics for Bibb, Jones and Monroe counties, both by housing tenure (owner occupied vs. rental units) and by racial sub-groups. All age information values are taken from the American Community Survey, Tables B25002, B25064, B25077 (for County overall values) and Tables B25003B through B25003I (for values associated with individual ethnic groups).

The data supports the following observations about the general nature of housing tenure in the MATS Area for the 2015 Base Year:

- The median housing value are generally much higher in the Jones County portions of the MATS area ($85,200 to $198,000 median housing value) and Monroe County portions of the MATS area ($216,700 to $231,800 median housing value) than in Macon-Bibb County ($106,600).
- The median gross rents for Macon Bibb County ($755) are in the middle of the range for median rents across all MATS areas ($487 to $959). In Jones County, the pattern in higher rental prices is also consistent with the pattern of higher household incomes in the various block groups, as described in the previous section. However, in Monroe County, the MATS area has significantly lower rents than the income would predict.
- Within Macon-Bibb County, the housing tenure rate overall is roughly 53.82% homeowner and 46.18% renters. However, this general number masks significant variability within different ethnic groups. African American and Hispanic households are more likely to be renters (61.35% and 64.24% renter occupied, respectively) than Non-Hispanic White or Asian (26.36% and 42.17% renter occupied, respectively)
- The rates of household home ownership in the Jones County and Monroe County portions of the MATS area are significantly higher than in Macon-Bibb County overall. Since this finding maintains across the various ethnic groups for which household data is available for comparison, this finding is a function of specific housing stock composition and availability in the different Census Block Groups.



Figure 3-9: Housing Occupancy by MATS Sub Area



Figure 3-10: Median Home Values and Median Gross Rents in MATS Areas



Figure 3-11: Bibb County Housing Tenure, by Race



Figure 3-12: Jones County Housing Tenure, by Race, MATS Sub Area



Figure 3-13: Monroe County Housing Tenure, by Race, MATS Sub Area

Educational Attainment and English Proficiency

Figures 3-14 and 3-15 show, respectively, the level of educational achievement and proportions of the population with limited English speaking capacity. Table 3-3 summarizes the general nature of educational attainment in the MATS Area for the 2015 Base Year. Values are based on data from the American Community Survey, Tables B15003.

Table 3-3: Marginal Percentages of Educational Attainment in 2015 for the MATS Area Population Age 25 and Over, Overall, and by MATS Sub Area

	MATS Area Overall	Bibb County	Jones County Census Tract 301.01 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.03 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.01 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3
Total:	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**
No schooling completed	1.29%	1.40%	0.21%	0.00%	2.61%	0.00%	0.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.29%
Nursery school	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Kindergarten	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
1st grade	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2nd grade	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3rd grade	0.06%	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
4th grade	0.29%	0.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
5th grade	0.21%	0.17%	0.47%	0.00%	0.49%	2.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
6th grade	0.52%	0.56%	0.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%	0.00%	0.56%	1.08%
7th grade	0.50%	0.52%	0.78%	0.00%	0.00%	1.46%	0.12%	0.62%	1.13%	0.00%
8th grade	0.58%	0.53%	0.00%	0.00%	1.76%	2.75%	0.33%	0.96%	0.00%	0.57%
9th grade	2.43%	2.40%	3.70%	0.93%	1.99%	3.60%	0.51%	2.66%	1.31%	8.97%
10th grade	2.84%	2.83%	3.86%	0.53%	2.16%	8.43%	1.72%	2.60%	3.66%	1.58%
11th grade	3.66%	3.56%	3.39%	4.99%	6.21%	5.17%	1.36%	8.95%	2.44%	2.08%
12th grade, no diploma	1.68%	1.84%	0.00%	0.27%	1.11%	2.59%	0.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Regular high school diploma	27.80%	27.46%	18.93%	30.45%	34.89%	36.37%	25.18%	30.52%	38.46%	28.91%
GED or alternative credential	4.96%	4.75%	2.45%	9.77%	10.52%	3.09%	3.47%	12.57%	4.22%	2.65%
Some college, less than 1 year	5.40%	5.15%	7.98%	6.52%	5.91%	6.30%	7.76%	9.40%	3.10%	7.10%
Some college, 1 or more years, no degree	16.40%	16.69%	17.00%	16.49%	13.49%	14.22%	16.94%	12.40%	16.98%	7.17%
Associate's degree	6.69%	6.46%	7.04%	12.63%	6.83%	6.07%	9.00%	11.27%	5.72%	6.60%
Bachelor's degree	14.80%	15.02%	22.37%	12.63%	6.21%	3.99%	21.44%	5.04%	9.57%	24.25%
Master's degree	6.11%	6.18%	8.97%	3.26%	5.82%	2.59%	7.76%	0.74%	9.01%	5.52%
Professional school degree	1.89%	1.98%	0.94%	1.53%	0.00%	0.00%	2.32%	2.27%	2.06%	1.79%
Doctorate degree	1.88%	2.09%	1.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.57%	0.00%	1.78%	1.43%

Across the MATS area overall, for persons age 25 or over

- 14.08% of all persons had not completed high school;
- 32.76% had a high school degree or equivalent;
- 21.80% had some form of college education, but had not yet completed an undergraduate degree;
- 21.49% had either an Associate's or Bachelor's degree;

- 9.87% had a graduate or professional degree

Overall, the median level of educational attainment is having had some college training, but not yet having completed a degree. Although this is fairly consistent across all MATS sub areas, there are significant differences between the MATS sub areas in terms of percentage of population with college degrees:

- The Northwest and Southeast portions of the MATS Area of Jones County (Tract 301.01 Block Group 1, Tract 301.03, Block Group 1, and Tract 303.01, Block Group 2) have substantially higher proportions of their population age 25 and older with an Associates or Bachelor's Degree (29.41%, 25.27%, and 30.44% respectively) compared to the MATS Area overall (21.49%)
- The Northwest and Southeast portions of the MATS Area of Jones County (Tract 301.01 Block Group 1, and Tract 303.01, Block Group 2) and the Western portion of the Monroe County MATS Area (Tract 503.01, Block Group 3) all have proportions of population who have Master's Degrees (8.97%, 7.76% and 9.01%, respectively) that are higher than the MATS Area overall (6.11%).
- The highest concentration of population with Professional or Doctoral Degrees are concentrated in Macon Bibb County or the Monroe County MATS Area. This is consistent with the fact that Macon-Bibb contains the regional medical centers, universities, as well as the regional State and Federal courthouses.

The proportion of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) population in the MATS Area is a significant consideration in determining the scope and methods most appropriate to meet the requirements for public participation, as set forth under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 13166, FTA Circular 4702.1B and the FAST Act. The current MATS strategies for engagement with the general public (including LEP populations) are detailed in the MATS Public Participation Plan (most recently updated in September, 2020). The LEP population is defined as those persons who speak English either "Not well" or "Not at all" according to the U.S. Census. Following that definition, the data for Figure 3-14 on LEP population for the 2015 Base Year comes from the American Community Survey, Tables B16004.

Under the rules set forth in FTA Circular 4702.1B, if a LEP population of 1,000 persons or 5% of the area population (whichever threshold is lower) exists in a transit service area, then a formal Language Assistance Program (LAP) needs to be established to support the specific LEP population. Based on the data presented in Figure 3-14, the only portion of the MATS area where this might be a concern is Bibb County.

Focusing on Bibb County, although none of the identified language groups meet either the 1,000 person or 5% thresholds, the Spanish speaking population is getting close; as of 2015, the estimated number of Spanish speaking population who spoke English either "Not well" or "Not at all" was 837. That number increased to 862 by the 2015-2019 American Community Survey (i.e., the latest information available as of the writing of this report). It is possible that, as a result of the 2020 Census, the 1,000 person threshold may be exceeded, at which point a formal LAP will need to be developed. MATS staff will continue to monitor this trend, and update the strategies in the MATS Public Participation Plan as necessary.



	Bibb County	Jones County Census Tract 301.01 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.03 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.01 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3
Less Than High School Completion	14,132	253	101	500	487	184	279	97	203
High School Degree or Equivalent	32,057	410	605	1,390	702	949	761	455	440
Some College, No Degree	21,733	479	346	594	365	818	385	214	199
Associate's Degree	6,426	135	190	209	108	298	199	61	92
4 Year Bachelor's Degree	14,947	429	190	190	71	710	89	102	338
Master's Degree or Professional School Degree	8,126	190	72	178	46	334	53	118	102
Doctorate Degree	2,084	22	0	0	0	19	0	19	20

Figure 3-14: Educational Attainment for Population in MATS Area Age 25 Years and Over



	MATS Area Overall	Bibb County	Jones County Census Tract 301.01 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.03 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.01 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3
			Jones County						Monroe County	
Speak Spanish	3,717	3,606	38	5	31	0	9	0	13	15
Speak Indo-European Language	1,760	1,718	0	4	9	21	0	0	0	8
Speak Asian Or Pacific Island Language	1,309	1,131	144	2	15	0	17	0	0	0
Speak Other Language	545	540	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Spanish - Speak English "Not Well" Or "Not At All"	850	837	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0
Indo European - Speak English "Not Well" Or "Not At All"	346	346	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian/PI - Speak English "Not Well" Or "Not At All"	136	134	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other - Speak English "Not Well" Or "Not At All"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Figure 3-15: Summary of Non English Speaking Populations Age 5 and Older, by Language Group, per MATS Area

Means of Travel to Work

Figures 3-16a through 3-21 summarize the commuting behavior observed in the MATS Area around 2015. For this particular parameter, the data come from the American Community Survey 2013 – 2017 5 Year dataset. The reason for using this particular dataset, as opposed to the 2015 vintage, is that the tables in this topic area did not exist uniformly across all data tables until after 2015. This discrepancy stems from the privacy and minimum data cell size requirements that must be met before the American Community Survey will produce a dataset on a particular topic. Since data was not available for the 2015 base year, the 2013 – 2017 period was chosen because the 2015 planning base year sits in the middle of the time period covered by that particular dataset.

Values for the charts and tables below come from ACS 2013 - 2017 Tables B08007 (Sex of Workers By Place of Work – State and County Level) Table B08301 (Means of Transportation to Work), and Tables B08134 (Means of Transportation to Work by Travel Time to Work).

The data supports the following conclusions for the 2013 to 2017 period:

- The MATS area is a regional employment destination, focusing primarily on Bibb County. Approximately 74.30% of persons who worked in the MATS area also live within the MATS planning area. However, that percentage varies substantially by particular sub area:
  - 82.60% of persons who work in Bibb County also resided in Bibb County
  - In the Jones County portion of the MATS area, the percentage of workers who both work and live in Jones County varies from 11.94% (Census Tract 301.03, Block Group 1) to 35.15% (Census Tract 301.04, Block Group 2)
    For the two census block groups in the Monroe County portion of the MATS area, the percentage of workers who both work and live in Monroe County are 16.52% (Census Tract 503.02, Block Group 3) and 20.81% (Census Tract 503.01, Block Group 3)
- The predominant mode for travel to work is single occupancy vehicle.
  - For the MATS Area overall, the percentage of workers who drove alone to work was 82.57%; by carpool, 9.68%; by Public Transportation, 0.90%
  - For Bibb County, the percentage of workers who drove alone to work was 81.96%; by carpool, 9.86%; by Public Transportation, 1.01%
  - For the Jones County portion of the MATS area, the percentage of workers who drove alone to work vary from 80.85% (Census Tract 303.02, Block Group 3) to 89.46% (Census Tract 301.03, Block Group 1); by carpool, 5.61% (Census Tract 303.01, Block Group 2) to 13.39% (Census Tract 303.02, Block Group 3); by Public Transportation, 0.13% (Census Tract 303.02, Block Group 3) to 1.02% (Census Tract 301.04, Block Group 1)
    For the two census block groups in the Monroe County portion of the MATS area, the percentage of workers who drove alone to work were 81.31% (Census Tract 503.01, Block Group 3) and 91.89% (Census Tract 503.02, Block Group 3); by carpool, 11.46% and 3.62% (respectively). Neither block group in the Monroe County portion of the MATS area had any recorded use of public transport for commute to work. This is not surprising, given that Monroe County was not served by any public transport system in 2015.

- Commute times vary across the area:
  - For the MATS area overall, the median commute time by private car is approximately 20 minutes. For Bibb County in particular, the median commute time is slightly lower: 19.36 minutes for single occupancy vehicle, and 19.45 minutes for carpool.
  - For Jones County, the median commute time can vary widely. For single occupancy vehicle commutes, the median travel time can vary from a low of 21.94 minutes (originating from Census Tract 301.04, Block Group 2) to a high of 34.78 minutes (originating from Census Tract 303.01, Block Group 2)
    For carpool commutes, the median travel time from Jones County can vary from a low of 17.54 minutes (originating from Census Tract 301.03, Block Group 1) to a high of 35.39 minutes (originating from Census Tract 303.01, Block Group 2)
  - For Monroe County, single vehicle occupancy commutes are slightly longer (20.96 to 22.42 minutes compared to 19.36 minutes in Bibb County and 20.04 minutes for MATS area overall), while carpool commutes are substantially longer (45.23 to 60+ minutes, compared to 19.45 minutes in Bibb County and 19.94 minutes for MATS area overall). This discrepancy can most likely be explained by two facts:
    - The Monroe County portion of the MATS area is on the Northern border of the MATS MPO planning area. To the extent that any of the work commutes involve traveling into or through downtown Macon/central Bibb County, they are commuting from longer distances than most residents in the Macon-Bibb or Jones County area.
    - The Monroe County portion of the MATS area is served by the I-75 and I-475 corridors. It is reasonable to anticipate most work commutes will be directed onto these interstate corridors during rush hour.
  - The median travel time for work commutes involving public transport in the MATS area is approximately 46 minutes (i.e., more than twice as long as the time for either commuting alone or by carpool).
    Discussion of this finding should be restricted to the Bibb County area, since in 2015 Jones County only has demand response rural transit provision under the FTA 5311 program; Monroe County had no transit service provision of any kind at that time.



Figure 3-16a: Workers By Place of Work – State and County Level: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County



Figure 3-16b: Workers By Place of Work – State and County Level: Jones County MATS Area



	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3
Worked in county of residence	118	169
Worked outside county of residence	449	828
Worked outside state of residence	0	26

Figure 3-16c: Workers By Place of Work – State and County Level: Monroe County MATS Area



	MATS Area	Bibb County
Drove alone	56,832	48,576
Carpooled:	6,662	5,842
Motorcycle	65	54
Public transportation (excluding taxicab):	619	600
Taxicab	85	85
Bicycle	47	47
Walked	1,415	1,364
Other means	944	934
Worked at home	2,162	1,768

Figure 3-17a: Mode of Travel to Work: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County



	Jones County Census Tract 301.01 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.03 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.01 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3
Drove alone	1,016	959	1,485	870	1,879	646
Carpooled:	86	77	193	138	117	107
Motorcycle	7	0	0	0	0	4
Public transportation (excluding taxicab):	0	0	18	0	0	1
Taxicab	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walked	0	0	38	0	13	0
Other means	0	10	0	0	0	0
Worked at home	91	26	34	39	76	41

Figure 3-17b: Mode of Travel to Work: Jones County MATS Area



	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3
Drove alone	461	940
Carpooled:	65	37
Motorcycle	0	0
Public transportation (excluding taxicab):	0	0
Taxicab	0	0
Bicycle	0	0
Walked	0	0
Other means	0	0
Worked at home	41	46

Figure 3-17c: Mode of Travel to Work: Jones County MATS Area



	MATS Area	Bibb County
Less than 10 minutes	6,741	6,141
10 to 14 minutes	8,474	7,963
15 to 19 minutes	13,125	11,681
20 to 24 minutes	10,714	8,949
25 to 29 minutes	3,583	2,859
30 to 34 minutes	7,724	5,979
35 to 44 minutes	2,201	1,614
45 to 59 minutes	2,294	1,738
60 or more minutes	1,976	1,652

Figure 3-18a: Distribution of Commute Times for Persons Who Drove Alone: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County



	Jones County Census Tract 301.01 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.03 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.01 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3
Less than 10 minutes	12	18	0	48	353	0
10 to 14 minutes	111	70	109	7	123	19
15 to 19 minutes	221	160	310	263	112	84
20 to 24 minutes	236	224	440	302	148	37
25 to 29 minutes	124	68	63	11	213	100
30 to 34 minutes	104	249	369	59	612	151
35 to 44 minutes	48	58	156	0	116	194
45 to 59 minutes	68	27	0	180	185	25
60 or more minutes	92	85	38	0	17	36

Figure 3-18b: Distribution of Commute Times for Persons Who Drove Alone: Jones County MATS Area



	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3
Less than 10 minutes	74	95
10 to 14 minutes	48	24
15 to 19 minutes	97	197
20 to 24 minutes	60	318
25 to 29 minutes	27	118
30 to 34 minutes	68	133
35 to 44 minutes	15	0
45 to 59 minutes	16	55
60 or more minutes	56	0

Less than 10 minutes | 10 to 14 minutes | 15 to 19 minutes | 20 to 24 minutes | 25 to 29 minutes | 30 to 34 minutes | 35 to 44 minutes | 45 to 59 minutes | 60 or more minutes

Figure 3-18c: Distribution of Commute Times for Persons Who Drove Alone: Monroe County MATS Area



	MATS Area	Bibb County
Less than 10 minutes	814	746
10 to 14 minutes	1,301	1,213
15 to 19 minutes	1,230	1,082
20 to 24 minutes	978	970
25 to 29 minutes	354	260
30 to 34 minutes	901	786
35 to 44 minutes	244	186
45 to 59 minutes	534	382
60 or more minutes	306	217

Figure 3-19a: Distribution of Commute Times for Persons Who Carpooled: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County



	Jones County Census Tract 301.01 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.03 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.01 Block Group 2	Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3
Less than 10 minutes	0	4	61	0	3	0
10 to 14 minutes	8	0	0	45	19	16
15 to 19 minutes	0	68	25	30	4	0
20 to 24 minutes	0	0	8	0	0	0
25 to 29 minutes	36	0	0	17	15	15
30 to 34 minutes	0	0	47	28	13	27
35 to 44 minutes	0	0	0	0	58	0
45 to 59 minutes	29	5	52	18	5	10
60 or more minutes	13	0	0	0	0	39

Figure 3-19b: Distribution of Commute Times for Persons Who Carpooled: Jones County MATS Area



	Monroe County Census Tract 503.01 Block Group 3	Monroe County Census Tract 503.02 Block Group 3
Less than 10 minutes	0	0
10 to 14 minutes	0	0
15 to 19 minutes	21	0
20 to 24 minutes	0	0
25 to 29 minutes	11	0
30 to 34 minutes	0	0
35 to 44 minutes	0	0
45 to 59 minutes	33	0
60 or more minutes	0	37

Figure 3-19c: Distribution of Commute Times for Persons Who Carpooled: Monroe County MATS Area



	MATS Area	Bibb County	Jones County Census Tract 301.04 Block Group 1	Jones County Census Tract 303.02 Block Group 3
Less than 10 minutes	18	17	0	1
10 to 14 minutes	58	58	0	0
15 to 19 minutes	72	72	0	0
20 to 24 minutes	109	109	0	0
25 to 29 minutes	0	0	0	0
30 to 34 minutes	38	38	0	0
35 to 44 minutes	0	0	0	0
45 to 59 minutes	112	112	0	0
60 or more minutes	212	194	18	0

Figure 3-20: Distribution of Commute Times for Persons Who Used Public Transportation: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County



Figure 3-21a: Median Work Commute Times by Major Travel Modes: MATS Area Overall, and Bibb County



Figure 3-21b: Median Work Commute Times by Major Travel Modes: Jones County MATS Area



Figure 3-21c: Median Work Commute Times by Major Travel Modes: Monroe County MATS Area

Employment

As of 2015, there were approximately 119,613 jobs in the MATS areas. All employment data for the 2015 base year are collected from the National Establishment Time-Series Database, 2019 Release (NETS 2019), produced by Walls & Associates.

Figures 3-22a through 3-22c aggregate these jobs according to the categories specified in the *Georgia MPO Travel Demand Models Socio-Economic Data Development Guides (2018),* prepared by HNTB Corporation and adopted by Georgia Dept. of Transportation (GDOT) Table 3-4 (next page) summarizes the 2015 employment counts by North American Industrial Classification (NAICS) category (2 digit level) by County for Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties, by County and MPO area

In 2015, the vast majority of jobs (116,592 out of 119,613; 97.47%) were concentrated in the Macon-Bibb area. As the largest population center for the MATS area, this concentration would be consistent with expectations. The largest employment categories in all MATS areas are classified under the GDOT Modeling system as Service (n=83,970) and Retail (n=15,108). The high proportions concentrations of Manufacturing and Wholesale employment in the area Macon-Bibb sub-area reflect the fact that Macon-Bibb serves as a rail and logistics hub for the Norfolk-Southern Rail Road.

Table 3-4: Distribution of Employment by NAICS Category and GDOT Travel Demand Modeling Category, by County, across the MATS Area

NAICS Category	GDOT Model Category	MATS Area	Bibb County	Jones County		Monroe County	
				MATS MPO	Outside MPO Boundary	MATS MPO	Outside MPO Boundary
11 - Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Related Activities	Agriculture, Mining & Construction	268	221	35	88	12	643
21 - Mining	Agriculture, Mining & Construction	183	183	-	56	-	5
22 - Utilities Service Employment	Agriculture, Mining & Construction	401	371	30	54	-	212
23 - Construction	Agriculture, Mining & Construction	4,547	4,175	244	346	128	454
31 - Manufacturing	Manufacturing & TCUW	1,048	1,041	6	5	1	382
32 - Manufacturing	Manufacturing & TCUW	2,583	2,570	13	59	-	237
33 - Manufacturing	Manufacturing & TCUW	2,076	2,052	11	19	13	107
42 - Wholesale Trade	Manufacturing & TCUW	3,949	3,829	86	122	34	328
48 - Transportation and Warehousing	Manufacturing & TCUW	2,298	2,250	44	187	4	266
49 - Transportation and Warehousing	Manufacturing & TCUW	825	822	1	19	2	44
44 - Retail Trade	Retail	10,682	10,553	89	409	40	542
45 - Retail Trade	Retail	4,606	4,555	32	64	19	348
51 - Information	Services	2,429	2,381	37	17	11	66
52 - Finance and Insurance	Services	5,187	5,098	28	139	61	376
53 - Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	Services	2,947	2,851	64	86	32	240
54 - Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	Services	5,725	5,572	91	185	62	460
55 - Management of Companies and Enterprises	Services	107	105	2	-	-	4
56 - Administration and Waste Services	Services	10,388	9,895	318	468	175	795
61 - Educational Services	Services	12,113	11,841	233	1,039	39	1,213
62 - Health Care and Social Assistance	Services	19,691	19,252	94	583	345	1,499
71 - Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	Services	1,334	1,293	36	97	5	152
72 - Accommodation and Food Services	Services	11,670	11,489	142	419	39	938
81 - Other Services, except Public Administration	Services	6,098	5,848	211	350	39	525
92 - Government and Government Enterprises	Services	8,458	8,345	10	821	103	2,317



Figure 3-22a: Employment by GDOT Modeling Category for MATS MPO Consolidated Area and Bibb County (2015 Base Year, and 2050 Projected)



Figure 3-22b: Employment by GDOT Modeling Category for MATS Portion of Jones County (2015 Base Year, and 2050 Projected)



Figure 3-22c: Employment by GDOT Modeling Category for MATS Portion of Monroe County (2015 Base Year, and 2050 Projected)

Growth Projections and Future Land Use

The profile of the MATS region described in the previous section for the 2015 base year period establishes the assumptions for anticipated growth patterns through the 2050 plan year. The working assumption is that whatever population and employment growth comes about between 2015 and 2050 will follow similar marginal distributions as the 2010 Census. This assumption will need to be re-examined at each new census, or as new data becomes available, to identify population trends and emerging opportunities or challenges.[4]

Population Growth and Distribution

Table 3-5 and Figure 3-23 show the anticipated future land use for the MATS area and the total acreage in each category. Future land use was obtained by reviewing the Macon-Bibb County 2040 Future Land Use Plan, the Middle Georgia Regional Commission 2017 Comprehensive Plan for Jones County, and the Middle Georgia Regional Commission 2007 Comprehensive Plan for Monroe County. Middle Georgia Regional Commission conducts comprehensive plan updates for Jones and Monroe Counties based on the schedules specified by Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs and uses a 20-year time horizon for future land use planning. Therefore, the Jones and Monroe County future land use time horizons extend only to 2037. All acreage is calculated as net acres, after removing the street right of way and the 100-year floodplain (i.e., areas not available for construction).

Bibb County	Acres
Urban Residential	20486.26
Suburban Residential	46382.97
Rural Residential	30771.86
Mixed Use	1363.93
Community Commercial	6117.69
Neighborhood Commercial	125.37
Office/Service	732.55
Industrial	14061.36
Transportation/Communication/Utilities	1624.43
Institutional	5479.39
Parks/Recreation/Open Space	6936.63
Jones County	**Acres**
Urban Residential	724.73
Suburban Residential	11879.77
Rural Residential	20129.89
Commercial	686.37
Industrial	1464.88
Public/Institutional	134.54
Transportation/Communication/Utilities	3252.69
Agriculture/Forestry	3432.79
Park/Recreation/Cons	2733.65
Monroe County	**Acres**
Residential	4777.99
Mixed Use	24.51
Commercial	257.64
Commercial-Light	64.87
Public / Institutional	3.25

Table 3-5: MATS Area Future Land Use Net Acreage, by County, by Category



Figure 3-23: MATS MPO Future Land Use

	2010 Census Totals		2020 Redistricting File		Annualized Growth Rate (over 10 years)		Projected 2050 Population (Based on Annualized Growth Rate Carried Forward over 30 Years)		Percentage Growth from 2020 Census	
County	Total Pop	MATS MPO	Total Pop	MATS MPO	Total Pop	MATS MPO	Total Pop	MATS MPO	Total Pop	MATS MPO
Jones County	28,669	11,800	28,347	12,244	0.998871	1.00370048	27,403	13,679	-3.33%	11.72%
Macon-Bibb County	155,547	155,547	157,346	157,346	1.001151	1.00115059	162,869	162,869	3.51%	3.51%
Monroe County	26,424	1,707	27,957	1,695	1.005655	0.99929478	33,111	1,660	18.44%	-2.06%

Table 3-6: Anticipated Population Growth in Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties, and Subtotals for MATS Area Portions

	Age Group								
Area	**0-4**	**5-9**	**10-14**	**15-19**	**20-24**	**25-29**	**30-34**	**35-39**	**40-44**
Bibb County	9,530	9,952	9,827	10,425	10,227	10,368	10,863	10,612	10,495
Jones County	1,226	1,370	1,539	1,660	1,637	1,680	1,563	1,704	1,869
MATS Area Proportion	612	684	768	829	817	839	780	851	933
Monroe County	1,740	1,849	1,896	2,052	2,246	2,141	2,091	2,083	2,124
MATS Area Proportion	87	93	95	103	113	107	105	104	106
	45-49	**50-54**	**55-59**	**60-64**	**65-69**	**70-74**	**75-79**	**80-84**	**85+**
Bibb County	9,552	10,318	11,365	10,028	8,178	6,981	6,857	5,521	1,770
Jones County	1,871	1,642	1,656	1,507	1,528	1,562	1,562	1,401	425
MATS Area Proportion	934	820	827	752	763	780	780	699	212
Monroe County	2,119	1,904	1,648	1,822	1,628	1,587	1,649	1,600	931
MATS Area Proportion	106	95	83	91	82	80	83	80	47
	Total								
Bibb County	**162,869**								
Jones County	**27,402**								
MATS Area Proportion	**13,680**								
Monroe County	**33,110**								
MATS Area Proportion	**1,660**								

Table 3-7: Breakdown of Anticipated Population Growth in Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties, and for MATS Area Portions, By Age Group

Building on the population projections discussed in Table 3-1 and 3-2 above, Table 3-6 and 3-7 (above) summarize the anticipated population changes by County, and by MATS area, and by age group. Full details on how these numbers were derived are available in Appendix B

By 2050, the MATS MPO is anticipated to grow by 15.76%, to a total population of 178,208. However, that figure is tentative, given that the MATS MPO planning area borders may be expanded as a result of the 2020 Census. Figure 3-24 below shows where the growth is anticipated to be distributed throughout the MATS region. These areas were identified and prioritized through consultation with the Zoning Director for Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission, the Planning Director for Jones County, and field review of the Monroe County portion of the MATS area. The zone numbers represented on the map correspond to specific Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs), which are the geographic unit used by GDOT to conduct travel demand modeling. TAZs are comprised of Census Blocks, meaning it is possible to calculate housing attributes for TAZs by aggregating the data from the relevant Census Blocks, assuming the data is available at the Census Block level from the U.S. Census.

While the exact calculations for future residential capacities are detailed in Appendix B, the basic process of assigning population was as follows:

- Using the most recent future land use plans available for each county, the amount of new residential acreage available for development was calculated by subtracting acreage already encumbered in 2015 from the future planned acreage.
- The amount of new acreage was multiplied by existing housing densities per acre in 2010 (using U.S. Census 2010 household counts and 2010 encumbered residential acreage), and adjusting for the observed 2010 housing vacancy rate, to estimate the number of new households in each zone.
- The number of new households was then multiplied by the average household size for each TAZ to estimate the amount of new population in each zone. (Note: TAZ level average household size values were based on weighted sums of 2010 Census household information. This is because Census 2010 was the most current available at the required level of geographic detail).
- A running population growth total is calculated so that it may be measured against the anticipated population growth for the MATS region of each county.

The results from the supporting calculations indicate that Macon-Bibb and Jones County are capable of absorbing all the anticipated population growth within their MATS areas under existing land use plans; Macon-Bibb has capacity for 12,228 new residents, but is only anticipated to receive 8,924; Jones County has capacity for 48,761 new residents in its MATS area, but is only anticipated to receive 1,979.



Figure 3-24: MATS Area Anticipated 2050 Population Growth Distribution, By County

Employment Growth

As described above, Figures 3-22a through 3-22c describe projected future employment by 2050. The results in these tables are based on employment projection factors based on REMI forecasts provided through the Georgia Dept. of Transportation. Specific expansion factors were calculated for each employment category (Agriculture, Mining & Construction, Manufacturing/Transportation/Communications/Warehousing (Manufacturing & TCUW), Retail, and Services). Refer to Table 3-4 above to see how each category correlates to the North American Industrial Classification system, which serves as the basis for the 2015 base year estimates for employment.

The results indicate that the MATS area can anticipate approximately 11,588 additional jobs by the target year of 2050. Consistent with the observations from the 2015 base year (see Figures 3-22a through 3-22c), the vast majority of this job growth (11,261 out of 11,588; 97.18%) will accrue to the Macon-Bibb area. Exploring the changes by sector, across the entire MATS region, net job losses are anticipated in the Retail sector (-2,696 jobs), while Service and Manufacturing & TCUW are expected to see significant gains (i.e.,+12,098 jobs and +1,598 jobs, respectively).

Summary

The MATS region is likely to experience moderate population growth through 2050. In particular, if the trends observed between the 2010 and 2020 Census are maintained, the MATS region can anticipate a significant increase of Hispanic/Latino and Asian American population groups into the region, concentrated primarily in the Bibb County region.

Total population increase for the MATS region between the 2015 base year and the 2050 plan horizon year is anticipated to be approximately 24,263 residents and 11,588 new jobs. Even with that growth, MATS would still be under the 200,000 population threshold that would designate MATS as a Transportation Management Area (TMA), pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Highway Act of 1964. However, given that MPO boundaries are subject to change after every decennial U.S. Census, it is entirely possible that the MATS region could be expanded or altered in such a way that it could reach that designation before the 2050 plan horizon is reached.

[i] The variability in the estimates used here is found in the Margin of Error (MOE) associated with each data point. For full details on how MOEs are developed and used in the American Community Survey, please refer to the technical documentation at:
https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2020/acs/acs_state_local_handbook_2020.pdf

Chapter 4 | Public Involvement

Introduction: MATS Public Participation Plan Overview

The Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) was developed through two key elements: *widespread public involvement and detailed technical work.* The public involvement process was guided by the MATS Participation Plan, which was adopted by the MATS Policy Committee on May 13, 2015, and amended November 4, 2020. The requirements for the Public Participation Plan were established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) which sets regulations for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to include public participation in the transportation planning process. Public participation is a critical component of the continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive Metropolitan Transportation Planning process as well as community ownership of the 2050 MTP. The Participation Plan defines the process for ensuring that citizens from all segments of the public including, but not limited to, users of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, representatives of the disabled, the poor, and minority communities have an opportunity to be involved in the MTP update. This also includes public agencies, providers of public transportation, providers of non-emergency transportation services, providers of freight transportation services, entities responsible for safety and security operations including fire and police, and other interested parties. One of the goals of the Participation Plan is that input into the transportation planning process should be accessible and reasonable to those willing to participate. Furthermore, the public should be involved early in the participation and decision making process. Participants should be provided with the information they need to participate in a productive and beneficial manner. Measures should be developed to provide information to those groups who are traditionally underserved such as low income and minority groups. The input and the concerns of the public should be considered and included in the final outcome.[1]

[1] MATS: Macon Area Transportation Participation Plan – May 2015/Amended November 2021

Public Outreach Strategies

This section describes public outreach strategies and stakeholder involvement that supports the development of MATS *Connect 2050* Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update. Understanding the importance to gain meaningful input from the public to be inclusive of all residents in the MATS study area, MPO staff strived to go beyond what is required to seek engagement from all sections of the study area.

Stakeholder Involvement

The development of a transportation plan should be inclusive of the needs and desires of all populations to create access to opportunity for people of all ages, incomes, and abilities. MATS MPO made a concerted effort to engage stakeholders and the public through the MATS Committee process, a series of traditional public meetings, and via the Connect 2050 online Transportation Survey. The stakeholder outreach process involved key policy and decision-making groups operating within the MATS Committee structure. Stakeholders represented a broad cross section of the MATS area to include: *representatives of local governments (Macon-Bibb, Jones, Monroe Counties), Middle Georgia Regional Commission, Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority, Macon Water Authority, Macon-Bibb County Industrial Authority, Georgia Dept. of Transportation (GDOT), County Department Heads, and local citizens representing special interest groups.* Stakeholders were instrumental in guiding the development of the plan, as well as reviewing and approving the proposed project list during the MATS Committee process. Stakeholders met virtually, three times throughout the beginning of the planning process. Meetings were coordinated with regularly scheduled MATS committee meetings. The MATS CAC met on Wednesday, October 13, 2021, 6:00PM; MATS TCC met on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, 10:00AM; and MATS Policy Committee on Wednesday, November 4, 2021, 9:30AM. The meetings included formal presentations



MATSCitizenAdvisoryCommittee_20211013_SpeakerAndSharedScreen.mp4
Posted by Mike G. · October 17, 2021 · 2.24 GB



MATSTechnicalCoordinatingCommittee_20211020_SpeakerAndSharedScreen.mp4
Posted by Mike G. · October 25, 2021 · 440 MB

by the MPO staff, as well as opportunities for in depth discussion. The input received from stakeholders was incorporated into the planning process and provided guidance for the development of the plan update.

Online Survey

The MPO developed an online survey to reach a broad section of the community. The survey was designed to gather feedback on local and national transportation priorities, and the MPOs transportation project list. The survey was circulated through various platforms including email distribution, E-Newsletters campaigns, websites, and social media. The MPO also developed a QR code that provided access to the survey. The initial survey was conducted November 1 through December 8, 2021.

In order to provide further opportunity for public comment and review, the survey was left open through the close of the comment period for the initial draft of the 2050 MTP document (i.e., through March 17, 2022).

Appendix C shows the introductory page of the on-line survey. The survey included five (5) questions in addition to three (3) open ended questions, run through the MATS website (www.maconmpo.com) using the JotForm.com platform. Not all respondents answered each question. The questions were organized as follows:

Question 1: "What are your transportation priorities? Sort the category list below by dragging & dropping the each priority. Number "1" is highest priority; "2" second highest and so on"

- *Add & Widen Roads*
- *Technologically Smarter Roads*
- *Better Traffic Flow*
- *Bicycle & Walking*
- *Road Maintenance*
- *Public Transportation*
- *Travel Safety*

The distributions of how each priority was sorted are described in Figures 4-1 through 4-7, below.



Figure 4-1: Distribution of Responses for Importance of Adding and Widening of Roads



Figure 4-2: Distribution of Responses for Importance of Deploying Advanced Technology on Roads



Figure 4-3: Distribution of Responses for Importance of Improving Travel Flows



Figure 4-4: Distribution of Responses for Importance of Enhancing Bicycling & Walking Environments



Figure 4-5: Distribution of Responses for Importance of Maintaining Roads



Figure 4-6: Distribution of Responses for Importance of Enhancing Public Transportation Options



Figure 4-7: Distribution of Responses for Importance of Enhancing Travel Safety

Question 2: Transportation touches every part of our lives. It's not just where we go, but how. How do we get there? How do our goods and services get to us? How do our kids get to school? And how do we do it all while protecting our environment and within budget?

Those questions are addressed by the transportation goals laid out in the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (or FAST Act). Passed in 2015, the FAST Act lays out the goals for projects that receive Federal transportation dollars, including:

- *Promoting many types of affordable travel choices in addition to personal vehicles (trains, buses & bikes)*
- *Managing Congestion and Improving Our Transportation System's Reliability*
- *Improving Air Quality & Protecting the Environment*
- *Improving Access to Essential Services*
- *Ensuring Equity*
- *Increase Safety, Health & Security*
- *Support Economic Equality*
- *Rebuilding Quickly After Natural Disasters*
- *Enhance Travel & Tourism*

What's important to you on this list?

Think about on how you ordered the priority list question, please rate these goals in order of importance Based on how you prioritized the project categories in the previous question, how would you rank the following in importance?

(0 = Not Important; 10 = Most Important)

Table 4-1 summarizes the responses of how important each Federal transportation goal is to the survey respondents (n=107 usable responses):

	Strategies for Achieving FAST Act Goals					
Priority Scoring	Improving air quality through fees & regulations	Add bus routes, extend service hours & days	Programs promoting ride sharing & carpooling	Fixing roads & bridges faster	High speed rail service from Macon to Atlanta	Adding more sidewalks & bike lanes
0 - Not Important	13	6	8	1	6	1
1 - Lowest Priority	2	2	6	0	3	2
2	8	5	9	1	5	3
3	12	1	10	3	3	2
4	3	3	7	2	3	2
5	41	27	35	20	11	23
6	3	9	8	6	1	5
7	7	16	8	17	11	15
8	9	16	5	15	20	11
9	3	7	6	10	8	16
10 - Highest Priority	6	15	5	32	36	27
Avg. Priority Score	4.64	6.25	4.72	7.51	7.14	7.23

Table 4-1: Distribution of Relative Importance of Strategies for Achieving FAST Act Transportation Goals

The responses to Question 2 indicate that respondents emphasized strategies that involve maintaining and enhancing physical infrastructure (i.e., maintaining roads; adding bike and pedestrian infrastructure) rather than expanding public services (such as public transit or ride sharing). Although the wider use of such public services would take advantage of existing road capacity to reduce congestion (and also extend the useful service life of that fixed infrastructure), it would require changes in individual travel behaviors that reduce individual autonomy and/or flexibility.

Still, even the public service and regulatory approaches did enjoy some support (Regulation and Fees, Additional Bus Capacity, and Promoting Rideshare and Carpool all had a median level of support of 5), indicating that the survey respondents accept that these strategies must be at least considered as part of achieving successful regional transportation outcomes.

This section of the survey concluded with an open ended question "*Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?"* Specific answers to this question, and MATS responses, are included in Appendix D

Question 3: All transportation projects paid for with federal funds are required to meet local & state criteria and then are added to the Macon Area Transportation Study's Project list.

At the time of this survey, we have 41 confirmed projects on this list spanning all corners of Macon-Bibb as well as southern portions of Jones & Monroe counties.

Follow this link to the MATS Project list (clicking the link will open another browser tab), browse the projects then let us know what projects most affect you and what, if any, projects need to be added to/deleted from the MATS Project List.

Open Ended Question: Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List Specific answers to this question, and MATS responses, are included in Appendix D

Question 4: Thank you for getting this far!

Please answer a few final questions. Your information will be kept private.

What is your home zip code?

What is your age? (n=108)

Table 4-2 provides the crosstab of age group responses by ZIP Code. Figure 4-8 shows the areas covered by JotForm survey responses

Zip Code	Total Responses Per ZIP Code	No Age Response	Under 17 years old	18 to 34 years old	35 to 59 years old	60 years old & older
31032	1	0	0	0	1	0
31052	5	0	0	0	1	4
31201	12	0	0	4	5	3
31204	16	1	0	2	6	7
31206	2	0	0	0	1	1
31210	22	0	0	3	13	6
31211	5	0	0	1	2	2
31216	6	0	0	0	4	2
31217	4	0	0	1	2	1
31220	10	1	0	1	2	6
No ZIP Code Response	15	1	0	0	6	8
Respondent ZIP Code Outside of MATS Area	10	0	0	4	3	3
Total Responses	**108**	3	0	16	46	43

Table 4-2: Crosstabulation of On-Line Survey Responses per ZIP Code by Age Group

Taken in combination, Figure 4-8 and Table 4-2 indicate that the majority of respondents to the survey skew older, with spatial concentrations towards the center of Bibb County. These spatial concentrations and age profiles are consistent with the pattern of public interest and involvement that MATS staff has observed in the normal course of conducting MATS activities and meetings.



Figure 4-8: Areas Covered (by ZIP Code) of Responses to MATS 2050 MTP On-Line Survey

Question 5: How do you get around Macon-Bibb/Middle Georgia?

Table 4-3 summarizes the responses of preferred/most commonly utilized travel mode (n=109 usable responses):

Mode	Frequency				
	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	No Response
Personal Vehicle	99	6	0	1	3
Ridesharing apps like Groome, Uber or Lyft	1	20	35	45	8
Public transportation (Bus, Para-Transit)	1	5	17	77	9
Bicycle	7	17	20	57	8
Walking	25	43	18	16	7

Table 4-3: Distribution of Survey Responses by Most Common Mode of Travel

As anticipated, the most commonly selected mode of travel is the use of a personal vehicle. However, there is also a significant interest in Walking as a preferred mode of physically active travel; 68 out of 109 respondents stated they walked either "Often" or "Occasionally."

Open Ended Survey Question: Do you have any other thoughts on transportation you would like to share? Specific answers to this question, and MATS responses, are included in Appendix D

In-Person Public Engagement

Understanding the importance to reach a broad cross-section of the community, particularly those with no access to internet service, the MPO held eight (8) in-person public information open house meetings throughout each section of MATS area.

- **Monday, November 29, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30:** Rosa Jackson Community Center, 1211 Maynard Street, Macon, Georgia 31216
- **Tuesday, November 30, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm:** South Bibb Recreation Center, 7035 Houston Road, Macon, Georgia 31216
- **Wednesday, December 1, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm:** Frank Johnson Community Center, 2227 Mercer University Drive, Macon, Georgia 31201
- **Thursday, December 2, 2021, 5:30pm – 7:30pm:** Jones County Government Center – Charlotte C. Wilson Conference Room, 166 Industrial Boulevard, Gray, Georgia 31032
- **Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm:** Elaine H. Lucas Senior Center, 132 Willie Smokie Glover Drive, Macon, Georgia 31201
- **Wednesday, December 8, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm:** Bloomfield - Gilead Community Center, 1931 Rocky Creek Road, Macon, Georgia 31206
- **Thursday, December 9, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm:** Lake Tobesofkee (Sandy Beach Pavilion), 6680 Moseley Dixon Road, Macon, Georgia 31220
- **Monday, December 13, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm:** Macon Area GDOT Office (Auditorium), 4499 Riverside Drive, Macon, Georgia 31210

MATS staff had to change the format of the following public involvement session from in-person to an online discussion, due to conditions at the Theron Ussery Recreation Center.

- **Monday, December 6, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm:** Theron Ussery Recreation Center, 815 N. Macon Park Drive, Macon, Georgia 31210

At each outreach session, participants were able to interact with planning staff to provide feedback on transportation planning improvements within the MATS area *(Macon-Bibb County and the southern portion of Jones and Monroe counties).* Staff members utilized visual aid boards to display: (1). Proposed projects list and map for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan; and (2). Macon Transit Authority Bus Routes. Attendees were able to provide written comments and scan the QR code to access the online survey. Participants were also encouraged to join the MATS Transportation Connection *E-Newsletter* mailing list and visit the project website www.maconmpo.com to stay abreast of project updates.

Overall, during the timeframe of the public outreach activities, staff recorded input from approximately 120 community members, through either the on-line survey, in person open houses, or e-mail correspondence with MATS staff (sign in and comment sheets for the in person open house sessions, and copies of e-mails to MATS staff, are included in Appendix E and Appendix F, respectively). The public provided feedback on road improvement projects, public transportation, active transportation projects such as walking and biking, safety improvement projects, freight and truck movement projects, location specific projects, rail projects and other projects.

Jeffersonville Rd. Improvement Projects

I-16/I-75 Interchange Improvement Project

Public Outreach Venue Partners

Public Outreach Timeframe / Locations: November 29, 2021 – December 13, 2021

Monday, November 29, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30: Rosa Jackson Community Center, 1211 Maynard Street, Macon, Georgia 31216

Tuesday, November 30, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: South Bibb Recreation Center, 7035 Houston Road, Macon, Georgia 31216

Wednesday, December 1, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: Frank Johnson Community Center, 2227 Mercer University Drive, Macon, Georgia 31201

Thursday, December 2, 2021, 5:30pm – 7:30pm: Jones County Government Center – Charlotte C. Wilson Conference Room, 166 Industrial Boulevard, Gray, Georgia 31032

Monday, December 6, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: The format of the following public involvement session from in-person to an online discussion, due to conditions at the Theron Ussery Recreation Center.



Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm: Elaine H. Lucas Senior Center, 132 Willie Smokie Glover Drive, Macon, Georgia 31201

Wednesday, December 8, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm: Bloomfield - Gilead Community Center, 1931 Rocky Creek Road, Macon, Georgia 31206

Thursday, December 9, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: Lake Tobesofkee (Sandy Beach Pavilion), 6680 Moseley Dixon Road, Macon, Georgia 31220



Monday, December 13, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm: Macon Area GDOT Office (Auditorium), 4499 Riverside Drive, Macon, Georgia 31210

Public Outreach Press / Media Partners

MATS MPO used various types of media across the Middle Georgia area to ensure that all residents were reached. Venturing further into social media, staff went beyond mainstream media outlets to include blogs, community publications and government channels. Staff members created detailed graphics to be used by the media to brand and promote the outreach efforts. The outreach efforts targeted various media outlets, including television, blogs, radio and print, with special attention to underserved communities. Staff worked with local government public affairs offices, minority newspapers such as the Middle Georgia Informer and Que Pasa, 13WMAZ; Fox24 NewsCentral; 41NBC; The Telegraph; Jones County News; Monroe County Reporter; Greater Macon Chamber of Commerce *(Website & E-Newsletter)*; Middle Georgia CEO E-Newsletter; Macon-Bibb Parks and Recreation Department's Facebook Page; Macon Area Transportation Study *Website, E-Newsletter, Facebook, Twitter and Blogs*; Macon Bibb County Consolidated Government – *The HUB E-Newsletter* to spread the word and to make the local news station aware of the need for media coverage on the metropolitan transportation plan and its related events. Staff members were interviewed by local TV news media and provided information to the newspaper, at times, leading up to various outreach activities. Staff was very persistent to ensure that all segments of

PRESS RELEASE

Connect 2050

2022 | THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

For Immediate Release
For more information contact:
Gregory L. Brown, Senior Planner
gbrown@mbpz.org
478-751-7460

November 24, 2021

MATS to Hold Public Information Open House meetings on 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is seeking public input during the update of the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) that will include over half a billion dollars of transportation projects.

The study will assess the existing transportation network, gather community feedback, update goals, objectives, & transportation priorities for Macon-Bibb County and parts of Jones & Monroe Counties.

The update will produce a report that includes a prioritized, cost-constrained list of projects that will be implemented over the next 25 to 30 years.

The **Connect 2050 Plan** guides future transportation improvements in the area, including transit opportunities, pedestrian & bike facilities, bridge replacement, safety & operational, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure.

The update of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan process relies heavily on public participation and input. This is your opportunity to voice your opinions to help formulate the goals & objectives of our future transportation systems; help prioritize a list of proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area.

Public Information Open House Schedule

11/29 Monday, November 29, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Rosa Jackson Community Center
1211 Maynard Street

11/30 Tuesday, November 30, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
South Bibb Recreation Center
7035 Houston Road

12/01 Wednesday, December 1, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Frank Johnson Community Center
2227 Mercer University Drive

12/02 Thursday, December 2, 2021 | 5:30pm – 7:30pm
Jones County Government Center
Charlotte C. Wilson Conference Room
166 Industrial Boulevard, Gray

12/06 Monday, December 6, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Theron Ussery Recreation Center
815 N. Macon Park Drive

12/07 Tuesday, December 7, 2021 | 2:00pm - 4:00pm
Elaine H. Lucas Senior Center
132 Willie Smokie Glover Drive

12/08 Wednesday, December 8, 2021 | 2:00pm - 4:00pm
Bloomfield - Gilead Community Center
1931 Rocky Creek Road

12/09 Thursday, December 9, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Lake Tobesofkee (Sandy Beach Pavilion)
6680 Moseley Dixon Road

12/13 Monday, December 13, 2021 | 2:00pm - 4:00pm
Macon Area GDOT Office (Auditorium)
4499 Riverside Drive

MACON-BIBB COUNTY Planning & Zoning

Macon Transportation Study | 200 Cherry St. Suite 300 | Macon, GA 31201

Take the Connect 2050 *Transportation Survey*

the population were reached to become involved with the public involvement opportunities. Staff devised a strategy for submitting stories and purchasing ads in newspapers within the MATS area to make sure residents were aware of major public involvement opportunities, such as the interactive public information open house events and MATS Special Called meetings. The ads were placed in general circulation papers in Macon – Bibb, Monroe, and Jones counties, as well as a Spanish-language paper and a publication targeting the African-American community, as shown below.

Copies of the public notice ads and public announcements are included in Appendix G. The original interview articles are included in Appendix H.

Concluding Outreach Efforts

On April 1, 2022, a final public notice was placed in the Macon Telegraph newspaper, and posted on the MATS website (www.maconmpo.com), announcing that the MATS 2050 MTP and the associated Air Quality Conformity Determination Report (AQ-CDR) would be adopted at the MATS Policy Committee meeting on May 3, 2022. The final draft documents were posted for public viewing, including responses to all comments (see Appendix D for full responses). This final public notification ad is included in Appendix I.

Chapter 5 | Operational & Management Strategies

Operational & Management Strategies

This section of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2050 MTP provides an overview of the Operational and Management Strategies (OMS) recognized by MATS to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities in order to increase the safety and mobility of pedestrians and to relieve traffic congestion. OMS are important because they reflect the safe and efficient use of existing facilities, thereby mitigating the need for construction of new or expanded infrastructure. The following sections discuss a variety of OMS, specifically:

- Intelligent Transportation Systems;
- Incident Management; and
- Transportation Asset Management.

Intelligent Transportation Systems

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) are the application of advanced computer, electronic, and communication technologies used in an integrated manner to increase the safety and efficiency of the transportation network. Road and highway conditions can change suddenly and traffic delays can result from accidents, bad weather and broken down vehicles.

The Transportation Management Center (TMC), based in Atlanta, is an important part of the Intelligent Transportation Systems in Georgia. TMC covers the entire Interstate system throughout Georgia (including for the MATS area), enhancing travel safety and efficiency by monitoring incidents, controlling traffic and providing information through the following activities:

- TMC collects important information from closed circuit television cameras and video detection systems located along Interstates, providing “at the moment” reporting on speeds, vehicle volumes, traffic congestion and accidents;
- TMC confirms problems, establishes the cause, and analyzes the effect it will have on traffic. TMC also contacts the appropriate department to respond to the situation.
- TMC notifies travelers on affected Interstate segments via Changeable Message Signs. These signs relay updated information such as travel times and incident messages.

In addition to these reactive measures, there is a traffic information phone service (Georgia 511) that provides free travel information, allowing travelers to report an accident and to receive current traffic reports. Georgia 511 is an advanced phone service that provides assistance 24 hours a day. Travelers can use the phone system to do the following:

- Receive road construction or closure information
- Obtain estimated trip times
- Report a traffic accident or road hazard
- Receive road traffic conditions
- Obtain route specific information

Georgia 511 also provides information on the following:

- Transit service in the area
- Tourism information
- Rideshare information
- Travel Planning
- Air quality conditions

In addition to calling, the Georgia 511 website (www.511ga.org) provides real-time traveler information current travel conditions for roadways in the MATS area including:

- Weather conditions
- Location and scope of active road construction activities on Interstate and State highways
- Alerts and special events which might impact traffic flow (e.g., a parade shutting down a particular part of a State route)

Driver can also sign up for e-mail alerts to their mobile devices from the Georgia 511 system, which pushes travel updates to subscribers as they become available. These roadside ITS technologies allow the website to provide travelers with real time information on trip times, travel alerts, congestion levels and traffic accident locations. This information helps drivers dynamically optimize their route choices, which reduces the congestion levels on the regional road network.

Incident Management

Incident management deals with stalled vehicles, traffic accidents, roadway debris and spilled loads. A portion of traffic congestion is due to vehicle crashes or incidents but in some cases, the initial incident can be minor. However, there is also an increased risk of secondary crashes that result from a primary crash or incident. Subsequently, the secondary crash caused by the initial incident may be even more severe than the primary crash.

Improved incident management can increase the safety of the transportation system. The incident management program was initiated to develop and sustain a method to facilitate the safe and fast clearance of roadway incidents, thereby lessening the impact on emergency vehicles and the traveling public. Georgia DOT strives to improve incident response across the entire state. For the MATS area, the GDOT incident management program is the Coordinated Highway Assistance & Maintenance Program (CHAMP).

CHAMP was established as a result of the Georgia Transportation Funding Act of 2015 (GTFA: see Ch. 8: Fiscal Assessment for more details). CHAMP patrols Interstate segments outside the metropolitan Atlanta region, with the exception of I-59 and I-24 (neither of which are in the MATS service area). CHAMP has three main functions: roadway maintenance, motorist assistance, and emergency response. Their specific tasks include:

- Provide quick response to maintenance issues and enhance proactive major maintenance by providing immediate district notification about bridge/roadway damage, signs down,

markings missing, signal malfunction, commercial vehicle crashes and spills and other major maintenance concerns.
- Provide immediate resolution for minor maintenance needs such as vegetation issues, blocked drainage and debris removal (including abandoned or disabled vehicles).
- Offer motorist assistance and temporary traffic control, which helps to reduce secondary incidents and increase responder safety.
- As an on-scene incident responder, assist with emergency response and provide roadway clearance and coordinate long-term traffic control and traveler information.
- Detect, verify, report and provide assistance on traffic incidents to ensure safe, quick clearance on interstates outside of Metro Atlanta AND on non-interstate state routes within 10 miles on either side of interstates, when requested.
- Maintain and/or improve safe and efficient traffic flow.
- Assist the Department of Public Safety and other law enforcement agencies.
- Identify, verify and report maintenance issues and/or property damage to infrastructure to GDOT, TMC, and District staff.

CHAMP operates 7 days a week, 16 hours each day, with the remaining 8 hours covered on an "on-call" basis. CHAMP operators patrol a 50-mile section of Interstate highway during an 8-hour shift. In the MATS area, there are three active vehicles patrolling from 6:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. daily for the following routes;

- South on I-475 to the I-75 merge, then returning North on I-75 to the I-475/I-75 merge in Monroe County;
- East on I-16 from the I-75/I-16 out to the 50 mile limit, then returning West along I-16
- North from the I-475/I-75 merge to Exit 216 in Henry County, then returning South on I-75 back down to the I-475/I-75 merge (i.e., serving Monroe County, mostly outside the MATS area)

CHAMP patrols use one driver in a Ford F-250 pick-up truck on each route. In the event that an incident is beyond the capacity of a single patrol vehicle to respond, CHAMP operators in the MATS area contact the GDOT District 3 office located in Thomaston (outside the MATS area) for dispatch of additional maintenance personnel.

Transportation Asset Management

Transportation Asset Management (TAM) is a comprehensive, integrated and systematic method for cost effectively managing physical transportation assets through the use of strategic goals, performance measures and data. TAM is a simple concept which involves the preservation of transportation assets by strategically anticipating and reacting to problems before they occur rather than afterward. The most obvious example is the consistent prioritization and application of routine repairs to extend the life of existing infrastructure, rather than expensive asset replacement due to foregone maintenance.

An effective Transportation Asset Management (TAM) program requires the coordination of three factors; strategic planning, asset management, and performance management. Strategic planning identifies and documents goals and objectives. In addition, it also identifies short-term

business strategies and sets the direction. Asset management focuses on extending the life-cycle of an existing asset, using data in order to make informed decisions and encourages collaboration and coordination. Performance measures help to set performance management and targets based on objectives. It also helps to determine if progress is being made towards identified goals, and guides decisions in making adjustments. See Chapter 2, Table 2-1 for a detailed discussion on LRTP Goals and Objectives and Performance Measures as they related to TAM.

The TAM principles currently adopted by GDOT for pavements, bridges, and signs can be found in the 2019-2028 Transportation Asset Management Plan.[1] For pavement management, risk factors such as average daily traffic and truck traffic percentage are used along with the Computerized Pavements Condition Evaluation Systems to guide decisions regarding roadway improvements. Figure 5-1 (below) shows the locations in Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties where GDOT traffic demand sensors are permanently located to collect vehicle counts (both total vehicles, and truck counts).

TAM is an important method to determine how to invest funding (and prioritize maintenance) for transportation projects. Preventive maintenance on assets will reduce life cycle costs and improve travel conditions, safety and reliability, resulting in an overall better-managed transportation system.

[1] For full document, see http://www.dot.ga.gov/IS/TAM



Figure 5-1 Distribution of GDOT Traffic Demand Sensors in Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties

Chapter 6 | Roads and Bridges Projects

Introduction

This section addresses the anticipated roads and bridge projects identified in the updated **2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).** The general goals of these proposed projects are defined under the **Moving Ahead For Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21)** and **Fixing America Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act)**, described in the **Goals and Objectives section**. To facilitate these goals, the MTP is updated every 5 years, to account for changes in demographics, budgets and/or project prioritization at the State and local level. Table 6-1 describes in detail a number of road centerline miles in each major road category, and Figure 6-1 provides an overview of the regional road network across the MATS jurisdiction.

MATS Areas	Total Centerline Miles	Interstate Highways (Including Ramps)	State Trunk Highways, Major Arterials & Frontage Roads	Local Streets & Roads (including Private Roads)	Misc. Other (Alleys, 4WD Trails, Parking Lots, etc.)
Jones County	299.92	0.08	59.65	239.87	0.32
Macon-Bibb County	1693.34	109.01	344.95	1238.92	0.45
Monroe County	54.93	7.94	10.65	36.33	0.00

Table 6-1: Road Centerline Miles in MATS Area By Type, per County



Figure 6-1: Road Network for MATS MPO Service Area

Road and Bridge Projects

Table 6-2 below lists the road and bridge projects adopted by the MATS Policy Committee. The initial list for this MTP Update was adopted on December 9, 2021. Projects on this list are in priority order, as decided by the MATS Policy Committee in consultation with Georgia Dept. of Transportation Office of Planning. The guidelines for setting road and bridge project prioritization are as follows:

1. **First Priority - Projects listed in the original MATS 2040 LRTP identified as ongoing (i.e., already underway or about to begin).** Delaying existing projects to promote others where plans have not been finalized would introduce logistical complications, and potentially create equity concerns
2. **Second Priority – Existing projects with higher need, as assessed by local planning and engineering staff and elected officials.** The operational definition of need used here prioritizes:

    Safety and State of Good Repair – Projects which were determined as necessary to maintain or repair deficiencies in existing road and bridge infrastructure were prioritized above new projects. The specific order of prioritization among these projects was determined based on consultation with County engineering staff and GDOT Office of Planning.

    Figures 6-2 through 6-6 below indicate the locations in the Statewide network identified by GDOT Office of Planning for capacity expansion, and as having insufficient Level of Service by 2050.

    Economic Development Potential – This includes projects which improved freight movement, relieve congestion or coordinate travel infrastructure with anticipated economic development activities at regional activity centers.

- **Third Priority - New projects identified by public input and recommendations from elected officials.** Projects in this category are primarily associated with pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and repair projects which were not otherwise prioritized as immediately critical to the state of good repair.

In addition to prioritizing the project list, Table 6-2 also provides the following information:

- Whether or not the project is Exempt from Air Quality Conformity Review[1] Projects are considered Exempt if they do not involve the construction of any new vehicle capacity (e.g., widening existing lanes or adding new lanes). Examples of Exempt projects include bridge repair and replacement, safety projects, projects improving traffic flow/traffic signalization at existing intersections, and pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure projects.

[1] See MATS 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination report for additional details on this process

- The list identifies how many totals, and which specific, planning factors identified under the FAST Act are addressed by each project;
- Whether or not the project is part of the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the MATS region. A project that is part of the current TIP has at least begun the preliminary engineering and environmental assessments necessary to begin construction, and may already be under construction;
- The anticipated total project cost for each of the projects

Finally, Figure 6-7 provides a locational orientation to where the projects in Table 6-2 are located throughout the MATS region.



Figure 6-2 - MATS Area 1st Network: Daily Level of Service MATS Area for 2015 Base Year
Source: Georgia Dept. of Transportation, Office of Planning



Figure 6-3 - MATS Area 2nd Network: 2015 Base year (1st Network) + Any Projects Which Either Opened to Traffic Since 2015, Or Currently Under Construction
Source: Georgia Dept. of Transportation, Office of Planning



Projects that are included in the 2050 E+C network:

Project ID	Primary County	Short Description	Primary Work Type
0015686	Bibb	SR 11/SR 49 @ SR 247	Roundabout

Projects that are not included in the 2050 E+C network:

Project ID	Primary County	Short Description	Reasons why they are not included
0013921	Bibb	I-475 @ CR 742/Tucker Rd - 2 Miles west of Macon	No additional capacity
0014072	Bibb	I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Walnut Creek	No additional capacity
0014090	Bibb	I-75 From SR 215/Dooly to CS 636/Bill Gardner Pkwy/Henry	No additional capacity
0014896	Bibb	CR 742/Bass Rd @Norfolk Southern Railroad #718357C	No additional capacity
0014897	Bibb	I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow	No additional capacity
0016902	Bibb	CR 1363/Walden	No additional capacity
0017679	Bibb	SR 87 @ I-16 Eastbound	No additional capacity
0017721	Bibb	SR 87 @ I-16 Westbound	No additional capacity
0017949	Bibb, Lamar, Monroe, Spalding	LED & Antiquated	No additional capacity
M005133	Bibb, Jones, Twiggs	SR 57 From SR 19 to Wilkinson Countyline	No additional capacity
M006093	Bibb	SR 247/US 41 from north of SR 49 to south of SR 19	No additional capacity
M006152	Monroe	I-475 Southbound & Northbound @ SR 19	No additional capacity
M006161	Bibb	I-475 @ 8 locations in Bibb County Bridge Preservation	No additional capacity
M006244	Bibb	SR 11/SR 247 from Houston Countyline to north of CR/795/Barnes Rd	No additional capacity
M006246	Bibb	SR 49 from SR 11 to Jones Countyline	No additional capacity

Figure 6-4 - MATS Area 3rd Network: 2nd Network + projects with construction (CST) funded in the STIP years 2021-2024 + local projects with CST funded in the MPO's current TIP



Figure 6-5 - MATS Area 4th Network: 3rd Network + Projects with Preliminary Engineering (PE) and/or Right of Way (ROW) Funded in STIP years 2021-2024 + Local Projects with PE and/or ROW Funded in the MATS Current TIP (FY 2021 – 2024)
Source: Georgia Dept. of Transportation, Office of Planning



Projects that are included in the 2050 LRTP network:

Project ID	Primary County	Short Description	Primary Work Type
M1	Bibb	7th St. Truck Route - 7th St. @ Walnut & 7th St. @ Eisenhower - Roundabout and Improvements	Roadway Project
351080-	Bibb	Widen Jeffersonville Road from 2 to 4 thru lanes with a continuous left turn lane from Recreation Rd. to Emery Rd (US 80).	Roadway Project
M15	Bibb	Bass Rd. widening, Phase II - Providence Blvd. to Zebulon Rd. widened from 2 to 4 lanes	Roadway Project
M17	Jones	Henderson Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from Rte 57 to Gray/Ashville Dr.	Roadway Project
M18	Jones	Griswoldville Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from Henderson Rd. to SR 49	Roadway Project
M19	Jones	Joycliff Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 49 to US 129	Roadway Project
332450-	Jones	Widen State Route 49 from Griswoldville Rd. to State Route 18 (Jones Co.) from 2-4 lanes	Roadway Project
M23	Bibb	Widen New Forsyth Rd from 2 to 4 lanes with turn lanes as needed from Bass Rd. to Riverside Dr., with major intersection reconfiguration with Bass Rd., Wesleyan Dr. and Riverside Dr.	Roadway Project
M24	Bibb	Widen Bass Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes from New Forsyth Rd. to Riverside Drive, and Interchange Improvements	Roadway Project
M25	Bibb	Widen Zebulon Rd. from Lake Wildwood entrance to Lamar Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes. Add turn lanes at Lamar Rd. and Zebulon Rd.	Roadway Project

Projects that are not included in the 2050 LRTP network:

Project ID	Primary County	Short Description	Reason why they are not included
13676	Bibb	Forest Hill Rd. - Widen from 2 to 3 lanes from Vineville Ave./Forsyth Rd. to Wimbish Rd.	No additional capacity
311400-	Bibb	I-75 from I-16 to CR 478/Pierce Ave - Phase VI	No additional capacity
0007029	Bibb, Crawford	Columbus Rd (SR 22) - Replace Bridge at Echeconnee Creek	No additional capacity
0006669	Bibb	Peake Rd. bridge replacement - Replace Bridge at Rocky Creek	No additional capacity
M2	Bibb	Safety Improvements Emery Hwy from Spring Street to Ivanhoe Highway	No additional capacity
333150-	Bibb	Emery Hwy - Reconstruct Bridge at Walnut Creek	No additional capacity
M3	Bibb	Safety Improvements Eisenhower Parkway from Bloomfield Dr to C Street	No additional capacity
0007624	Bibb	Pierce Ave. (SR 247) - Pedestrian improvements and bike lanes from Vineville Ave. to Riverside Dr.	No additional capacity
M4	Bibb	Safety Improvements Gray Hwy from I-75 to Jones County Line	No additional capacity
M5	Bibb	I-75/Riverside Drive Interchange - Signalize interchange. Modify ramps to add turn lanes & storage. Run fiberoptic.	No additional capacity
M6	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive- NB and SB Ramp Intersections (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M7	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway- NB Ramp intersection (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M8	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: 7th Ntono Avenue NB Ramp Intersection	No additional capacity
M9	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Between Bass Road to Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M10	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Riverside Drive to Arkwright Road- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M11	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Pierce Avenue at intersection with Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M12	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street, NB off ramp (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M13	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street to Mercer University Drive- Both Directions (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M14	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive to Eisenhower Parkway- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	No additional capacity
M15	Bibb	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway to Pio Nono Avenue in Both Directions	No additional capacity
M20	Bibb	Sardis Church Rd. Extension from SR 247 to Sgoda Rd. - New Road on new location project. Includes study	Outside of model network
M21	Bibb, Monroe	Bolingbroke Bike Loop - Bolingbroke to Estes Rd, to Zebulon Rd., to Bass Rd., to New Forsyth Rd., to Macon-Bibb County Line	No additional capacity
M22	Bibb, Jones	Central Georgia Rail Trail - Macon to Milledgeville pedestrian/bike trail conversion on abandoned CSX right of way	No additional capacity

Figure 6-6 - MATS Area 5th Network: Completion of 4th Network + all projects To Address Future Transportation Needs Through 2050, As Identified Through the MATS MTP Process
Source: Georgia Dept. of Transportation, Office of Planning

Priority Number	GDOT Project ID#	Description	Project Type	County	Number of LRTP Goals Addressed	Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices for people and freight?	Manage Congestion & System Reliability?	Improve Air Quality, Protect the Environment, Improve Quality of Life, and Promote Good Land Use Planning?	Connect People?	Improve Infrastructure Condition?	Ensure Equity?	Increase Safety, Health and Security?	Support economic vitality?	Improve resiliency and reduce stormwater impacts?	Enhance travel and tourism?	In Current TIP?	Air Quality Modeling Status	Air Quality Network Modeling Year	Funding in Previous TIP Years	Funding in Current TIP (FY 2024 - FY 2027)	Total Project Cost (Current Estimate)	Total Project Outstanding Balance (i.e., Total Cost - (Sum of Expended/Obligated Funds from all TIPs)
1.	311005-	I-16 Eastbound from I-75 to Walnut Creek-Phase IV	Bridge Reconstruction	Bibb	5	X	X		X	X		X				No	Non-Exempt	2030	$149,006,176.02		$149,006,176.02	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
2.	0012701	I-16 from I-75 to Walnut Creek-Phase V	Roadway Project	Bibb	5	X	X		X	X		X				No	Non-Exempt	2030	$90,566,681.71		$90,566,681.71	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
3.	0013921	Bridge Replacement - Replace Bridge on I-475 @ CR 742/Tucker Rd, 2 miles West of Macon.	Bridges	Bibb	2					X		X				Yes	Exempt		$ 2,436,000.00	$ 9,977,485.00	$13,922,618.38	$1,509,133.38
4.	0014072	Bridge Replacement - Replace Bridge on I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Walnut Creek 1 Mile East of Macon	Bridges	Bibb	2					X		X				Yes	Exempt		$ 17,607,652.00	$ 19,636,645.00	$21,565,644.22	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
5.	0017121	CR 742/Bass Road from Providence Blvd to New Forsyth Road	Bridges & Roadway Project	Bibb	6	X	X	X		X		X	X			Yes	Non-Exempt	2027		$5,387,700.00	$35,823,137.00	$30,435,437.00
6.	0014896	CR 742/BASS ROAD @ NS # 718357C 2 MI W OF MACON	Bridge Replacement	Bibb	4	X	X			X		X				Yes	Exempt		$ 13,901,770.49		$13,901,770.49	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
7.	0014897	I-16 EB & WB @ OCMULGEE RIVER OVERFLOW	Bridge Replacement	Bibb	3					X		X		X		Yes	Exempt		$ 13,394,434.13		$13,394,434.13	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
8.	0016130	SR 18 @ Ocmulgee River, 13 Miles East of Forsyth	Bridges	Jones	1					x						Yes	Exempt			$2,098,200.00	$1,456,588.42	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
9.	0017221	SR 247 @ Echeconne Creek & Overflow @ 3 Locations	Bridges	Bibb, Houston	1					x						Yes	Exempt		$1,795,920.00	$504,000.00	$17,900,000.00	$15,600,080.00
10.	0017230	SR 11/SR 22/US 129 Southbound & Northbound @ Rock Creek	Bridges	Jones	1					x						Yes	Exempt		$1,019,500.00	$500,000.00	$10,386,748.00	$8,867,248.00
11.	0017231	SR 11/SR 22/US 129 Sand Creek, Southbound	Bridges	Jones	1					x						Yes	Exempt		$1,764,000.00	$357,000.00	$9,890,170.03	$7,769,170.03
12.	0013712	Replace Railroad Bridge on SR 11/SR 49/US 41 @ Norfolk Southern #734080Y, 1.4 Miles South of Macon	Bridges	Bibb	4	X				X		X	X			Yes	Exempt		$ 3,422,192.57	$ 19,021,722.74	$22,443,915.31	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
13.	0018327	SR 22/US 80 FROM CR 5503/CANTERBURY ROAD TO I-75 SB RAMP - Re-stripe and add a road diet, rumble strips and sidewalk installation on the northside of Eisenhower Pkwy . Recommended long-term improvements which include lighting and installing sidewalks on the south side of Eisenhower Pkwy connecting the east and west of the existing sidewalks at the intersection of Eisenhower Pkwy at SR 247/Pio Nono Avenue.	Roadway Project	Bibb	3				X					X	X	Yes	Exempt			$ 730,000.00	$2,463,000.00	$1,733,000.00

Priority Number	GDOT Project ID#	Description	Project Type	County	Number of LRTP Goals Addressed	Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices for people and freight?	Manage Congestion & System Reliability?	Improve Air Quality, Protect the Environment, Improve Quality of Life, and Promote Good Land Use Planning?	Connect People?	Improve Infrastructure Condition?	Ensure Equity?	Increase Safety, Health and Security?	Support economic vitality?	Improve resiliency and reduce stormwater impacts?	Enhance travel and tourism?	In Current TIP?	Air Quality Modeling Status	Air Quality Network Modeling Year	Funding in Previous TIP Years	Funding in Current TIP (FY 2024 - FY 2027)	Total Project Cost (Current Estimate)	Total Project Outstanding Balance (i.e., Total Cost - (Sum of Expended/Obligated Funds from all TIPs)
14.	0020056	Bonds View Road From West Of Stone Creek To State Route 87. Road base improvement and grading, shoulder reconditioning, drainage headwall improvements along a 1.06 mile stretch of Bondsview Road with access to 800 acres of Wildlife refuge land.	Roadway Project	Bibb	3				X					X	X	Yes	Exempt			$ 490,000.00	$490,000.00	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
15.	0019933	I-75 @ Rocky Creek	Bridges	Bibb	1					x						Yes	Exempt			$1,100,000.00	$19,400,000.00	$18,300,000.00
16.	0019934	I-475 SB & NB @ TOBESOFKEE CREEK 3 MI S OF MACON	Bridges	Bibb	1					x						Yes	Exempt			$1,700,000.00	$23,000,000.00	$21,300,000.00
17.	0019935	I-16 EB & WB 2 @ CSX #636057K & BOGGY BRANCH 1.5 MI E OF MACON	Bridges	Bibb	1					x						Yes	Exempt			$1,700,000.00	$29,000,000.00	$27,300,000.00
18.	0019936	I-16 EB & WB @ OCMULGEE RIVER OVERFLOW 2 MI E of MACON	Bridges	Bibb	1					x						Yes	Exempt			$1,700,000.00	$13,000,000.00	$11,300,000.00
19.	0019945	SR 19/SR 87 SB & NB @ WALNUT CREEK	Bridges	Bibb	1					x						Yes	Exempt			$1,300,000.00	$13,600,000.00	$12,300,000.00
20.	0020213	SR 247/US 129 SB & NB @ NS #729382R	Bridges	Bibb	1					x						Yes	Exempt			$2,150,000.00	$22,650,000.00	$20,500,000.00
21.	0020345	I-16 FROM SR 22/BIBB TO SR 96/TWIGGS	Roadway Project	Bibb	3			x		x					x	Yes	Exempt			$435,200.00	$435,200.00	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
22.	0013676	Forest Hill Rd. - Widen from 2 to 3 lanes from Vineville Ave./Forsyth Rd. to Wimbish Rd.	Roadway Project	Bibb	4		X		X	X		X				No	Non-Exempt	2030			$14,114,015.00	$14,114,015.00
23.	311400	I-75 from I-16 to CR 478/Pierce Ave - Phase VI	Roadway Project	Bibb	5	X	X		X	X		X				No	Non-Exempt	2030		$123,986,011.94	$123,986,011.94	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
24.	N/A	7th St. Truck Route - 7th St. @ Walnut & 7th St. @ Eisenhower - Roundabout and Improvements	Roadway Project	Bibb	7	X	X	X		x		X	X		X	No	Non-Exempt	2030			$12,650,000.00	$12,650,000.00
25.	0007029	Columbus Rd (SR 22) - Replace Bridge at Echeconnee Creek	Bridges	Bibb, Crawford	2				X		X					No	Exempt				$774,061.41	$774,061.41
26.	0006659	Peake Rd. bridge replacement - Replace Bridge at Rocky Creek	Bridges	Bibb	5				X	X	X	X	X			No	Exempt				$1,833,329.00	$1,833,329.00
27.	N/A	Safety Improvements Emery Hwy from Spring Street to Irwinton Highway	Safety Project	Bibb	6	X		X	X	X	X	X				No	Exempt				$1,000,000.00	$1,000,000.00
28.	333150	Emery Hwy - Reconstruct Bridge at Walnut Creek	Bridges	Bibb	3					X		X	X			No	Exempt				$5,902,371.00	$5,902,371.00
29.	N/A	Safety Improvements Eisenhower Parkway from Bloomfield Dr to C Street	Safety Project	Bibb	7	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			No	Exempt				$1,000,000.00	$1,000,000.00
30.	N/A	Pierce Ave. (SR 247) - Pedestrian improvements and bike lanes from Vineville Ave. to Riverside Dr.	TE/Bike/Ped	Bibb	5	X		X	X		X	X				No	Exempt				$2,500,000.00	$2,500,000.00
31.	N/A	Safety Improvements Gray Hwy from I-75 to Jones County Line	Safety Project	Bibb	6	X		X	X	X	X	X				No	Exempt				$1,000,000.00	$1,000,000.00

Priority Number	GDOT Project ID#	Description	Project Type	County	Number of LRTP Goals Addressed	Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices for people and freight?	Manage Congestion & System Reliability?	Improve Air Quality, Protect the Environment, Improve Quality of Life, and Promote Good Land Use Planning?	Connect People?	Improve Infrastructure Condition?	Ensure Equity?	Increase Safety, Health and Security?	Support economic vitality?	Improve resiliency and reduce stormwater impacts?	Enhance travel and tourism?	In Current TIP?	Air Quality Modeling Status	Air Quality Network Modeling Year	Funding in Previous TIP Years	Funding in Current TIP (FY 2024 - FY 2027)	Total Project Cost (Current Estimate)	Total Project Outstanding Balance (i.e., Total Cost - (Sum of Expended/Obligated Funds from all TIPs)
32.	351080-	Widen Jeffersonville Road from 2 to 4 thru lanes with a continuous left turn lane from Recreation Rd. to Emery Rd (US 80).	Roadway Project	Bibb	6	X			X	X	X	X	X			No	Non-Exempt	2050			$9,070,702.00	$9,070,702.00
33.	*N/A*	I-75/Riverside Drive Interchange - Signalize interchange. Modify ramps to add turn lanes & storage. Run fiberoptic.	Intersection/ Signal/ Safety	Bibb	2		X					X				No	Exempt				$755,777.00	$755,777.00
34.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive- NB and SB Ramp Intersections (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	Traffic Signals	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Exempt				$200,000.00	$200,000.00
35.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway- NB Ramp Intersection (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	Traffic Signals	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Exempt				$200,000.00	$200,000.00
36.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Pio Nono Avenue NB Ramp Intersection	Traffic Signals	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Exempt				$200,000.00	$200,000.00
37.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Between Bass Road to Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	Auxiliary Lanes	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Non-Exempt	2040			$6,200,000.00	$6,200,000.00
38.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Riverside Drive to Arkwright Road- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	Auxiliary Lanes	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Non-Exempt	2040			$6,800,000.00	$6,800,000.00
39.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Pierce Avenue at intersection with Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	Turn Lanes	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Exempt				$600,000.00	$600,000.00
40.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street- NB off ramp (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	Turn Lanes	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Exempt				$300,000.00	$300,000.00
41.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street to Mercer University Drive- Both Directions (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)	Auxiliary Lanes	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Non-Exempt	2040			$10,700,000.00	$10,700,000.00
42.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive to Eisenhower Parkway- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)	Auxiliary Lanes	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Non-Exempt	2040			$2,600,000.00	$2,600,000.00
43.	N/A	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway to Pio Nono Avenue in Both Directions	Auxiliary Lanes	Bibb	2		X			X						No	Non-Exempt	2040			$8,100,000.00	$8,100,000.00
44.	N/A	Bass Rd. widenting, Phase II - **Providence Blvd.** to Zebulon Rd. widened from 2 to 4 lanes	Roadway Project	Bibb	6	X	X	X		X		X	X			No	Non-Exempt	2040			$21,942,036.00	$21,942,036.00
45.	N/A	Henderson Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 57 to Griswoldville Rd.	Roadway Project	Jones	0											No	Non-Exempt	2050			$11,089,192.00	$11,089,192.00
46.	N/A	Griswoldville Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from Henderson Rd. to SR 49	Roadway Project	Jones	0											No	Non-Exempt	2050			$36,963,568.00	$36,963,568.00
47.	N/A	Joycliff Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 49 to US 129	Roadway Project	Jones	0											No	Non-Exempt	2050			$35,732,383.00	$35,732,383.00

Priority Number	GDOT Project ID#	Description	Project Type	County	Number of LRTP Goals Addressed	Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices for people and freight?	Manage Congestion & System Reliability?	Improve Air Quality, Protect the Environment, Improve Quality of Life, and Promote Good Land Use Planning?	Connect People?	Improve Infrastructure Condition?	Ensure Equity?	Increase Safety, Health and Security?	Support economic vitality?	Improve resiliency and reduce stormwater impacts?	Enhance travel and tourism?	In Current TIP?	Air Quality Modeling Status	Air Quality Network Modeling Year	Funding in Previous TIP Years	Funding in Current TIP (FY 2024 - FY 2027)	Total Project Cost (Current Estimate)	Total Project Outstanding Balance (i.e., Total Cost - (Sum of Expended/Obligated Funds from all TIPs)
48.	N/A	Sardis Church Rd. Extension from SR 247 to Sgoda Rd. - New Road on new location project. Includes study	Roadway Project	Bibb	2	X							X			No	Non-Exempt	2040			$62,409,791.00	$62,409,791.00
49.	N/A	Bolingbroke Bike Loop - Bolingbroke to Estes Rd, to Zebulon Rd., to Bass Rd., to New Forsyth Rd., to Macon-Bibb County Line	TE/Bike/Ped	Bibb, Monroe	4	X		X		X	X					No	Exempt				$946,843.64	$946,843.64
50.	N/A	Central Georgia Rail Trail - Macon to Milledgeville pedestrian/bike trail conversion on abandoned CSX right of way	TE/Bike/Ped	Bibb, Jones	5	X		X	X				X		X	No	Exempt				$7,077,123.90	$7,077,123.90
51.	332450	Widen State Route 49 from Griswoldville Rd. to State Route 18 (Jones Co.)	Roadway Project	Jones	5	X			X	X			X		X	No	Non-Exempt	2050			$60,457,495.21	$60,457,495.21
52.	N/A	Widen New Forsyth Rd from 2 to 4 lanes with turn lanes as needed from Bass Rd. to Riverside Dr., with major intersection reconfiguration with Bass Rd., Wesleyan Dr. and Riverside Dr.	Roadway Project	Bibb	2		X					X				No	Non-Exempt	2040			$7,500,000.00	$7,500,000.00
53.	N/A	Widen Bass Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes from New Forsyth Rd. to Riverside Drive, and Interchange Improvements	Roadway Project	Bibb	6		X	X	X		X		X	X		No	Non-Exempt	2040			$9,525,089.00	$9,525,089.00
54.	N/A	Widen Zebulon Rd. from Lake Wildwood entrance to Lamar Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes. Add turn lanes at Lamar Rd. and Zebulon Rd.	Roadway Project	Bibb	3		X	X				X				No	Non-Exempt	2040			$1,783,137.00	$1,783,137.00
55.	0019107	Truck Parking Expansion - Region 2	Roadway Project	Bibb, Monroe, Dooly	3	X	X						X			No	Exempt		$ 100,000.00		$100,000.00	Fully accounted for in current or previous TIP to reflect total project costs
56.	0020763	Repair/replacement of overpass and transition from Northbound SR 11/SR 49 (Industrial Hwy) to Northbound SR 247 (Hawkinsville Rd.)	Roadway Project	Bibb	2		X			x						Yes	Exempt	2030		$ 500,000.00	$6,250,000.00	$5,750,000.00

Project Balances	**$524,590,982.57**
Total for TIP Obligated Projects	**$193,273,964.68**
Grand Total	**$717,864,947.25**

* Project priority numbers are indicators of relative priority within the MTP Project List. They do not indicate in which specific TIP period GDOT intends to include a specific project.



Priority	Project Description
1	I-75/I-16 Interchange - Phase 4 - Expansion of I-16 eastbound from I-75 to Walnut Creek
2	I-75/I-16 Interchange - Phase 5 - Expansion of I-16 westbound from I-75 to Walnut Creek
3	Tucker Rd. bridge replacement over I-475Tucker Rd. bridge replacement over I-475Tucker Rd. bridge replacement over I-475
4	Bridge Replacement - Replace Bridge on I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Walnut Creek 1 Mile East of Macon
5	Bass Road widening, Phase 1 Providence Blvd to New Forsyth Rd (widening from 2 to 4 lanes)
6	Bass Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.Bass Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.
7	I-16 bridge replacements over Norfolk Southern railroadI-16 bridge replacements over Norfolk Southern railroad
8	Bridge Replacement--Dames Ferry Rd. (aka SR 18) at Ocmulgee River.Bridge Replacement--Dames Ferry Rd. (aka SR 18) at Ocmulgee River.
9	Bridge Replacement--Hawkinsville Rd. from Bibb County/Houston County border to Feagin Rd. (Northbound lanes), at 3 locations
10	Bridge Replacement--Gray Highway (aka US 129) Northbound & Southbound over Rock Creek
11	Bridge Replacement--Gray Hwy (aka US Hwy 129) over Sand CreekBridge Replacement--Gray Hwy (aka US Hwy 129) over Sand Creek
12	Hawkinsville Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.Hawkinsville Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.
13	Forest Hill Rd. - Widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Vineville Ave./Forsyth Rd. to Wimbish Rd.
14	I-75/I-16 Interchange - Phase 6 - Expansion of I-75 from I-16 to Pierce Ave.
15	7th St. Truck Route - 7th St. @ Walnut & 7th St. @ Eisenhower - Roundabout and Improvements
16	Eisenhower Pkwy bridge replacement at Echeconee Creek (Crawford Co. line)
17	Peake Rd. bridge replacement at Rocky Creek near Stratford AcademyPeake Rd. bridge replacement at Rocky Creek near Stratford Academy
18	Safety Improvements Emery Hwy from Spring Street to Irwinton Highway
19	Emery Hwy bridge replacement at Walnut CreekEmery Hwy bridge replacement at Walnut Creek
20	Safety Improvements Eisenhower Parkway from Bloomfield Dr to C Street
21	Pierce Ave pedestrian and bicycle improvements from Ingleside Ave. to Riverside Dr.
22	Safety Improvements Gray Hwy from I-75 to Jones County LineSafety Improvements Gray Hwy from I-75 to Jones County Line
23	Jeffersonville Rd. widening - Norfolk Southern bridge replacementJeffersonville Rd. widening - Norfolk Southern bridge replacement
24	I-75/Riverside Drive Interchange - Signalize interchange. Modify ramps to add turn lanes & storage. Run fiberoptic.

25	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive- Northbound and Southbound ramp intersection signalization and improvement (as a result of failing 201
26	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway- Northbound ramp intersection signalization and improvement (as a result of failing 2040 Level of Service)
27	I-75 Corridor: Pio Nono Avenue-Northbound ramp intersection signalization and improvement
28	I-75 Corridor: Riverside Drive to Arkwright Road- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 Level of Service)
29	I-75 Corridor: Between Bass Road to Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2040 Level of Service)
30	I-75 Corridor: Pierce Avenue at intersection with Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 Level of Service)
31	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street- Northbound off ramp (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 Level of Service)
32	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street to Mercer University Drive- Both Directions (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)
33	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive to Eisenhower Parkway- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)
34	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway to Pio Nono Avenue in Both Directions
35	Bass Rd. widenting, Phase II - Providence Blvd. to Zebulon Rd. widened from 2 to 4 lanes
36	Henderson Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 57 to Griswoldville Rd.Henderson Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 57 to Griswoldville Rd.
37	Griswoldville Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from Henderson Rd. to SR 49Griswoldville Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from Henderson Rd. to SR 49
38	Joycliff Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 49 to US 129Joycliff Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 49 to US 129
39	Sardis Church Rd. Extension from SR 247 to Sgoda Rd. - New Road on new location project. Includes study
40	Bolingbroke Bike Loop - Bolingbroke to Estes Rd, to Zebulon Rd., to Bass Rd., to New Forsyth Rd., to Macon-Bibb County Line
41	Proposed pedestrian/bike trail from macon-Bibb County to Milledgeville (Jones County).
42	Gray Hwy (aka State Route 49) widening from Griswoldville Rd. to State Route 18 (Jones Co.)
43	Widen New Forsyth Rd from 2 to 4 lanes with turn lanes as needed from Bass Rd. to Riverside Dr., with major intersection reconfiguration with
44	Widen Bass Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes from New Forsyth Rd. to Riverside Drive, and Interchange Improvements
45	Zebulon Rd. - Widen Zebulon Rd. from Lake Wildwood entrance to Lamar Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes. Add turn lanes at Lamar Rd. and Zebulon Rd.

Figure 6-7 Road and Bridges Projects Throughout MATS Area

Costs and Revenue Estimation

Costs

The total cost of all obligated road and bridge projects listed in Table 6-2 above is estimated at $717,864,947.25 (as of November 5, 2025). This value is based on the most current project cost estimates from GDOT and Macon-Bibb County Engineering Department. It includes an assumption of 2% increase in non-obligated project costs each year over the entire planning and construction duration of the project. This assumption is an average, based on GDOT's historic project management experience with road and bridge projects. While in any specific year this 2% assumption may be high or low, the expectation is that over the operational life of this MTP, individual years will balance out around a 2% inflation rate. This assumption is a continuation of the project cost inflation assumptions applied in the 2050 MTP.

Of the $717,864,947.25, the amount already obligated to these projects (as of November 5) is $193,273,964.68. Reducing the total project costs by these expended or obligated amount leaves a net outstanding cost of $524,590,982.57.

Revenues

Revenues for road and bridge projects were estimated using historic funding patterns. On June 21, 2021, GDOT Office of Planning provided MATS with estimates of revenues available for both new highway capital improvements (roads, bridges and bike/ped improvements) and highway maintenance expenditures, from 2015 through 2050. These estimates were further broken out by Federal, State, and Local funding sources. This table was adjusted to reflect only those revenues anticipated from FY 2024 through FY 2050, since the fiscal years prior to FY 2024 have already been closed out, and therefore should not be included in future year revenue projections. Table 6-3 below shows the anticipated revenues on a year by year basis for New Road & Bridge Projects and Maintenance Projects.

Table 6-3: Anticipated Revenues for New Road & Bridge Projects, and for Maintenance: FY 2024 - 2050

	Annual Estimate of Funding Available for New Road & Bridge Projects			***Maintenance Estimate***			***Total Estimate***
	Project Cost Total	***Federal Share***	***State & Local Share***	***Project Cost Total***	***Federal Share***	***State & Local Share***	
2021	$236,671,629	$189,337,303	$47,334,326	$4,994,003	$3,995,202	$998,801	***$241,665,631***
2022	$18,336,085	$14,668,868	$3,667,217	$4,524,994	$3,619,996	$904,999	***$22,861,079***
2023	$44,226,028	$35,380,823	$8,845,206	$4,615,494	$3,692,395	$923,099	***$48,841,523***
2024[a,b]	$30,285,127	$24,326,102	$5,959,025	$4,707,804	$3,766,243	$941,561	***$34,992,931***
2025[c]	$20,625,451	$16,500,361	$4,125,090	$4,801,960	$3,841,568	$960,392	***$25,427,411***
2026[d]	$143,162,472	$30,445,177	$112,717,294	$4,897,999	$3,918,400	$979,600	*$148,060,471*
2027[c]	$20,309,989	$16,247,991	$4,061,998	$4,995,959	$3,996,768	$999,192	**$25,305,948**
2028	$19,951,189	$15,960,951	$3,990,238	$5,095,879	$4,076,703	$1,019,176	***$25,047,067***
2029[a]	$110,850,213	$88,680,170	$22,170,043	$5,197,796	$4,158,237	$1,039,559	***$116,048,009***
2030[c]	$41,257,217	$33,005,773	$8,251,443	$5,301,752	$4,241,402	$1,060,350	***$46,558,969***
2031	$21,172,361	$16,937,889	$4,234,472	$5,407,787	$4,326,230	$1,081,557	***$26,580,148***
2032	$21,595,808	$17,276,647	$4,319,162	$5,515,943	$4,412,754	$1,103,189	***$27,111,751***
2033	$22,027,725	$17,622,180	$4,405,545	$5,626,262	$4,501,009	$1,125,252	***$27,653,986***

Table 6-3 (Cont): Anticipated Revenues for New Road & Bridge Projects, and for Maintenance: FY 2021 - 2050

2034	$22,468,279	$17,974,623	$4,493,656	$5,738,787	$4,591,030	$1,147,757	***$28,207,066***
2035	$22,917,645	$18,334,116	$4,583,529	$5,853,563	$4,682,850	$1,170,713	***$28,771,207***
2036	$23,375,998	$18,700,798	$4,675,200	$5,970,634	$4,776,507	$1,194,127	***$29,346,632***
2037	$23,843,517	$19,074,814	$4,768,703	$6,090,047	$4,872,037	$1,218,009	***$29,933,564***
2038	$24,320,388	$19,456,310	$4,864,078	$6,211,848	$4,969,478	$1,242,370	***$30,532,235***
2039	$24,806,796	$19,845,436	$4,961,359	$6,336,085	$5,068,868	$1,267,217	***$31,142,880***
2040	$25,302,932	$20,242,345	$5,060,586	$6,462,806	$5,170,245	$1,292,561	***$31,765,738***
2041	$25,808,990	$20,647,192	$5,161,798	$6,592,062	$5,273,650	$1,318,412	***$32,401,053***
2042	$26,325,170	$21,060,136	$5,265,034	$6,723,904	$5,379,123	$1,344,781	***$33,049,074***
2043	$26,851,673	$21,481,339	$5,370,335	$6,858,382	$5,486,705	$1,371,676	***$33,710,055***
2044	$27,388,707	$21,910,965	$5,477,741	$6,995,549	$5,596,439	$1,399,110	***$34,384,256***
2045	$27,936,481	$22,349,185	$5,587,296	$7,135,460	$5,708,368	$1,427,092	***$35,071,941***
2046	$28,495,211	$22,796,168	$5,699,042	$7,278,170	$5,822,536	$1,455,634	***$35,773,380***
2047	$29,065,115	$23,252,092	$5,813,023	$7,423,733	$5,938,986	$1,484,747	***$36,488,848***
2048	$29,646,417	$23,717,134	$5,929,283	$7,572,208	$6,057,766	$1,514,442	***$37,218,625***
2049	$30,239,345	$24,191,476	$6,047,869	$7,723,652	$6,178,921	$1,544,730	***$37,962,997***
2050	$30,844,132	$24,675,306	$6,168,826	$7,878,125	$6,302,500	$1,575,625	***$38,722,257***
Grand Total	***$900,884,546***	***$636,720,837***	***$264,163,709***	***$166,394,155***	***$133,115,324***	***$33,278,831***	***$1,067,278,701***
a. *On 5/1/2024, fiscal years 2024 and 2029 had their estimates increased by $11,363,312.74 and $90,500,000, respectively, to accommodate the cost increases associated with revised cost estimates for GDOT PI #0013712, and the amendment of GDOT PI #0019933, 0019934, #0019935, #0019936, #0019945 and #0020056.*							
b. *The Federal and State & Local portion of the FY 2024 line have been adjusted to reflect the fact that GDOT PI #0020056 is 100% under the Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) grant*							
c *On 8/7/2024, fiscal years 2025, 2027 and 2030 had their estimates increased by $1,825,000, $750,000 and $20,500,000, respectively, to accommodate the cost increases associated with cost estimates for amendments GDOT PI #0020213 and GDOT PI #20345, as per e-mail of 5/23/2024 from GDOT Office of Planning.*							
d *On 5/7/2025, fiscal year 2026 estimates were increased by $123,986,011.94 (+$15,104,009.55 Federal; +$108,882,002.39 State), to accommodate the cost increases associated with cost estimates for amendments GDOT PI #311400, as per e-mail of 3/5/2024 from GDOT Office of Planning.*							

Summing the inflation adjusted values for the Federal, State and Local categories from FY 2024 through FY 2050, the total estimated revenue available for New Road and Bridge Projects is ***$900,884,546*** (see notes a through d in Table 6-3 for specific adjustments). Assuming the standard 80%/20% cost sharing arrangement between Federal, State and Local partners (see full discussion, next section), this value breaks out to **$636,720,837** in anticipated Federal funds**,** and **$264,163,709** in State and Local cost share. For Highway Maintenance Projects, the corresponding total is $**166,394,155** (**$133,115,324** Federal funds; **$33,278,831** State & Local funding).

Statement of Fiscal Balancing

Pursuant to the requirements in 23 CFR §450.324(f)(11)(i-viii), this section demonstrates that the projects listed in this chapter are compliant with Federal requirements for being fiscally constrained. Comparing the net revenue and net cost estimates, the Roads and Bridges project list has an anticipated surplus of **$117,224,670.16** for Highway Capital projects, and **$154,902,999.37** remaining for Highway Maintenance projects, over the operating life of the

2050 MTP. Table 6-4 lays out the calculations, based on the most recent project cost estimates in each category.

These surpluses are the totals across all Federal, State and Local funding sources. How much of that surplus accrues to each level of government is, in part, dependent on the specific funding sources used to pay for the individual projects. Normal cost sharing arrangements for federally supported transportation projects involve the federal government paying up to 80% of the total project cost, with the remaining 20% (commonly known as "match") being the responsibility of the State and Local participants (23 US Code §120(b): https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/docs/title23usc.pdf)

Table 6-4: Demonstration of Fiscal Balancing for Roads & Bridges Projects

Highway Capital Projects Revenue Estimates

	Summed Estimates @ 2% Inflation
Federal	$ 636,720,837.19
State & Local Match	$ 264,163,709.30
Total Estimated Revenues	**$ 900,884,546.49**
TIP Project Adjustments (as of 11/5/2025)	$ 193,273,964.68
Net Highway Capital Revenues Available	**$ 707,610,581.81**
Outstanding Road & Bridge Projects in MTP	**$ 524,590,982.57**
Capital Surplus (deficit) *New Estimate (11/5/2025)*	**$ 183,019,599.24**

Highway Maintenance Revenue Estimates

	Summed Estimates @ 2% Inflation
Federal	$ 133,115,323.62
State & Local Match	$ 33,278,830.91
Total Estimated Revenues	**$ 166,394,154.53**
FY 24-27 TIP Project Adjustments (as of 3/18/2024)	$ 11,491,155.16
Net Highway Capital Revenues Available	**$ 154,902,999.37**
Outstanding Road & Bridge Projects in LRTP	**$ -**
Maintenance Surplus (deficit) *New Estimate (as of 9/9/2021)*	**$ 154,902,999.37**

In addition to the recognized Federal revenue sources, since 2015 there have been significant updates to how the State and Local portion are being generated.

Georgia Transportation Funding Act Of 2015

On May 4, 2015, the Governor signed the Georgia Transportation Funding Act of 2015 (GTFA 2015: http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/en-US/display/20152016/HB/170). This act provides for a variety of State funding sources (i.e., vehicle registration fees, hotel/motel occupancy taxes, a 1% sales tax on retail motor fuels up to $3.00 per gallon) which are to be dedicated to funding transportation projects. Since passage of this act, the practical effect has been for GDOT to identify certain transportation projects of statewide significance, which are then fully funded in their 20% match requirement by supplemental state funding. The result is that federally sponsored road and bridge projects which are matched with GTFA 2015 funds require significantly lower budget contributions from the local jurisdictions where the projects are located. In many cases, the local funding component is completely eliminated.

Local Revenue Options

Just as GTFA 2015 provides a mechanism for the State to assume the full match burden of road and bridge projects, there are policies in place by which Local partners can either assume the 20% match portion, or even fully assume the entire cost of the project (which would effectively remove the project from the MTP project list).

Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax

The Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) is a mechanism under Georgia state law (Title 48, Ch. 8, Article 3, Part 1: **http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/gacode/**), whereby voters within a county can, within certain limits, assign a self-imposed 1% sales tax for the purpose of funding for a variety of capital improvement projects. Originally passed in 1985, the legislation has undergone several legislative updates. The most recent SPLOST in the MATS region passed in the Macon-Bibb County consolidated government on November 8, 2016, authorizing $35,000,000 for various transportation projects throughout the Macon-Bibb area. To the extent that projects are on the road and bridges projects list for this 2050 MTP Update, these projects can have their match paid for through SPLOST funds, either in part or all the way up to the full 20% match requirement. Alternatively, if the MATS Policy Committee were to decide to accelerate a project faster than GDOT's timetable, they could use SPLOST funds to remove it from the MTP project list entirely. This strategy would allow the jurisdiction sponsoring the project to proceed at their own pace, but it would also forego any opportunity for State or Federal support for the project.

Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank

Another local funding option is the Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank (GTIB). GTIB was established to provide a revolving loan fund (and in some cases, grant funding) for qualified eligible infrastructure projects, including mass transit and bicycle infrastructure (Title 32, Ch. 10, Article 2)[2]. Because the GTIB program allows local units of government to borrow for project costs over the design life of a project, the effect of the GTIB program is to reduce the immediate budget impacts of coming up with the local match for large infrastructure and facilities projects. For example, if GTIB financing were used to meet local match requirements for a 5-year construction project for a bridge with a 30-year design life, the local jurisdiction could issue

[2] The full list of what is defined as an "eligible project" can be found in Title 32, Ch. 10, Article 2, Part 3, Sec. 122 of the 2016 GA State Code. See http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/gacode/ for specific definitions.

a bond to meet the match requirements and pay it back over a period no longer than 30 years. This has a less intense fiscal impact on the local government than financing the match requirement in each of the 5 budget years over which the bridge is being constructed.

SPLOST and GTIB are not mutually exclusive. A local jurisdiction could elect to use either, both or neither of these funding sources to address local match requirements for transportation projects.

Projects for Future Consideration and the MTP Amendment Process

Projects for Future Consideration

In addition to the projects in Table 6-2, several supplemental projects were identified through the public involvement and MATS committee processes. Table 6-5 below identifies these projects using the same evaluation criteria as was used in Table 6-2.

Unlike Table 6-2, the projects in Table 6-5 are not listed in any particular priority order. Many of these are new projects for consideration, and as of yet have not had any programmatic or fiscal evaluation. Any project costs associated with these projects are considered advisory, and subject to change.

Unprioritized **Project Number**	**GDOT Project ID#**	**Description**	**Project Type**	**County**	**Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices for people and freight?**	**Manage Congestion & System Reliability?**	**Improve Air Quality, Protect the Environment, Improve Quality of Life, and Promote Good Land Use Planning?**	**Connect People?**	**Improve Infrastructure Condition?**	**Ensure Equity?**	**Increase Safety, Health and Security?**	**Support economic vitality?**	**Improve resiliency and reduce stormwater impacts?**	**Enhance travel and tourism?**	***Proposed*** **Network Year**	**In MTP?**	**In Current TIP?**	**Anticipated Budget**
1.	N/A	*Lane reiorientation on US 41/Pio Nono Ave. between Mercer Univ. Dr.and Anthony Rd. Add dedicated center left turn lane, crosswalk across Pio Nono, sidewalks on both sides*	*Roadway Project*	*Bibb*		X		X	X	X	X				*2030*	*No*	*No*	***New Project***
2.	*N/A*	*Lane reiorientation on US 41/Pio Nono Ave. from Rolf Ave. to Hillcrest Ave. Add dedicated center left turn lane*	*Roadway Project*	*Bibb*		X				X	X				*2030*	*No*	*No*	***New Project***
3.	*N/A*	*Improvements at US 80/Eisenhower Pkwy and US 41/GA 247/Pio Nono Ave. Road maintenance and restriping, crosswalk improvements, improved transit access points, improve dedicated left turn lanes from US 80 eastbound to GA 247 northbound*	*Roadway Project*	*Bibb*	X	X			X	X		X			*2030*	*No*	*No*	***New Project***
4.	*N/A*	*Resurfacing of US 41/Pio Nono Ave. from I-75 to Hawkinsville Rd.*	*Resurfacing/ Maintenance*	*Bibb*		X			X						*2030*	*No*	*No*	***New Project***
5.	*N/A*	*Extension of 2nd St. pedestrian improvements from Ash St./new bridge alignment down to Eisenhower Blvd. Possible new roundabout at intersection of 2nd St./Bowden St./Grants Chapel Alley.*	*TE/Bike/Ped*	*Bibb*	X	X				X	X				*2030*	*No*	*No*	***New Project***
6.	*N/A*	*Add sidewalks along Napier Ave. from Park St. to Forsyth Ave.*	*TE/Bike/Ped*	*Bibb*	X		X			X	X				*2030*	*No*	*No*	***New Project***
7.	*N/A*	*Replace existing crosswalk signals with new signals incorporating countdown clocks*	*TE/Bike/Ped*	*Bibb*	X	X			X	X	X				*2030*	*No*	*No*	***New Project***
8.	0006689	Houston Rd. - Widen from 2 to 4 lanes from north of Sardis Church Rd. Extension (approx. South Walden Rd.) to existing Sardis Church Rd./North Walden Rd.	Roadway Project	Bibb	X	X		X				X			2040	Yes	No	**$8,390,118.16**
9.	331750	Houston Rd. - Standardize lanes from south of Sardis Church Rd. extension (South Walden Rd.) to US 41 in Houston County	Roadway Project	Bibb, Houston	X	X		X				X			2040	Yes	No	**$453,630.00**
10.	Local	Tucker Rd. (Phase 2) - Resurfacing, striping, standardization, turn lanes, multi-use path from Foster to Idlewood. Phase I from Idlewood to Forsyth is complete	Roadway Project	Bibb	X	X			X		X				2040	Yes	No	**$1,320,171.00**
11.	N/A	Widen Forest Hill Rd. from Hall to Northside Dr.	Roadway Project	Bibb	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		2040		No	**New Project**

Table 6-5: Projects Identified for Further Study and Future Consideration

MTP Amendments

From time to time it will be necessary to modify the financially constrained project list to reflect updated project costs, changes in project timetables, or add and remove projects from consideration. These actions require formal amendments to the MTP and possibly the TIP. Both the MTP and TIP can be amended at any time, in accordance with the procedures specified in the MATS Public Participation Plan. The process for amending the MTP project list involves the following steps:

1. Updating and/or creating new project sheets for the current TIP, to reflect changes in any projects currently underway;
2. Updating the project tables in the relevant MTP chapters, to reflect the new projects and associated cost changes;
3. Updating the fiscal analysis in this MTP chapter to continue demonstrating fiscal constraint (i.e., that revenues are sufficient to cover anticipated costs), even with the proposed amendments
4. Soliciting public input in accordance with the approved MATS Public Participation Plan (last updated 11/4/2020, which involves;
    1. Completing a 15 day public review period with drafts of the proposed amended MTP project list and (if necessary) TIP, available for download from the MATS website
    2. Soliciting comments and recommendations from the MATS Citizen Advisory Committee and MATS Technical Coordinating Committee
5. After close of public comment period, formal adoption of the amended MTP project list and (if necessary) TIP by the MATS Policy Committee.

In accordance with these procedures, the following project list amendments have been made to the MTP Roads and Bridges Projects List:

Amendment #1 (6/9/2022) – On March 24, 2022, Georgia Dept. of Transportation requested the following amendments to the MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges Project List, so that it might also be included as a new project in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP:

- GDOT Project #0019107 (Truck Parking Expansion – Region 2)

The project has been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2) as Priority #46, in the amount of $100,000. The MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), and Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined this project is “Exempt” from air quality analysis for Ozone.

Amendment #2 (6/9/2022) – On March 31, 2022, Georgia Dept. of Transportation requested the following amendments be applied to the revenue projections for the MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges chapter, as a result of State of Georgia allocations under the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act of 2021 (See Chapter 12 – Plan Considerations for additional details)

- $620,000 in Carbon Reduction Program funding
- $26,055,622 in PROTECT Grant program funding

Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined this amendment is “Exempt” from air quality analysis for Ozone.

Amendment #3 (5/1/2024) – On September 28, 2023, in consultation with, and at the direction of, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), the MATS MPO adopted a new FY 2024 – 2027 TIP. Pursuant to fulfilling the requirements of 23 CFR 450.326(i) and 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), this change in TIP necessarily required an update to the MATS 2050 MTP Roads & Bridges chapter, including a re-demonstration of fiscal rebalancing, to continue the ability to amend the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP.
Tables 6-2, 6-3 and 6-4 above have been updated as of this date to incorporate the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, including updated project prioritization and demonstration of continued fiscal constraint (limiting the analysis to the years FY 2024 through FY 2027). As described in Table 6-3, GDOT Office of Planning confirmed updates to the FY 2024 and FY 2029 fiscal year anticipated revenues to cover the projects listed in Amendment #5 (see below).

Amendment #4 (5/1/2024) – January 31, 2024, the Macon-Bibb County Department of Engineering requested of MATS staff that the following project be amended into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP:

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #0020056	Bondsview Rd. from West of Stone Creek to SR 87. Road base improvement and grading, shoulder reconditioning, drainage headwall improvements along a 1.06 mile stretch of Bondsview Road with access to 800 acres of Wildlife refuge land.	Roadway Project	$490,000

Pursuant to 23 CFR 450.326 (i), the MATS 2050 MTP must first be updated to reflect the project This project has been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2) as Priority #14. The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Table 6-3 and 6-4 described in Amendment #3. Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined this project is "Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details)

Amendment #5 (5/1/2024) – On March 13, 2024, the Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning requested that the following projects be amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, as part of incorporating them into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP (adopted previously on September 28, 2023):

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #0019933	I-75 @ Rocky Creek	Bridge Replacement	$19,400,000
GDOT PI #0019934	I-475 Southbound & Northbound @ Tobesofkee Creek 3 Miles South of Macon	Bridge Replacement	$23,000,000

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #0019935	I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ CSX #636057K & Boggy Branch, 1.5 miles East of Macon	Bridge Replacement	$29,000,000
GDOT PI #0019936	I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow	Bridge Replacement	$13,000,000
GDOT PI #0019945	SR 19/SR 87 Southbound & Northbound @ Walnut Creek	Bridge Replacement	$13,600,000

These projects have been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2) as Priority #15 through #19. The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Table 6-3 and 6-4 described in Amendment #3. Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined these projects are "Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details)

Amendment #6 (8/7/2024) – On May 10, 2024, the Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning requested that the following projects be amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, as part of incorporating them into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP (adopted previously on September 28, 2023):

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #0020213	SR 247/US 129 SB & NB @ NS #729382R	Bridge Replacement	$22,650,000
GDOT PI #0020345	I-16 From SR 22/Bibb To SR 96/Twiggs	Roadway Project	$425,000

These projects have been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2) as Priority #20 and #21. The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Table 6-3 and 6-4 described in Amendment #3. Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined these projects are "Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details)

Amendment #7 (5/7/2025) – On January 9, 2025, the Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning requested that the following projects be amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, as part of incorporating them into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP (adopted previously on September 28, 2023, and subsequently amended):

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #311400	I-75 from I-16 to CR478/Pierce Ave. – Phase VI	Roadway Project	$123,986,011.94

This project is already included on the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2; Priority #23). The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Table 6-3 and 6-4 described in Amendment #3. Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined this project is "Non-Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details). However, this project was included in the latest model run (completed 26 April 2016) for compliance with the relevant NAAQS for Ozone. That model was determined to be conforming to standards. Pursuant to guidance from FHWA and EPA after *South Coast II* court decision (882 F.3d 1138), no new air quality modeling is required.

Amendment #8 (11/5/2025) – On March 24, 2025, the Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning requested that the following projects be amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, as part of incorporating them into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP (adopted previously on September 28, 2023, and subsequently amended):

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #0020763	Repair/replacement of overpass and transition from Northbound SR 11/SR 49 (Industrial Hwy) to Northbound SR 247 (Hawkinsville Rd.)	Roadway Project	$6,250,000.00

This project has been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2; Priority #56). The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Table 6-3 and 6-4 described in Amendment #3. Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined this project is "Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details).

Chapter 7 | Public Transportation

Introduction

This section of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2050 MTP Update provides an overview of the current transit system and ADA service in the MATS area, and any improvements planned in the next six fiscal years (i.e., FY 2018 through FY 2023, inclusive).

Background

The providers of public transit service for the MATS area include Jones County Transit (JCT) and the Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA). Currently, Monroe County does not have any form of public transit option anywhere within their jurisdiction.

Jones County

Jones County Transit system was originally commissioned in 1997. Due to the size, demographic composition and geographic distribution of the population of Jones County, JCT operates as a Coordinated Transportation System, which "combines all relevant personal transit needs in the County under a single provider who has direct control."[1] The JCT coordinates with the Georgia Dept. of Human Services (DHS), and the Georgia Dept. of Transportation Section 5311 (GDOT 5311) program to conduct their Coordinated Transportation System program.[2]

Macon-Bibb County

Originally a privately owned concern, the City of Macon purchased their transit system from the private operator in 1973; MTA as an agency was formed in 1980 by an act of the Georgia legislature. MTA was first funded by local sources but finally applied for federal funding assistance in FY 2000. Currently, funding for the MTA system is provided by federal, state and local sources as well as system revenues.

Description of Service

Jones County

JCT operates on a reservation basis, Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The system is run under sub-contracts with Macon-Bibb County Equal Opportunity Council, Inc., administered by the Middle Georgia Regional Commission (for those trips associated with DHS supported activities), and with Middle Georgia Community Action Agency (MGCAA: for trips associated with the GDOT 5311 program).

For trips associated with GDOT 5311 activities, MGCAA charges the rider $2.00 per round trip, plus $0.50 per stop, up to a maximum of $4.00 per day, for trips within Jones County. For trips that cross the Jones County boundary, the rider pays $4.00 per round trip plus $0.50 per stop, up to a maximum of $6.00 per day. No discounts or coupons are available.

For trips associated with DHS supported activities, there is no charge to the passenger. Trips associated with DHS activities cover a variety of different programs, with different categories of eligibility. The categories for eligible trips are as follows:

- Division of Aging Services (DAS)
  - Trips to and from senior centers
  - Trips to and from medical appointments
  - Trips for shopping
  - Trips to and from work/employment
  - Field trips
  - Trips to pay bills
- Division of Family and Children Services (DFCS)
  - Trips in support of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) recipients (employment, job training, job search, etc.)
  - Trips to and from technical schools and adult education classes
  - Trips to and from work experience sites for food stamp recipients
  - Trips to and from medical appointments
  - Trips to and from mental health centers
  - Other non-TANF trips
  - Trips to and from substance abuse treatment
  - Trips for social services
  - Miscellaneous trips
- Division of Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities (DBHDD)
  - Trips to and from employment locations
  - Trips to and from day centers
  - Trips to and from mental health appointments
  - Trips to and from community training and integration activities
  - Trips to and from job training
  - Trips to and from medical appointments
  - Trips for social services
  - Miscellaneous trips
- Division of Public Health (DPH)
  - Trips for immunizations
  - Trips to and from the public health clinic, and to and from stores
  - Trips for prenatal visits to clinics and other prenatal appointments
  - Trips to scheduled medical appointments
- Department of Labor Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program (DOL/VRS)
  - Trips to and from school
  - Trips to and from employment
  - Trips for job search and job placement
  - Trips to and from job training
  - Trips to and from workshops and assessment sites

Macon-Bibb

Currently, MTA operates twelve fixed bus routes in Bibb County. The service hours for the bus routes are currently from 5:25 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday – Friday but on Saturdays, the hours are

from 5:25 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. The main transfer station for the transit system is presently located at 200 Cherry St., Macon GA (i.e., Terminal Station). This facility was originally constructed in 1916 as a hub for all 15 railroads (regional and national) operating in the Macon area. The station ceased rail operations in 1975 and was sold to private interests. It was finally purchased by City of Macon in 2002 through a TEA grant and converted into a mixed-use office, retail and multi-modal transportation center. In 2008, MTA moved their main office from the Riverside Drive garage location to the Terminal Station, and it is anticipated to be used as an intermodal regional commuter rail facility again in the future.

The regular fare for the MTA system is:

- $1.25 for a one-way triptransfers for $0.50
- Senior Citizens (age 62+): $0.60
- Children and Under (with an adult) – Free
- Students Age 13 – 18: $0.75

The Transit Authority sells various types of bulk passes at the Terminal Station for discounted and/or unlimited rides on the fixed route system (https://www.mta-mac.com/how-to-ride/fares/). There are also ticket vending machines available at the transfer station.

MTA also offers paratransit service, provided on demand with 24-hour prior notice via telephone appointment. Riders are charged $2.50 one-way, $5.00 round trip, with similar bulk passes available at discounted rates (**http://www.mta-mac.com/paratransit.html**)

A general description of each MTA route is provided below. The maps on the following pages show each route individually, and the full system operated by the Macon Transit Authority. All fixed routes for transit riders operated by MTA originate from Terminal Station.



Figure 7-1: MTA Route 1 - Vineville Route/Zebulon Rd.

This route connects Northwest Bibb County, as well as the suburbs along Vineville Ave., to the Macon downtown. The route includes Washington Ave., Hardeman Ave., Vineville Ave./Forsyth Rd. (aka U.S. Hwy 41 and/or GA State Route 19), Zebulon Rd. and Plantation Dr. This route includes service to Piedmont Northside Hospital, Wesleyan College, and the shopping center on Zebulon Rd.. MTA operates one bus for this route, running Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:05 p.m., and on Saturday from 5:25 a.m. to 1:35 p.m.



Figure 7-2a: MTA Route 2 - Bellevue-Log Cabin Route

Like Route 1, this route connects Northwest Bibb County to the Macon Downtown, but deviates off of Vineville Ave./Forsyth Rd. Instead of serving the residents along Vineville Ave, this route serves the residents along Log Cabin Rd., Napier Ave., Forsyth Rd. and Hollingsworth Rd. This route runs Monday through Friday, 5:45 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Saturday 5:25 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. MTA operates two vehicles along this route on weekdays from 5:25 a.m. to 11:05 a.m., and one vehicle at all other times.

Figure 7-2b: MTA Route 2 – Bellevue vs. Bellevue Express Route

As shown in Figure 7-2b, the Bellevue route turns North from Napier Ave. onto Log Cabin Way, then West onto Hillcrest Rd. From Hillcrest Rd. the route joins Log Cabin Dr., traveling Southwest through the Log Cabin Dr./Napier Ave. intersection, then Northeast onto Hollingsworth Rd. at the Log Cabin Dr./Hollingsworth Rd. intersection, then East on Mumford Rd. at Hollingsworth Rd./Mumford Rd. intersection, and then rejoins Napier Ave. at the Mumford Rd./Napier Ave. intersection.
In contrast, the Bellevue Express route continues directly along Napier Ave. at the Hillcrest Rd. intersection, avoiding all subsequent route diversions. The Bellevue Express Route rejoins the regular Bellevue Route at the Mumford Ave./Napier Ave. intersection. MTA operates one vehicles along the Bellevue Express route on weekdays from 5:45 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and on Saturdays from 5:45 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. The schedule for the Bellevue Express is offset so as minimize service overlap with the normal Bellevue Route.



Figure 7-3: MTA Route 3 - West Macon – Macon Mall

This route serves the areas along Montpelier Ave., Columbus Road, Jackson St., Ash St. and Mercer University Drive. Stops along this route include service to the Elam Alexander II Elementary School, Mercer University, Anthony Homes public housing complex, the Macon Mall, the Georgia Dept. of Labor, and the Veteran's Administration Clinic. This route runs Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Saturday 5:25 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. MTA operates two vehicles along this route on weekdays, and one vehicle on Saturdays.



Figure 7-4: MTA Route 4 - North Highlands

Service is provided to various sites on Gray and Emery Hwy. including Baconsfield Shopping Center, the Macon-Bibb County Health Department, and the Georgia Dept. of Community Supervision day reporting field office. This route runs Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Saturday 5:25 a.m. to 6:50 p.m. MTA operates two vehicles along this route on weekdays, and one vehicle on Saturdays.



Figure 7-5: MTA Route 5 – Ocmulgee – Tom Hill and Ocmulgee Express

This bus operates along Riverside Dr., Pierce Ave., Ingleside Ave., and Northside Drive. The Ocmulgee – Tom Hill route runs to the Kroger Shopping Center on Tom Hill Sr. Blvd, by way of Ingleside Dr. and Pierce Ave.. In contrast, the Ocmulgee Express route avoids Ingleside Dr., continues North on Riverside Dr. up to Bass Rd and the Shops at River Crossing Shopping Center, and returns down Riverside Dr.

The Ocmulgee – Tom Hill route runs Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Saturday 5:25 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. MTA operates one vehicle along this route on weekdays, and one vehicle on Saturdays. Along the Ocmulgee Express Route, MTA operates one vehicle on weekdays from 5:45 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and on Saturdays from 5:45 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. The schedule for the Ocmulgee Express is offset so as to minimize service overlap with the normal Ocmulgee – Tom Hill Route.



Figure 7-6: MTA Route 6 - Westgate/Bloomfield

This route consists of Eisenhower Pkwy., Pio Nono Ave., Bloomfield Rd., and Rocky Creek Road. The route serves the Murphey Homes public housing complex, the Rocky Creek Shopping Center, Bloomfield Park, and the Bloomfield and Barden Elementary Schools. MTA operates only one bus along the route, which runs Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Saturday 5:45 a.m. to 6:40 p.m.



Figure 7-7: MTA Route 7 - Macon Mall/Chambers Road

This route offers service to Macon Mall, Eisenhower Crossing Shopping Center, Central Georgia Technical College, and Middle GA State University. Stops served along the route include the Atrium/Navicent Health Medical Center, the Felton Homes and Anthony Homes public housing complexes, Mercer University, the Frank Johnson Recreational Center, and the Goodwill/Amerson Center. The main components of this route consist of Telfair St., Pio Nono Ave., Ivey Rd., and Eisenhower Pkwy/U.S. Hwy 80. This route runs Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.. MTA operates three vehicles along this route on weekdays from 5:25 to 6:40 a.m., two vehicles from 7:00 a.m.to 4:30 p.m., and one vehicle from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. On Saturdays, the MTA runs two vehicles from 5:50 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.



Figure 7-8: MTA Route 8 - East Macon/Kings Park

The East Macon – Kings Park route provides transportation to such sites as Macon Centerplex, Ocmulgee Mounds National Historic Park, Piedmont Macon Medical Center and Northeast Plaza Shopping Center. The main components for this route include Coliseum Drive, Shurling Drive, Old Clinton Rd., and Gray Highway. This route runs Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:05 p.m., and Saturday 5:25 a.m. to 6:55 p.m. MTA operates two vehicles along this route on weekdays from 5:25 a.m. to 11:05 a.m., one vehicle from 11:10 a.m. to 9:05 p.m., and only one vehicle on Saturdays.



Figure 7-9: MTA Route 9 - Houston Ave/Peach Orchard

This route serves the Houston Ave. and Peach Orchard area of the city. Stops along this route include the Bowden Homes, Murphey Homes and Pendleton Homes public housing complexes. The Peach Orchard area consists of Guy Paine Rd., Marion Ave., Mead Rd., Carlos Dr., and a portion of Broadway. This route runs Monday through Friday, 5:25 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Saturday 5:50 a.m. to 6:45 p.m. MTA operates two vehicles along this route on weekdays from 5:25 a.m. to 9:25 a.m., one vehicle on weekdays from 9:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and one vehicle on Saturdays.



Figure 7-10: MTA Route 10 – 2nd St. Corridor

This route was commissioned in October 2020, concurrent with the deployment of MTA's first delivery of electric buses. Areas served by this route include the Tindall Fieldss apartment complex, the Tindall Fields senior residential towers, Mercer University, Atrium/Navicent Health Center, Macon downtown, and Piedmont Macon Medical Center. MTA operates one vehicle along this route on weekdays from 6:00 a.m. to 6:55 p.m. There is no Saturday service on this route.

ADA Service

The American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) states complementary paratransit service must be provided to the disabled population who are not able to use the regular local transit system. In the Jones and Macon-Bibb County areas, ADA services are provided as a reservation service that picks up riders at their residence and takes them to their destination (i.e., door to door service). JCT meets the ADA requirement by having 25% of its total fleet wheelchair accessible (see below).

For its part, MTA maintains a fleet of thirteen operating vans as part of the requirements for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The table below describes the characteristics of the MTA ADA service. This service is important for the disabled population and conforms to all the requirements of the ADA legislation.

SERVICE CHARACTERISTIC	***WEEKDAY***	***SATURDAY***	***SUNDAY***
SPAN OF SERVICE	**5:20 am – 9 pm**	**5:20 am – 7 pm**	**CLOSED**
DAILY VAN Hrs.	**8 hours per van**	**8 hours per van**	**CLOSED**
DAILY VAN MILES (Annual Averages)			
2019	**1,046.7 Miles/Day**		**CLOSED**
2020	**920.1 Miles/Day**		
2021	**1,115.1 Miles/Day**		
DAILY RIDERSHIP (Annual Averages)			
2019	**112.7 Passenger Trips/Day**		**CLOSED**
2020	**93.4 Passenger Trips/Day**		
2021	**116.9 Passenger Trips/Day**		

Table 7-1 ADA Service Characteristics for Macon Transit Authority



Figure 7-11: MTA Route Master Map

Service and Operational Changes Since the 2040 LRTP Update

MTA periodically conducts ridership surveys to evaluate the effectiveness and productivity of the routes currently in operation, and to account for changes to agency budgets due to changes in local, State and/or Federal support. As a result of earlier analyses, MTA added service to the Second Street Corridor under a program that would allow the purchase of electric buses in late 2020. Currently, MTA is pursuing plans to begin additional routes that will serve the southern areas of Macon and Bibb County, to connect the industrial facilities around State Route 247 (Kuhmo Tire and Irving Paper), Interstate 75 (Tractor Supply Inc., Fed Ex, Amazon) and the Middle GA Regional Airport (First Quality Paper Products, Dean Baldwin Painting & Aircraft Maintenance) with potential employees who live in East and Central Bibb County. While the exact details of the route are still under development, it is anticipated that the route will be a special service, running in accordance with the shift changes at the various facilities. This may involve updating the general hours of operation for the Macon-Bibb Transit Authority.

In addition to the route expansion proposals, there is a general capital improvement program to increase and improve the overall number of bus shelters and benches throughout the MTA service area. MTA has also placed electronic kiosks at the Downtown Bus Transfer Center in order to provide the public with schedule and bus information.

With regards to the conditions and operations of Terminal Station, MTA continues to rent out space for corporate offices and special events, with the net proceeds (after maintenance expenses) being used to augment operational funds. Since the 2040 LRTP Update, MTA has also leased out a lot adjacent to the Terminal Station to an apartment complex, resulting in additional operational revenue.

Transit Vehicle Inventory

Jones County

There are currently 23 vehicles available in the JCT transit system, split between the Coordinated Transportation System and the GDOT 5311 program. The Coordinated Transportation System (CTS) program (run by Macon-Bibb County Equal Opportunity Council, Inc.) has 20 passenger vans (15 rider capacity), including 5 with wheelchair capabilities. Because the CTS program serves 11 counties in the area covered by the Middle GA Regional Commission (Baldwin, Bibb, Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe, Peach, Pulaski, Putnam, Twiggs and Wilkinson) vans are dispatched as needed (i.e., they do not run on a fixed route system). Thus, CTS fleet service is not apportioned to any particular county. While vehicles are regularly maintained as per recommendations in the owners' manuals, they are not replaced on a regular schedule.

The GDOT 5311 program (administered by the Middle GA Regional Mobility Management Team) uses 3 mini-buses, owned by Jones County; 2 of these buses are wheelchair lift equipped. Each van is capable of carrying 11 passengers, with 2 spots for wheelchairs in each of the wheelchair accessible vehicles. The vehicles are on a 5 year/100,000 mile replacement schedule; 2 of the vehicles are the model year 2011, and 1 is the model year 2010. Replacement of all three vehicles is currently underway.

Macon-Bibb County

Currently, the MTA has an active total bus fleet of 29 passenger vehicles. The number of vehicles during peak usage is 18 vehicles for the transit route system. It is essential to replace the old buses for the MTA in order to maintain an efficient bus fleet. The MTA Bus Replacement Schedule for Transit and Paratransit vehicles for FY 2021 – FY 2030 (Table 7-2) is presented below. MTA plans to retire and replace 2 passenger buses each year. The bus replacement schedule also lists the number of passenger buses by model year. As part of that replacement strategy, MTA is actively looking at opportunities to convert the fleet to electric transit vehicles. MTA currently operates two electric transit buses (BYD Model K9S obtained under a Low Emission/No Emission EPA grant, awarded in 2017), and is looking to obtain two more of the same type, scheduled for delivery in FY 2023.

MTA has instituted a fleet management plan in order to decrease the overall spare ratio. In 2017, when the MATS 2040 LRTP update was produced, the spare ratio was 47%. As seen below, the spare ratio has been reduced to 38% (i.e., 11 vehicles), going forward.

Transit										
	Fiscal Year									
Model Year	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
2004	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	7	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
2018	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	5
2019	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2020	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2021	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
2022	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2023	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2024	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2025	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5
2026	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3
2027	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2
2028	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2029	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Active Fleet	29	29	29	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Peak Buses	18	18	18	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Spares	11	11	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Spare Ratio	61.11%	61.11%	61.11%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Buses Retired	5	2	1	0	5	3	2	0	2	0
Buses Purchased	5	2	1	3	5	3	2	0	2	0

Para Transit										
	Fiscal Year									
Model Year	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
2010	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	5	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
2019	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0
2020	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2021	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2022	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2023	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2024	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	3
2025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2026	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2
2027	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2028	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Active Fleet	10	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Peak Buses	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Spares	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Spare Ratio	0.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Buses Retired	3	0	3	0	3	0	2	0	2	0
Buses Purchased	0	3	3	0	3	0	2	0	2	0

Table 7-2 Macon Transit Authority Vehicle Replacement Schedule

Transit Ridership

Jones County

Table 7-3 shows the ridership trend for Jones County Transit from Fiscal Year 2011 through 2020 (the most recent data available. The total number of trips across both programs has been relatively stable around 10,520 overall (4,717 for the DHS Coordinated Trips Program; 5,803 for the GDOT 5311 Rural Transit Program). The averages mask some significant variation due to changes in program delivery, specifically in the case of the DHS Coordinated Trips Program:

- The drop from 2012 to 2013 is due to the shut down of the Department of Behavioral Health & Developmental Disabilities program in November 2012 (FY 2013);
- The "0" value for 2017 is due to lost data from when the DHS program changed service providers, from Quality Transit, Inc. to Macon-Bibb County Economic Opportunity Council (i.e., current provider).
- The abnormally low trip totals for 2020 are likely a reflection of the Covid-19 pandemic, which started in late February/early March of 2020 (i.e., mid-way through FY 2020). As the pandemic recedes, it is anticipated that trip totals will rebound as discretionary travel returns to historic averages.

FY	DHS Coordinated Trips	GDOT 5311 Program	Total
2011	7,987	8,969	16,956
2012	8,168	7,745	15,913
2013	5,321	6,594	11,915
2014	3,783	6,000	9,783
2015	3,996	6,556	10,552
2016	3,196	4,696	7,892
2017	0	4,063	4,063
2018	4,471	4,913	9,384
2019	6,825	3,971	10,796
2020	3,422	3,123	6,545

Table 7-3: Jones County Yearly Transit Trip Totals, by Program

Macon-Bibb County

According to MTA's internal projections, the daily ridership will increase 92.41% by the year 2029 (see Table 7-4 below). This increase will occur as a result of increased demand served by the anticipated South Bibb County route, and the waning of the Covid-19 pandemic in the coming years. In terms of ridership characteristics, the majority of the transit users are African Americans in the 25-61-year-old age group. Most of these users do not have an automobile and use the transit system for such purposes as travel to work, shopping, and medical visits.

PROJECTED TRANSIT WEEKDAY DAILY RIDERSHIP			
YEAR	2021	2029	PERCENT CHANGE
BUS SERVICE	1,635	3,201	95.78%
PARATRANSIT SERVICE	117	170	45.30%
TOTAL	1,752	3,371	92.41%

Table 7-4 Projected Daily Ridership for Macon Transit Authority, 2021 - 2029

Funding Sources

The main funding source for the Transit Authority is the FTA Section 5307 and FTA 5339 grant programs. The Section 5307 program provides funding for both capital and operating costs. The federal share of the program provides 80% of the costs for capital projects and the remainder is covered by state and local shares that are responsible for 10% each. The amount of funding that remains after the acquisition of capital items can be applied to operating costs under the Section 5307 grant program. However, the funding applied to the operating costs cannot exceed 50% of the total amount. The rest of the operating costs are covered by local sources. The Transit Authority also receives farebox revenues from its daily operations as well as revenue from advertising. The MTA files a grant application under the Section 5307 program each year to acquire capital items. The amount of funding levels under the Section 5307 program can vary each year but it is important that the amounts remain relatively consistent in the future in order to support local transit service.

Prior to 2016, the State supported capital projects through the FTA Section 5309 program. However, in 2016, the State switched from FTA Section 5309 to the FTA Section 5339 program. The reason for the switch is the FTA Section 5339 grant program does not have the requirements for State match; the entire 20% is open to negotiation between the State, local governments and the transit service providers.

The anticipated revenues and expenses for FY 2021 and FY 2022 are already reflected in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP. For years FY 2023 through FY 2028, Tables 7-5 through 7-6 (below) reflect the anticipated MTA capital and operating expenditures. The emphases in these expenditures are on replacing/upgrading the passenger bus fleet (including acquiring electric vehicles), upgrades to automatic transit vehicle locations systems, obtaining software for developing in-house route modeling capabilities, and deployment of a passenger phone app that will allow bus riders to know where their transit vehicle is along the route in real time. In the out years, there are minor expenditure for new office equipment and furniture will be purchased, as well as new computers and software.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Replace Bus Routing System	$ 1,200,000					
Purchase 35 FT. Transit Buses (6)		$ 1,600,000		$ 1,600,000		$ 1,600,000
Buses For ADA Service (9)	$ 840,000		$ 840,000		$ 840,000	
Bus Maintenance Parts & Supplies for Fleet	$ 200,000	$ 100,000	$ 150,000	$ 200,000	$ 100,000	$ 200,000
Replace & Refurbhis Bus Shelters & Benches	$ 60,000		$ 100,000		$ 80,000	$ 80,000
New Service Vehicles (9)	$ 100,000		$ 100,000			$ 100,000
Office Equipment & Furniture	$ 15,000	$ 15,000	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ 10,000	$ 10,000
Computer Equipment & Softw are	$ 80,000	$ 80,000	$ 150,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000
GPS Tablets With Kits (50)	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 19,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000
Terminal Station Maintenance & Renovation	$ 30,000	$ 50,000		$ 500,000	$ 250,000	$ 140,000
Purchase Vans for Shuttle Service in 4 Zones (4)		$ 160,000				
Purchase Training Aid Simulator	$ 100,000					
TOTAL	**$ 2,645,000**	**$2,025,000**	**$1,365,000**	**$2,424,000**	**$1,400,000**	**$2,250,000**

Table 7-5 MTA Capital Improvement Program (5307 Program), FY 2023 – 2028

Looking at Table 7-5, Macon Transit Authority plans to make the highest proportion of capital investments in FY 2023. Under the provisions of the Section 5307 program, the balances of Federal and Local anticipated capital funding can be applied in future years to the operating costs (balances of State capital funds may not be applied towards operating expenses). It is anticipated the local funding share required for operating costs will not increase substantially over the next five years. Table 7-6 contains the overview of the funding sources available for both Capital and Operating expenses associated with anticipated MTA activities.

	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
CAPITAL COSTS (FROM TABLE 7-6)	**$2,645,000**	**$2,025,000**	**$1,365,000**	**$2,424,000**	**$1,400,000**	**$2,250,000**
CAPITAL FUNDS	**$2,645,000**	**$2,025,000**	**$1,365,000**	**$2,424,000**	**$1,400,000**	**$2,250,000**
· FEDERAL (80%)	$2,116,000	$1,620,000	$1,092,000	$1,939,200	$1,120,000	$1,800,000
· STATE MATCH (10%)	$264,500	$202,500	136500	$242,400	$140,000	$225,000
· LOCAL MATCH (10%)	$264,500	$202,500	$136,500	$242,400	$140,000	$225,000
OPERATING COSTS	**$6,470,000**	**$6,550,000**	**$6,793,500**	**$6,889,760**	**$6,996,000**	**$7,189,520**
OPERATING FUNDS	**$6,470,000**	**$6,550,000**	**$6,793,500**	**$6,889,760**	**$6,996,000**	**$7,189,520**
· FEDERAL (50%)	$3,235,000	$3,275,000	$3,396,750	$3,444,880	$3,498,000	$3,594,760
· LOCAL (50%)	$3,235,000	$3,275,000	$3,396,750	$3,444,880	$3,498,000	$3,594,760
NET INCOME (LOSS)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
FEDERAL FUND WORKSHEET						
FTA SECTION 5307						
NEW	**$5,351,000**	**$4,895,000**	**$4,488,750**	**$5,384,080**	**$4,618,000**	**$5,394,760**
APPLIED TO Capital Projects	$2,116,000	$1,620,000	$1,092,000	$1,939,200	$1,120,000	$1,800,000
AVAILABLE FOR OPERATING ASSISTANCE	$3,235,000	$3,275,000	$3,396,750	$3,444,880	$3,498,000	$3,594,760

Table 7-6 MTA Capital Improvement Program (FTA 5339 Program), FY 2023 – 2028

Long-Term Capital Projects

MATS is not aware of any long-term capital projects for the JCT system. With respect to MTA, the long term plans that MATS is aware of are the aforementioned plan to deploy real time bus location notification services to passengers, and an anticipated route extension into Southern Bibb County.

Regional Public Transit Options

Aside from the JCT programs described above, the only other public transit operator operating between counties in the MATS region is Greyhound Lines, serving the larger cities of Atlanta, Savannah, and Jacksonville, Florida, with stops in Tifton (Tift County) and Valdosta (Lowndes County). The routes serving these cities are either non-stop or stop in counties not covered by the MATS area.

In 2018 the Georgia state legislature expressed interest in studying what would be required to establish a series of regional public transportation systems, with integrated statewide connectivity. Under Georgia House Resolution 848 (2017-2018 Session), the House established a study committee tasked with "[assessing] the needs for and means of providing a system of mass transportation and mass transportation facilities for any one or more metropolitan areas in this state."[1] The subcommittee final report recommendations focused on establishing a statewide strategic vision for expanding and coordinating transit service among the rural and

small urban transit providers throughout Georgia. MATS staff attended the study committee hearings, and is aware of the conclusions.

Transit Performance Measures

Transit Asset Management

In July 2016, FTA issued the final rule (49 CFR 625.17) establishing Transit Asset Management (TAM) requirements for recipients and sub-recipients of federal funds. Based on the requirements established under 23 CFR 450.324 and 23 CFR 450.326, acknowledgement of this final rule also must be reflected in the MATS transportation planning documents.

On August 24, 2018, Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Intermodal Division published finalized Group TAM Plans and targets for Tier II sub-recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds. The Group TAM Plan covers the four year period FY 2019 through FY 2022, and includes both preliminary assessments relative to TAM Plan targets (Table 7-7, below), and a detailed breakdown of TAM targets by asset class and initial FY 2019 TAM Plan targets (Table 7-8, below).

Asset Category	Performance Measure	Initial Target FY 2017	Actual Performance
Rolling Stock – Revenue Vehicles by Mode	**% of vehicles met or exceeded Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)**	**<15.0%**	**12.4%**
Equipment – non-revenue support service and maintenance vehicles	**% of vehicles met or exceeded ULB**	**<50%**	**42.6%**
Facilities – maintenance and administrative facilities, passenger stations (buildings); and parking facilities	**% of assets with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA TERM scale**	**<40%**	**8.4%**

Table 7-7: Summary of Initial GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds
Source: GDOT Group Transit Asset Management Plan, Table 4.2 – Summary of Initial Performance Targets, 24 August 2018.

Because both Jones County Transit (JCT) and Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) are specifically identified as being covered under the GDOT Group TAM Plan, the targets identified in that plan are applicable by reference in the MATS 2050 MTP.

Detailed Breakdown of GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds, and Proposed FY 2019 TAM Targets

Asset Category/Class	Total Number	Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	Number Exceeding ULB/3.0 TERM Rating	Exceeding ULB/3.0 TERM Rating	Proposed FY 2019 Targets
Rolling Stock	**775**		**96**	**12.4%**	
BU-Bus (35' – 40')	82	14 yrs.	8	9.8%	<15%
BU-Bus (29' – 30')	54	12 yrs.	21	38.9%	<35%
CU – Cutaway Bus	593	7 yrs.	52	8.8%	<10%
MV – Minivan	1	8 yrs.	1	100.0%	<50%
SB – School bus	33	15 yrs.	8	24.2%	<50%
VN – Van	12	8 yrs.	6	50.0%	<50%
Equipment	**55**		**23**	**42.6%**	
AO – Automobile	18	8 yrs.	11	61.1%	<55%
Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles	31	10 yrs.	11	35.5%	<55%
Equip. > $50,000	6	14 yrs.	n/a	n/a	n/a
Facilities	**83**		**7**	**8.4%**	
Administration	62	n/a	2	3.2%	<25%
Maintenance	11	n/a	5	45.5%	<25%
Passenger/ Parking Facilities	10	n/a	0	0%	<10%

Table 7-8: Detailed Breakdown of GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds, and Proposed FY 2019 TAM Targets
Source: GDOT Group Transit Asset Management Plan, Table 4.1 – Summary of Asset Performance by Asset Class, 24 August 2018.

Public Transit Agency Safety Planning

On July 19, 2018, the Federal Transit Administration published final rule 49 CFR 673, which requires agencies that receive money under 49 USC 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (aka "5307 funds") to establish a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP). The PTASP must include the following:

- Documents the processes and activities related to safety management system implementation;
- Includes performance targets measures established under the National Public Transportation Safety Plan;
- Establish a process and timeline for conducting annual reviews and updates for performance targets

On June 20, 2020, Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) adopted a PTASP document

consistent with the requirements set forth by FTA. As the sole recipient of 5307 funds in the MATS planning area, the Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority Safety Plan (MTA-SP) document is the controlling reference for transit related Safety Performance Measures in the MATS region.

Section 4.2 of the MTA-SP identifies the following performance measures required by the National Public Transportation Safety Plan, and sets the target values to be achieved:

- Fatalities - Total number of reportable fatalities and rate per total vehicle revenue miles (VRM) by mode (The thresholds for "reportable" fatalities, injuries, and events are defined in the NTD Safety and Security);
- Injuries - Total number of reportable injuries and rate per total VRM by mode;
- Safety Events - Total number of reportable events and rate per total VRM by mode; and
- System Reliability - Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode.

Specific targets safety performance measures are updated annually. Section 5 of the MTA-SP identifies the specific methods used to attain and maintain the targets.

Projects for Future Study, and the MTP Amendment Process

If the MATS Policy Committee, in conjunction with Jones County Transit and/or Macon Transit Authority, decides to introduce new transit projects, this would require formal amendments to the MTP and possibly the TIP. The process is identical to the one described for roads and bridges in the previous chapter; it is re-stated here for the sake of convenience.

Both the MTP and TIP can be amended at any time, in accordance with the procedures specified in the MATS Public Participation Plan. The process for amending the MTP project list involves the following steps:

1. Updating and/or creating new project sheets for the current TIP, to reflect changes in any projects currently underway;
2. Updating the project tables in the relevant MTP chapters, to reflect the new projects and associated cost changes;
3. Updating the fiscal analysis in this MTP chapter to continue demonstrating fiscal constraint (i.e., that revenues are sufficient to cover anticipated costs), even with the proposed amendments
4. Soliciting public input in accordance with the approved MATS Public Participation Plan (revised 11/4/2020), which involves;
    1. Completing a 15 day public review period with drafts of the proposed amended MTP project list and (if necessary) TIP, available for download from the MATS website
    2. Soliciting comments and recommendations from the MATS Citizen Advisory Committee and MATS Technical Coordinating Committee
5. After close of public comment period, formal adoption of the amended MTP project list and (if necessary) TIP by the MATS Policy Committee.

In accordance with these procedures, the following project list amendments have been made to the MTP Public Transportation Projects List:

Chapter 8 | Fiscal Assessment

Introduction

This section addresses the costs and revenues associated with the roads and bridge projects (Chapter 6), and public transportation projects (Chapter 7), identified in the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). For details on costs of individual projects and activities, please see the associated chapter.

Road Projects - Costs and Revenue Estimation

Costs

The total cost of all obligated road and bridge projects listed in Table 6-2 above is estimated at $ **$717,864,947.25** (as of 11/5/2025). This value is based on the most current project cost estimates from GDOT and Macon-Bibb County Engineering Department. It includes an assumption of 2% increase in non-obligated project costs each year over the entire planning and construction duration of the project. This assumption is an average, based on GDOT's historic project management experience with road and bridge projects. While in any specific year this 2% assumption may be high or low, the expectation is that over the operational life of this MTP, individual years will balance out around a 2% inflation rate. This assumption is a continuation of the project cost inflation assumptions applied in the 2050 MTP.

Of the $717,864,947.25, the amount already obligated to these projects (as 11/5/2025) is **$193,273,964.68**. Reducing the total project costs by these expended or obligated amount leaves a net outstanding cost of **$ $524,590,982.57**.[1]

Revenues

Revenues forecasts for road and bridge projects in the MATS area were provided by Georgia Dept. of Transportation Office of Planning on June 21, 2021. Table 8-1 takes the information provided by Office of Planning, focusing on the years FY 2024 through 2050 (i.e., the beginning year of the current MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP through the planning horizon year).

The total available revenue for new roads and bridges projects or cost increases in existing projects, over the operating life of the updated 2050 MTP is **$900,884,546** (as of 5/7/2025). For maintenance projects, the corresponding figure is **$166,394,154.53**. Table 8-1 further breaks out the anticipated Federal, State and Local shares of each of these funding streams. Based on the data provided by GDOT Office of Planning, the annualized average growth rate in the funding stream is 2.56%.

It should be noted that the estimates of these apportionments are highly generalized. How much of the funding share in any specific year accrues to each level of government is dependent on the specific funding sources used to pay for the individual projects in that year.

[1] [1] For details on costs and descriptions for individual road and bridge projects, please see Chapter 6.

Demonstration of Fiscal Constraint

Comparing the net revenue and net cost estimates in Table 8-2 and 8-3 below, the Roads and Bridges project list has identified an anticipated surplus of **$ $183,019,599.24** (as of 11/5/2024) for new projects or cost increases over the operating life of the updated 2050 MTP.

2015-2050 Macon Funding Projections *

	New Projects Estimate			*Maintenance Estimate*			*Total Estimate*
	Project Cost Total	*Federal Share*	*State & Local Sare*	*Project Cost Total*	*Federal Share*	*State & Local Sare*	
2021	$236,671,629	$189,337,303	$47,334,326	$4,994,003	$3,995,202	$998,801	***$241,665,631***
2022	$18,336,085	$14,668,868	$3,667,217	$4,524,994	$3,619,996	$904,999	***$22,861,079***
2023	$44,226,028	$35,380,823	$8,845,206	$4,615,494	$3,692,395	$923,099	***$48,841,523***
2024[a,b]	$30,285,127	$24,326,102	$5,959,025	$4,707,804	$3,766,243	$941,561	***$34,992,931***
2025[c]	$20,625,451	$16,500,361	$4,125,090	$4,801,960	$3,841,568	$960,392	***$25,427,411***
2026[d]	$143,162,472	$30,445,177	$112,717,294	$4,897,999	$3,918,400	$979,600	***$148,060,471***
2027[c]	$20,309,989	$16,247,991	$4,061,998	$4,995,959	$3,996,768	$999,192	***$25,305,948***
2028	$19,951,189	$15,960,951	$3,990,238	$5,095,879	$4,076,703	$1,019,176	***$25,047,067***
2029[a]	$110,850,213	$88,680,170	$22,170,043	$5,197,796	$4,158,237	$1,039,559	***$116,048,009***
2030[c]	$41,257,217	$33,005,773	$8,251,443	$5,301,752	$4,241,402	$1,060,350	***$46,558,969***
2031	$21,172,361	$16,937,889	$4,234,472	$5,407,787	$4,326,230	$1,081,557	***$26,580,148***
2032	$21,595,808	$17,276,647	$4,319,162	$5,515,943	$4,412,754	$1,103,189	***$27,111,751***
2033	$22,027,725	$17,622,180	$4,405,545	$5,626,262	$4,501,009	$1,125,252	***$27,653,986***
2034	$22,468,279	$17,974,623	$4,493,656	$5,738,787	$4,591,030	$1,147,757	***$28,207,066***
2035	$22,917,645	$18,334,116	$4,583,529	$5,853,563	$4,682,850	$1,170,713	***$28,771,207***
2036	$23,375,998	$18,700,798	$4,675,200	$5,970,634	$4,776,507	$1,194,127	***$29,346,632***
2037	$23,843,517	$19,074,814	$4,768,703	$6,090,047	$4,872,037	$1,218,009	***$29,933,564***
2038	$24,320,388	$19,456,310	$4,864,078	$6,211,848	$4,969,478	$1,242,370	***$30,532,235***
2039	$24,806,796	$19,845,436	$4,961,359	$6,336,085	$5,068,868	$1,267,217	***$31,142,880***
2040	$25,302,932	$20,242,345	$5,060,586	$6,462,806	$5,170,245	$1,292,561	***$31,765,738***
2041	$25,808,990	$20,647,192	$5,161,798	$6,592,062	$5,273,650	$1,318,412	***$32,401,053***
2042	$26,325,170	$21,060,136	$5,265,034	$6,723,904	$5,379,123	$1,344,781	***$33,049,074***
2043	$26,851,673	$21,481,339	$5,370,335	$6,858,382	$5,486,705	$1,371,676	***$33,710,055***
2044	$27,388,707	$21,910,965	$5,477,741	$6,995,549	$5,596,439	$1,399,110	***$34,384,256***
2045	$27,936,481	$22,349,185	$5,587,296	$7,135,460	$5,708,368	$1,427,092	***$35,071,941***
2046	$28,495,211	$22,796,168	$5,699,042	$7,278,170	$5,822,536	$1,455,634	***$35,773,380***
2047	$29,065,115	$23,252,092	$5,813,023	$7,423,733	$5,938,986	$1,484,747	***$36,488,848***
2048	$29,646,417	$23,717,134	$5,929,283	$7,572,208	$6,057,766	$1,514,442	***$37,218,625***
2049	$30,239,345	$24,191,476	$6,047,869	$7,723,652	$6,178,921	$1,544,730	***$37,962,997***
2050	$30,844,132	$24,675,306	$6,168,826	$7,878,125	$6,302,500	$1,575,625	***$38,722,257***
	$900,874,346	***$636,712,677***	***$264,161,669***	***$166,394,155***	***$133,115,324***	***$33,278,831***	***$1,067,268,501***

** Projection amounts are YOE $ - (2% inflation per year)*

[a] On 5/1/2024, fiscal years 2024 and 2029 had their estimates increased by $11,363,312.74 and $90,500,000, respectively, to accommodate the cost increases associated with revised cost estimates for GDOT PI #0013712, and the amendment of GDOT PI #0019933, 0019934, #0019935, #0019936, #0019945 and #0020056.

[b] The Federal and State & Local portion of the FY 2024 line have been adjusted to reflect the fact that GDOT PI #0020056 is 100% under the Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) grant

[c] On 8/7/2024, fiscal years 2025, 2027 and 2030 had their estimates increased by $1,825,000, $750,000 and $20,500,000, respectively, to accommodate the cost increases associated with cost estimates for amendments GDOT PI #0020213 and GDOT PI #20345, as per e-mail of 5/23/2024 from GDOT Office of Planning.

[d] On 5/7/2025, fiscal year 2026 estimates were increased by $123,986,011.94 (+$15,104,009.55 Federal; +$108,882,002.39 State), to accommodate the cost increases associated with cost estimates for amendments GDOT PI #311400, as per e-mail of 3/5/2024 from GDOT Office of Planning.

Table 8-1: Revenue Projections for MATS Area Roads & Bridges Projects
Source: Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning

The corresponding value for the maintenance fund is currently **$154,902,999.37**. However, that value is for all years FY 2024 through 2050. Using the Maintenance Estimate values from Table 8-1, focusing only on the years FY 2024 – 2027, and comparing them to the anticipated maintenance costs in the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, the calculation of fiscal constraint for the Maintenance funds in the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP period is:

Net Anticipated Maintenance Revenues (FY 2024 – 2027): $19,403,723.00

- Net Anticipated Costs: $11,491,155.16

Anticipated Maintenance Surplus (FY 2024 – 2027): **$7,912,567.84**

Highway Capital Projects Revenue Estimates

	Summed Estimates @ 2% Inflation
Federal	$ 636,720,837.19
State & Local Match	$ 264,163,709.30
Total Estimated Revenues	**$ 900,884,546.49**
TIP Project Adjustments (as of 11/6/2025)	**$ 193,273,964.68**
Net Highway Capital Revenues Available	**$ 707,610,581.81**
Outstanding Road & Bridge Projects in MTP	**$ 524,590,982.57**
Capital Surplus (deficit) *New Estimate (11/6/2025)*	**$ 183,019,599.24**

Table 8-2: MATS Highway Capital Projects Revenue Estimates: 2024 – 2050

Highway Maintenance Revenue Estimates

	Summed Estimates @ 2% Inflation
Federal	$ 133,115,323.62
State & Local Match	$ 33,278,830.91
Total Estimated Revenues	**$ 166,394,154.53**
FY 24-27 TIP Project Adjustments (as of 3/18/2024)	**$ 11,491,155.16**
Net Highway Capital Revenues Available	**$ 154,902,999.37**
Outstanding Road & Bridge Projects in LRTP	**$ -**
Maintenance Surplus (deficit) *New Estimate (as of 9/9/2021)*	**$ 154,902,999.37**

Table 8-3: MATS Highway Maintenance Revenue Estimates: 2024 - 2050

These surpluses are the totals across all Federal, State and Local funding sources. How that surplus accrues to each level of government is dependent on the specific funding sources used to pay for the individual projects.

Public Transportation - Costs and Revenue Estimation

As described in Chapter 7 – Public Transportation, the two transit systems operating in the MATS service area are Jones County Transit System and the Macon Transit Authority. The two systems operate under separate funding programs. For those programs receiving federal assistance, the funding practice has historically been that Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will pay 80% of capital costs, with the requirement that the State and Local partners account for the balance equally (i.e., 10% each). In contrast, operating costs are split 50% federal, and 50% State/Local contribution. In Georgia, the practice has been that the State does not contribute to operating costs, but does allow positive balances in non-State portions of capital funding to be transferred to operating expenses.

Jones County

Jones County Transit System operates under the Coordinated Transportation Program (CTP), and the GDOT 5311 Program.

As described in Chapter 7, the CTP is operated by the Georgia Department of Human Services (DHS), consolidating transportation programs provided by the various agencies under the jurisdiction of DHS. These agencies include Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS), Department of Behavioral Health & Developmental Disabilities (DBHDD), Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (GVRA) and Area Agency on Aging (Aging). The transportation programs for the agencies are funded by the following federal programs:

- Capital Assistance Program for Elderly Persons
- Rehabilitation Services – Vocational Rehabilitation
- Special Programs for Aging – Supportive Services and Senior Center
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
- Social Services Block Grant

CTP services are provided by contract (see Chapter 7 for details), paid from the federal grants at a pre-determined rate. Individual riders are not charged for trips qualifying under the various programs covered by DHS

Since CTP funding is based on specific program ridership and reimbursement, fiscal balancing for this program in future years will depend on negotiated rates with private providers, as well as total funding allocated by the component federal programs.

The GDOT 5311 program for Jones County is also operated by a contract with the Middle Georgia Community Action Agency, although it is a distinct and separate provider from the one responsible for CTP. As such, fiscal balancing will depend upon negotiations of future conditions which, at this time, cannot be predicted accurately.

Macon Transit Authority

The Macon Transit Authority (MTA) operates as sub recipients to GDOT under the FTA 5307 and FTA 5339(a) formula grant program for capital and operating costs. In comparison to Jones County, as a public agency operating under a different transit support program, it is easier to forecast the anticipated revenues and expenses for the MTP period. The gross revenue forecasts are based on the following assumptions:

- The anticipated revenues and expenses for FY 2024 through FY 2027 are accurately reflected in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP; and
- The FY 2022 base year values for estimating gross revenue was calculated by taking the 10 year average from FY 2011 through 2021 in each revenue category (using data from MTA annual audits)
- Differential growth rates were applied to the various funding categories
    - For Federal transit program revenue streams, passenger fares, and other revenue streams that are not under active management by MTA (i.e., Miscellaneous Income and Investments) these categories were inflated from the base year using the same growth rate as used for roads and bridges (i.e., annualized rate of 2.56% for each year from 2028 through 2050).
    - For the revenue streams that *are* under active management by MTA (i.e., Rents on facilities owned by MTA; Advertising Rates), other than passenger fares, the inflation factor was 3.5%. This rate was determined to be conservative, based on discussions with the MTA Chief Financial Officer.

Tables 8-4 and 8-5 estimate the gross transit revenues and expenses for MTA from 2028 through 2050.

	Operating Revenues					Non-Operation Revenues					
	Passenger Fees	Advertising*	Facilities Rental Income*	Miscellaneous	Operating Revenue SubTotal	FTA/Georgia DOT Grants	Local Match	Investments	Other Income	Non-Operating Revenue SubTotal	Annual Grand Total
2011	$ 900,686.00	$ -	$ -	$ 14,092.00	$ 914,778.00	$ 2,249,021.00	$ 2,114,646.00	$ 326.00	$ -	$ 4,363,993.00	$ 5,278,771.00
2012	$ 1,072,086.00	$ -	$ -	$ 16,163.00	$ 1,088,249.00	$ 1,946,333.00	$ 2,135,208.00	$ 196.00	$ -	$ 4,081,737.00	$ 5,169,986.00
2013	$ 1,098,639.00	$ 21,298.00	$ 308,591.00	$ 32,171.00	$ 1,460,699.00	$ 1,962,596.00	$ 2,668,409.00	$ 269.00	$ -	$ 4,631,274.00	$ 6,091,973.00
2014	$ 1,074,241.00	$ 18,985.00	$ 229,120.00	$ 87,240.00	$ 1,409,586.00	$ 2,905,775.00	$ 3,205,949.00	$ 234.00	$ -	$ 6,111,958.00	$ 7,521,544.00
2015	$ 1,039,182.00	$ 14,711.00	$ 261,308.00	$ 65,760.00	$ 1,380,961.00	$ 2,787,533.00	$ 2,751,000.00	$ 155.00	$ -	$ 5,538,688.00	$ 6,919,649.00
2016	$ 951,160.00	$ 35,390.00	$ 350,670.00	$ 78,178.00	$ 1,415,398.00	$ 2,446,542.00	$ 2,966,364.00	$ 76.00	$ -	$ 5,412,982.00	$ 6,828,380.00
2017	$ 804,994.00	$ 29,429.00	$ 575,781.00	$ 145,720.00	$ 1,555,924.00	$ 2,113,008.00	$ 2,872,078.00	$ 3.00	$ -	$ 4,985,089.00	$ 6,541,013.00
2018	$ 767,736.00	$ 49,851.00	$ 638,792.00	$ 35,808.00	$ 1,492,187.00	$ 2,600,907.00	$ 2,534,656.00	$ -	$ -	$ 5,135,563.00	$ 6,627,750.00
2019	$ 608,914.00	$ 20,645.00	$ 629,343.00	$ 75,909.00	$ 1,334,811.00	$ 2,488,572.00	$ 2,506,901.00	$ 516.00	$ 22,383.00	$ 5,018,372.00	$ 6,353,183.00
2020	$ 498,426.00	$ -	$ 733,357.00	$ 71,386.00	$ 1,303,169.00	$ 3,729,372.00	$ 3,122,183.00	$ 550.00	$ 40,498.00	$ 6,892,603.00	$ 8,195,772.00
2021	$ 400,225.00	$ -	$ 722,026.00	$ 48,772.00	$ 1,171,023.00	$ 6,730,132.00	$ 2,316,500.00	$ 725.00	$ 135,938.00	$ 9,183,295.00	$ 10,354,318.00
Average	**$ 837,844.45**	**$ 17,300.82**	**$ 404,453.45**	**$ 61,018.09**	**$ 1,320,616.82**	**$ 2,905,435.55**	**$ 2,653,990.36**	**$ 277.27**	**$ 18,074.45**	**$ 5,577,777.64**	**$ 6,898,394.45**
*2022**	*$ 859,293.27*	*$ 17,906.35*	*$ 418,609.33*	*$ 62,580.15*	*$ 1,358,389.10*	*$ 2,979,814.70*	*$ 2,721,932.52*	*$ 284.37*	*$ 18,537.16*	*$ 5,720,568.74*	*$ 7,078,957.84*
*2023**	*$ 881,291.18*	*$ 18,533.07*	*$ 433,260.65*	*$ 64,182.21*	*$ 1,397,267.11*	*$ 3,056,097.95*	*$ 2,791,613.99*	*$ 291.65*	*$ 19,011.71*	*$ 5,867,015.30*	*$ 7,264,282.41*
*2024**	*$ 903,852.23*	*$ 19,181.73*	*$ 448,424.77*	*$ 65,825.27*	*$ 1,437,284.01*	*$ 3,134,334.06*	*$ 2,863,079.31*	*$ 299.12*	*$ 19,498.41*	*$ 6,017,210.90*	*$ 7,454,494.90*
2025***	$ 926,990.85	*$ 19,853.09*	*$ 464,119.64*	$ 67,510.40	$ 1,478,473.98	$ 3,214,573.01	$ 2,936,374.14	$ 306.77	$ 19,997.57	$ 6,171,251.49	$ 7,649,725.47
2026***	$ 950,721.82	*$ 20,547.94*	*$ 480,363.83*	$ 69,238.66	$ 1,520,872.26	$ 3,296,866.08	$ 3,011,545.32	$ 314.63	$ 20,509.51	$ 6,329,235.53	$ 7,850,107.79
2027***	$ 975,060.30	*$ 21,267.12*	*$ 497,176.56*	$ 71,011.17	$ 1,564,515.16	$ 3,381,265.85	$ 3,088,640.88	$ 322.68	$ 21,034.55	$ 6,491,263.96	$ 8,055,779.12
2028	$ 1,000,021.84	*$ 22,011.47*	*$ 514,577.74*	$ 72,829.06	$ 1,609,440.11	$ 3,467,826.26	$ 3,167,710.08	$ 330.94	$ 21,573.04	$ 6,657,440.32	$ 8,266,880.43
2029	$ 1,025,622.40	*$ 22,781.87*	*$ 532,587.96*	$ 74,693.48	$ 1,655,685.72	$ 3,556,602.61	$ 3,248,803.46	$ 339.42	$ 22,125.31	$ 6,827,870.79	$ 8,483,556.51
2030	$ 1,051,878.33	*$ 23,579.24*	*$ 551,228.54*	$ 76,605.64	$ 1,703,291.75	$ 3,647,651.64	$ 3,331,972.83	$ 348.10	$ 22,691.71	$ 7,002,664.28	$ 8,705,956.03
2031	$ 1,078,806.42	*$ 24,404.51*	*$ 570,521.54*	$ 78,566.74	$ 1,752,299.21	$ 3,741,031.52	$ 3,417,271.33	$ 357.02	$ 23,272.62	$ 7,181,932.49	$ 8,934,231.70
2032	$ 1,106,423.86	*$ 25,258.67*	*$ 590,489.80*	$ 80,578.05	$ 1,802,750.38	$ 3,836,801.93	$ 3,504,753.48	$ 366.16	$ 23,868.40	$ 7,365,789.96	$ 9,168,540.34
2033	$ 1,134,748.31	*$ 26,142.72*	*$ 611,156.94*	$ 82,640.85	$ 1,854,688.82	$ 3,935,024.05	$ 3,594,475.17	$ 375.53	$ 24,479.43	$ 7,554,354.18	$ 9,409,043.01
2034	$ 1,163,797.87	*$ 27,057.72*	*$ 632,547.43*	$ 84,756.45	$ 1,908,159.47	$ 4,035,760.67	$ 3,686,493.73	$ 385.14	$ 25,106.11	$ 7,747,745.65	$ 9,655,905.13
2035	$ 1,193,591.09	*$ 28,004.74*	*$ 654,686.59*	$ 86,926.22	$ 1,963,208.64	$ 4,139,076.14	$ 3,780,867.97	$ 395.00	$ 25,748.82	$ 7,946,087.94	$ 9,909,296.58
2036	$ 1,224,147.03	*$ 28,984.91*	*$ 677,600.62*	$ 89,151.53	$ 2,019,884.08	$ 4,245,036.49	$ 3,877,658.19	$ 405.11	$ 26,407.99	$ 8,149,507.79	$ 10,169,391.88
2037	$ 1,255,485.19	*$ 29,999.38*	*$ 701,316.64*	$ 91,433.81	$ 2,078,235.02	$ 4,353,709.43	$ 3,976,926.24	$ 415.48	$ 27,084.04	$ 8,358,135.19	$ 10,436,370.21
2038	$ 1,287,625.61	*$ 31,049.36*	*$ 725,862.73*	$ 93,774.51	$ 2,138,312.21	$ 4,465,164.39	$ 4,078,735.55	$ 426.12	$ 27,777.39	$ 8,572,103.45	$ 10,710,415.66
2039	$ 1,320,588.83	*$ 32,136.08*	*$ 751,267.92*	$ 96,175.14	$ 2,200,167.97	$ 4,579,472.60	$ 4,183,151.18	$ 437.03	$ 28,488.49	$ 8,791,549.30	$ 10,991,717.27
2040	$ 1,354,395.90	*$ 33,260.85*	*$ 777,562.30*	$ 98,637.23	$ 2,263,856.27	$ 4,696,707.10	$ 4,290,239.85	$ 448.22	$ 29,217.79	$ 9,016,612.96	$ 11,280,469.23
2041	$ 1,389,068.44	*$ 34,424.98*	*$ 804,776.98*	$ 101,162.34	$ 2,329,432.73	$ 4,816,942.80	$ 4,400,069.99	$ 459.69	$ 29,965.77	$ 9,247,438.25	$ 11,576,870.98
2042	$ 1,424,628.59	*$ 35,629.85*	*$ 832,944.17*	$ 103,752.09	$ 2,396,954.71	$ 4,940,256.53	$ 4,512,711.79	$ 471.46	$ 30,732.89	$ 9,484,172.67	$ 11,881,127.38
2043	$ 1,461,099.08	*$ 36,876.89*	*$ 862,097.22*	$ 106,408.15	$ 2,466,481.34	$ 5,066,727.10	$ 4,628,237.21	$ 483.53	$ 31,519.66	$ 9,726,967.49	$ 12,193,448.84
2044	$ 1,498,503.22	*$ 38,167.59*	*$ 892,270.62*	$ 109,132.20	$ 2,538,073.62	$ 5,196,435.31	$ 4,746,720.08	$ 495.91	$ 32,326.56	$ 9,975,977.86	$ 12,514,051.48
2045	$ 1,536,864.90	*$ 39,503.45*	*$ 923,500.09*	$ 111,925.98	$ 2,611,794.43	$ 5,329,464.06	$ 4,868,236.12	$ 508.60	$ 33,154.12	$ 10,231,362.90	$ 12,843,157.32
2046	$ 1,576,208.64	*$ 40,886.07*	*$ 955,822.60*	$ 114,791.29	$ 2,687,708.60	$ 5,465,898.34	$ 4,992,862.96	$ 521.62	$ 34,002.86	$ 10,493,285.79	$ 13,180,994.38
2047	$ 1,616,559.58	*$ 42,317.08*	*$ 989,276.39*	$ 117,729.94	$ 2,765,883.00	$ 5,605,825.33	$ 5,120,680.25	$ 534.98	$ 34,873.34	$ 10,761,913.90	$ 13,527,796.90
2048	$ 1,657,943.51	*$ 43,798.18*	*$ 1,023,901.06*	$ 120,743.83	$ 2,846,386.58	$ 5,749,334.46	$ 5,251,769.67	$ 548.67	$ 35,766.10	$ 11,037,418.90	$ 13,883,805.48
2049	$ 1,700,386.86	*$ 45,331.12*	*$ 1,059,737.60*	$ 123,834.87	$ 2,929,290.45	$ 5,896,517.43	$ 5,386,214.97	$ 562.72	$ 36,681.71	$ 11,319,976.82	$ 14,249,267.27
2050	$ 1,743,916.76	*$ 46,917.71*	*$ 1,096,828.42*	$ 127,005.04	$ 3,014,667.93	$ 6,047,468.27	$ 5,524,102.07	$ 577.12	$ 37,620.76	$ 11,609,768.23	$ 14,624,436.16
Anticipated Gross Revenues FY 2028 - 2050	$ 30,802,312.26	$ 758,524.44	$17,732,561.92	$2,243,254.44	**$ 51,536,653.05**	$ 106,814,734.45	$ 97,570,664.19	$ 10,193.59	$ 664,484.91	**$ 205,060,077.13**	**$ 256,596,730.19**

** Growth rate for Advertising and Facilities Rental Income is 3.5%; Growth rate for all other categories is 2.56%. See narrative for full details.*

*** FYs 2022 through 2024 are projected only for modeling purposes. They are not considered as part of any revenue assessment, because grant revenues and project expenses supported by FTA are already identified in the MATS FY 2021 - 2024 TIP*

****The initial MATS 2050 MTP adoption was based on the FY 2021 - 2024 TIP. Subsequently, MATS MPO, at the direction of GDOT, adopted the MATS 2024 - 2027 on September 208, 2023. Due to the adoption of the FY 2024 - 2027 TIP, FYs 2025, 2026 and 2027 are no longer considered as part of the outlying years revenue estimates.*

Table 8-4 Projected Transit Capital and Operating Funding for MTA 2028 – 2050.

Fiscal Year	Total	Federal Portion (80%)	State Portion (10%)	Local Portion (10%)	Total	Federal Portion (50%)	State Portion (0%)	Local Portion (including transfers from any Capital Budget surpluses: 50%)
2021	$ 3,502,547.00	$ 3,132,547.00	$ -	$ 370,000.00	$ 4,979,569.00	$ 4,979,569.00		$ -
2022	$ 1,489,000.00	$ 1,191,200.00	$ 73,900.00	$ 223,900.00	$ 5,038,000.00	$ 2,519,000.00		$ 2,519,000.00
2023	$ 3,082,800.00	$ 2,640,000.00	$ 221,400.00	$ 221,400.00	$ 5,569,154.00	$ 2,784,577.00		$ 2,784,577.00
2024	$ 2,296,878.00	$ 1,852,380.00	$ 222,249.00	$ 222,249.00	$ 5,680,537.08	$ 2,840,268.54		$ 2,840,268.54
2025	$ 2,296,786.38	$ 1,852,247.08	$ 222,269.65	$ 222,269.65	$ 5,794,147.82	$ 2,897,073.91		$ 2,897,073.91
2026	$ 2,779,222.38	$ 2,223,377.90	$ 277,922.24	$ 277,922.24	$ 5,910,030.78	$ 2,955,015.39		$ 2,955,015.39
2027	$ 2,779,111.52	$ 2,223,289.22	$ 277,911.15	$ 277,911.15	$ 6,028,231.39	$ 3,014,115.70		$ 3,014,115.70
2028	$ 2,263,631.16	$ 1,810,904.93	$ 226,363.12	$ 226,363.12	$ 6,148,796.02	$ 3,074,398.01		$ 3,074,398.01
2029	$ 2,286,267.47	$ 1,829,013.97	$ 228,626.75	$ 228,626.75	$ 6,271,771.94	$ 3,135,885.97		$ 3,135,885.97
2030	$ 2,309,130.14	$ 1,847,304.11	$ 230,913.01	$ 230,913.01	$ 6,397,207.38	$ 3,198,603.69		$ 3,198,603.69
2031	$ 2,332,221.44	$ 1,865,777.16	$ 233,222.14	$ 233,222.14	$ 6,525,151.53	$ 3,262,575.76		$ 3,262,575.76
2032	$ 2,355,543.66	$ 1,884,434.93	$ 235,554.37	$ 235,554.37	$ 6,655,654.56	$ 3,327,827.28		$ 3,327,827.28
2033	$ 2,379,099.10	$ 1,903,279.28	$ 237,909.91	$ 237,909.91	$ 6,788,767.65	$ 3,394,383.83		$ 3,394,383.83
2034	$ 2,402,890.09	$ 1,922,312.07	$ 240,289.01	$ 240,289.01	$ 6,924,543.00	$ 3,462,271.50		$ 3,462,271.50
2035	$ 2,426,918.99	$ 1,941,535.19	$ 242,691.90	$ 242,691.90	$ 7,063,033.86	$ 3,531,516.93		$ 3,531,516.93
2036	$ 2,451,188.18	$ 1,960,950.54	$ 245,118.82	$ 245,118.82	$ 7,204,294.54	$ 3,602,147.27		$ 3,602,147.27
2037	$ 2,475,700.06	$ 1,980,560.05	$ 247,570.01	$ 247,570.01	$ 7,348,380.43	$ 3,674,190.22		$ 3,674,190.22
2038	$ 2,500,457.06	$ 2,000,365.65	$ 250,045.71	$ 250,045.71	$ 7,495,348.04	$ 3,747,674.02		$ 3,747,674.02
2039	$ 2,525,461.63	$ 2,020,369.30	$ 252,546.16	$ 252,546.16	$ 7,645,255.00	$ 3,822,627.50		$ 3,822,627.50
2040	$ 2,550,716.25	$ 2,040,573.00	$ 255,071.62	$ 255,071.62	$ 7,798,160.10	$ 3,899,080.05		$ 3,899,080.05
2041	$ 2,576,223.41	$ 2,060,978.73	$ 257,622.34	$ 257,622.34	$ 8,032,104.90	$ 4,016,052.45		$ 4,016,052.45
2042	$ 3,091,468.09	$ 2,473,174.47	$ 309,146.81	$ 309,146.81	$ 8,273,068.05	$ 4,136,534.03		$ 4,136,534.03
2043	$ 3,153,297.45	$ 2,522,637.96	$ 315,329.75	$ 315,329.75	$ 8,521,260.09	$ 4,260,630.05		$ 4,260,630.05
2044	$ 3,216,363.40	$ 2,573,090.72	$ 321,636.34	$ 321,636.34	$ 8,776,897.90	$ 4,388,448.95		$ 4,388,448.95
2045	$ 3,280,690.67	$ 2,624,552.54	$ 328,069.07	$ 328,069.07	$ 9,040,204.83	$ 4,520,102.42		$ 4,520,102.42
2046	$ 3,346,304.48	$ 2,677,043.59	$ 334,630.45	$ 334,630.45	$ 9,311,410.98	$ 4,655,705.49		$ 4,655,705.49
2047	$ 3,413,230.57	$ 2,730,584.46	$ 341,323.06	$ 341,323.06	$ 9,590,753.31	$ 4,795,376.65		$ 4,795,376.65
2048	$ 3,481,495.18	$ 2,785,196.15	$ 348,149.52	$ 348,149.52	$ 9,878,475.91	$ 4,939,237.95		$ 4,939,237.95
2049	$ 3,551,125.09	$ 2,840,900.07	$ 355,112.51	$ 355,112.51	$ 10,174,830.18	$ 5,087,415.09		$ 5,087,415.09
2050	$ 3,551,125.09	$ 2,840,900.07	$ 355,112.51	$ 355,112.51	$ 10,480,075.09	$ 5,240,037.54		$ 5,240,037.54
	$ 63,920,548.64	**$ 51,136,438.91**	**$ 6,392,054.86**	**$ 6,392,054.86**	**$ 182,345,445.29**	**$ 91,172,722.65**	**$ -**	**$ 91,172,722.65**

Total MTA Anticipated Expenses FY 2028 - 2050	**$ 246,265,993.94**

****The initial MATS 2050 MTP adoption was based on the FY 2021 - 2024 TIP. Subsequently, MATS MPO, at the direction of GDOT, adopted the MATS 2024 - 2027 on September 208, 2023. Due to the adoption of the FY 2024 - 2027 TIP, FYs 2025, 2026 and 2027 are no longer considered as part of the outlying years revenue estimates.*

Table 8-5 Estimated Capital and Operating Expenses (from Macon Transit Authority)

The results in Table 8-4 and Table 8-5 support the conclusion that MTA expected revenues will exceed anticipated expenses through 2050, by approximately **$10,330,736.25**.

After additional adjustments to the MATS Transit Programs in FY 2024 – 2027 (i.e., leaving the FY 2025 through FY 2027 Capital items for MTA unobligated, subject to future amendment), applied after the original 2050 MTP adoption, the current estimated surplus (as of 3/18/2024) stands at **$11,516,378.86**. See Table 8-6 (below) and the MATS 2024 – 2027 TIP for full details.

Program Balancing and Future Amendments

Program Balancing and Demonstration of Fiscal Constraint

Table 8-6 provides an overview of the fiscal analysis for the Highway Program and Transit Program for the MATS planning area. Since both programs anticipate revenues from Federal, State and Local sources exceed estimated project costs for the duration of the planning period, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan continues to meet fiscal constraint requirements.

Transportation Projects Master Balance Sheet

Highway Program			Transit Program		
Revenues			**Revenues**		
Highway Capital Funds	**$**	**900,884,546.49**	**FY 2024 - 2027 TIP (As of 9/28/2023)**		
Federal Contribution	*$*	*636,720,837.19*	**Small Urban Transit Programs**		
State & Local Match	*$*	*264,163,709.30*	Transit Capital Program	**$**	**22,868,260.00**
			Federal Contribution	$	18,294,608.00
Highway Maintenance Funds	**$**	**166,394,154.53**	*State Match*	$	724,172.20
Federal Contribution	*$*	*33,278,830.91*	*Local Match*	$	3,849,479.80
State & Local Match	*$*	*33,278,830.91*	Transit Operating Program	**$**	**28,080,676.00**
			Federal Contribution	$	14,040,338.00
			State Match		
			Local Match	$	14,040,338.00
			Rural Transit Programs		
			Planning (Sec. 5303 & 5304)	**$**	**691,351.85**
			Federal Contribution	$	555,686.40
			State Match	$	67,831.72
			Local Match	$	67,833.73
			Service Delivery (Sec. 5311)	**$**	**206,032.00**
			Federal Contribution	$	142,268.00
			State Match	$	9,836.00
			Local Match	$	53,928.00
			FY 2028 - 2050 Projections		
			Transit Capital & Operations Programs	**$**	**204,385,398.64**
			Federal & State Contribution (Combined)	$	106,814,734.45
			Local Match	$	97,570,664.19
			Other Transit Revenues	**$**	**52,211,331.55**
			Passenger Fees	$	30,802,312.26
			Advertising	$	758,524.44
			Rent	$	17,732,561.92
			Investment Income	$	10,193.59
			Miscellaneous (Operating and Non-Operating)	$	2,907,739.34
Expenditures			**Expenditures**		
TIP Obligations (FY 2024 - 2027)	**$**	**204,765,119.84**	**TIP Obligations (FY 2024 - 2027)**	**$**	**50,660,677.24**
Capital Obligations	*$*	*193,273,964.68*	**Estimated Capital Costs (FY 2028 - 2050)**	**$**	**63,920,548.64**
Safety & Maintenance Obligations (FY 24-27 TIP)	*$*	*11,491,155.16*	*Federal Contribution*	*$*	*51,136,438.91*
Updated MTP Projects List	**$**	**524,590,982.57**	*State Match*	*$*	*6,392,054.86*
Anticipated Road & Bridge Capital Projects	*$*	*524,590,982.57*	*Local Match*	*$*	*6,392,054.86*
Anticipated Maintenance Projects		*$0.00*	**Estimated Operating Costs (FY 2025 - 2050)**	**$**	**182,345,445.29**
			Federal Contribution	*$*	*91,172,722.65*
			State Match		*$0.00*
			Local Match	*$*	*91,172,722.65*
Highway Funds Summary			**Transit Funds Summary**		
Total Revenues	**$**	**1,067,278,701.01**	*Total Revenues*	**$**	**308,443,050.04**
Total TIP Obligations	**$**	**204,765,119.84**	*Total TIP Obligations*	**$**	**50,660,677.24**
Total New Projects	**$**	**524,590,982.57**	*Estimated Capital Cost*	**$**	**63,920,548.64**
			Estimated Operating Costs	**$**	**182,345,445.29**
Highway Fund Balance	**$**	**337,922,598.60**	**Transit Fund Balance**	**$**	**11,516,378.86**

Table 8-6 Transportation Programs Master Balance Sheet

Cost Sharing and Supplemental Funding Sources

Normal cost-sharing arrangements for federally supported transportation projects involve the federal government paying up to 80% of the total project cost, with the remaining 20% (commonly known as "match") being the responsibility of the State and Local participants (23 US Code §120(b): https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/docs/title23usc.pdf). Since 2015, there have been significant updates to how the State and Local portion are being generated.

Georgia Transportation Funding Act Of 2015

On May 4, 2015 the Governor signed the Georgia Transportation Funding Act of 2015 (GTFA 2015: http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/en-US/display/20152016/HB/170). This act provides for a variety of State funding sources (i.e., vehicle registration fees, hotel/motel occupancy taxes, a 1% sales tax on retail motor fuels up to $3.00 per gallon) which are to be dedicated to funding transportation projects. Since passage of this act, the practical effect has been for GDOT to identify certain transportation projects of statewide significance, which are then fully funded in their 20% match requirement by supplemental state funding. The result is that federally sponsored road and bridge projects which are matched with GTFA 2015 funds require significantly lower budget contributions from the local jurisdictions where the projects are located. In many cases, the local funding component is completely eliminated.

Local Revenue Options

Just as GTFA 2015 provides a mechanism for the State to assume the full match burden of road and bridge projects, there are policies in place by which Local partners can either assume the 20% match portion, or even fully assume the entire cost of the project (which would, effectively remove the project from the MTP project list).

Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax

The Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) is a mechanism under Georgia state law (Title 48, Ch. 8, Article 3, Part 1: http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/gacode/), whereby voters within a county can, within certain limits, assign a self-imposed 1% sales tax for the purpose of funding for a variety of capital improvement projects. Originally passed in 1985, the legislation has undergone several legislative updates. The most recent SPLOST in the MATS region passed in the Macon-Bibb County consolidated government on November 8, 2016, authorizing $35,000,000 for various transportation projects throughout the Macon-Bibb area. For projects already included on the road and bridges projects list for this 2050 MTP, these projects can have their match paid for through SPLOST funds, either in part or all the way up to the full 20% match requirement. Alternatively, if the MATS Policy Committee were to decide to accelerate a project faster than GDOT's timetable, they could use SPLOST funds to remove it from the MTP project list entirely. This strategy would allow the jurisdiction sponsoring the project to proceed at their own pace, but it would also forego any opportunity for State or Federal support for the project.

Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank

Another local funding option is the Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank (GTIB). GTIB was established to provide a revolving loan fund (and in some cases, grant funding) for qualified infrastructure projects eligible projects, including mass transit and bicycle infrastructure (Title 32, Ch. 10, Article 2: http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/gacode/)[2][2]. Because the GTIB program allows local units of government to borrow for project costs over the design life of a project, the effect of the GTIB program is to reduce the immediate budget impacts of coming up with local match for large infrastructure and facilities projects. For example, if GTIB financing were used to meet local match requirements for a 5 year construction project for a bridge with a 30 year design life, the local jurisdiction could issue a bond to meet the match requirements and pay it back over a period no longer than 30 years. This has a less intense fiscal impact on the local government than financing the match requirement in each of the 5 budget years over which the bridge is being constructed.

SPLOST and GTIB are not mutually exclusive. A local jurisdiction could elect to use either, both or neither of these funding sources to address local match requirements for transportation projects.

Future Amendments

From time to time it will be necessary to modify the fiscal analysis and the project list to reflect updated project costs, changes in project timetables, or add and remove projects from consideration. These actions require formal amendments to the MTP and possibly the TIP. Both the MTP and TIP can be amended at any time, in accordance with the procedures specified in the MATS Public Participation Plan. The process for amending the MTP project list involves the following steps:

1. Updating and/or creating new project sheets for the current TIP, to reflect changes in any projects currently underway;
2. Updating the project tables in the relevant MTP chapters, to reflect the new projects and associated cost changes;
3. Updating the fiscal analysis in this MTP chapter to continue demonstrating fiscal constraint (i.e., that revenues are sufficient to cover anticipated costs), even with the proposed amendments
4. Soliciting public input in accordance with the approved MATS Public Participation Plan (revised 3/9/2016), which involves;

    a) Completing a 15 day public review period with drafts of the proposed amended MTP project list and (if necessary) TIP, available for download from the MATS website
    b) Soliciting comments and recommendations from the MATS Citizen Advisory Committee and MATS Technical Coordinating Committee

[2] The full list of what is defined as an "eligible project" can be found in Title 32, Ch. 10, Article 2, Part 3, Sec. 122 of the 2016 GA State Code. See http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/gacode/ for specific definitions.

5. After close of public comment period, formal adoption of the amended MTP project list and (if necessary) TIP by the MATS Policy Committee

In accordance with these procedures, the following project list amendments have been made to the MTP Projects List:

Amendment Date

Amendment #1 (6/13/2022) – On March 24, 2022, Georgia Dept. of Transportation requested the following amendments to the MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges Project List, so that it might also be included as a new project in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP:

- GDOT Project #0019107 (Truck Parking Expansion – Region 2)

The project has been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2) as Priority #46, in the amount of $100,000. The MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)

Amendment #2 (6/13/2022) – On March 31, 2022, Georgia Dept. of Transportation requested the following amendments be applied to the revenue projections for the MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges chapter, as a result of State of Georgia allocations under the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act of 2021 (See Chapter 12 – Plan Considerations for additional details)

- $620,000 in Carbon Reduction Program funding
- $26,055,622 in PROTECT Grant program funding

Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined this amendment is "Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone.

Amendment #3 (6/13/2022) – Between February 3 and May 20, 2022, Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Intermodal Division (GDOT Intermodal) advised MATS that there were updates required in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP in order for Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) to obtain sub-recipient funding for projects covered under the FTA 5307 and 5339(a) formula funding program for FY 2022 and FY 2023. Those amendments have been reflected in Table 8-6, to arrive at an updated fiscal balancing for the MATS Transit Program portfolio. After reflecting these amendments, the MATS 2050 MTP Transit Program continues to have a positive fund balance of **$7,733,143.36**. Therefore, this 2050 MTP continues maintain fiscal balance, as required by 23 CFR 450.324(f)

A full listing of all Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP can be found in that document.

Amendment #4 (5/1/2024) – On September 28, 2023, in consultation with, and at the direction of, the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), the MATS MPO adopted a new FY 2024 – 2027 TIP. Pursuant to fulfilling the requirements of 23 CFR 450.326(i) and 23 CFR

450.324(f)(11), this change in TIP necessarily required an update to the MATS 2050 MTP Fiscal Balance chapter, to continue the ability to amend the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP.

Tables 8-1 through 8-6 above have been updated as of this date to incorporate the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, demonstrating continued fiscal constraint.

Amendment #5 (8/7/2024) – On May 10, 2024, the Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning requested that the following projects be amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, as part of incorporating them into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP:

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #0020213	SR 247/US 129 SB & NB @ NS #729382R	Bridge Replacement	$22,650,000
GDOT PI #0020345	I-16 From SR 22/Bibb To SR 96/Twiggs	Roadway Project	$425,000

These projects have been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2) as Priority #20 and #21. The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Tables 8-1, 8-2 and 8-6. Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined these projects are "Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details).

Amendment #6 (2/5/2025) - On November 20, 2024, GDOT – Office of Intermodal advised MATS that amendments were required in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP in order for Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) to obtain sub-recipient funding for projects covered under the FTA 5307 and 5339(a) formula funding program for FY 2025 through FY 2027. Those amendments have been reflected in Table 8-6, to arrive at an updated fiscal balancing for the MATS Transit Program portfolio. After reflecting these amendments, the MATS 2050 MTP Transit Program continues to have a positive fund balance of **$10,330,736.25**. Therefore, this 2050 MTP continues to maintain fiscal balance, as required by 23 CFR 450.324(f).

Amendment #7 (5/7/2025) – On January 9, 2025, the Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning requested that the following projects be updated in the MATS 2050 MTP, as part of incorporating them into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP:

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #311400	I-75 From I-16 To CR 478/Pierce Ave. - Phase VI	Roadway Project	$123,986,011.94

The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Tables 8-1, 8-2 and 8-6. These projects were presented to the Interagency Coordinating Committee as "Non-Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details). However, this project was included in the latest model run (completed 26 April 2016) for compliance with

the relevant NAAQS for Ozone. That model was determined to be conforming to standards. Pursuant to guidance from FHWA and EPA after *South Coast II* court decision (882 F.3d 1138), no new air quality modeling is required.

Amendment #8 (11/5/2025) – On March 24, 2025, the Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning requested that the following projects be amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, as part of incorporating them into the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP (adopted previously on September 28, 2023, and subsequently amended):

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
GDOT PI #0020763	Repair/replacement of overpass and transition from Northbound SR 11/SR 49 (Industrial Hwy) to Northbound SR 247 (Hawkinsville Rd.)	Roadway Project	$6,250,000.00

This project has been added to the Roads and Bridges Project list (Table 6-2; Priority #56). The amended MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Project list still maintains fiscal balance as required under 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), as demonstrated in the updated Table 6-3 and 6-4 described in Amendment #3. Interagency Coordinating Committee has determined this project is "Exempt" from air quality analysis for Ozone (see MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP Appendix: Interagency Coordinating Committee/Air Quality Conformity Communications Log for details).

Chapter 9 | Safety

Introduction

This chapter covers background information and analysis related to transportation safety in the MATS region. Safety is an essential consideration in the development and growth of the MATS transportation network. There are many federal, state, and local directives that incorporate safety into the transportation planning process. Overall, safety is a key element in the transportation planning process and, with new research and available data, safety can be incorporated into the transportation project development process (planning, design, and maintenance) to effectively identify countermeasures to reduce crashes and crash severity for a community.

Federal Performance Measures

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) updated Safety Performance Management Measures (Safety PM) in March 2016 in order to better assess serious injuries and fatalities on public roads.

The Safety performance measures fulfill FHWA's commitment that safety improvement progress is transparent, based on a data-driven process, and is monitored and tracked. The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures that States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) must set targets for each year. These performance measures are the five-year rolling averages for:

- Number of Fatalities,
- Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle-Miles Traveled (VMT),
- Number of Serious Injuries,
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT, and
- A number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries.

The Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries performance measure encourages all States to address pedestrian and bicycle safety and highlights attention on transportation system users who are not in motor vehicles, such as pedestrians and bicyclists. Having a uniform national safety non-motorized performance measure will increase momentum throughout the country to address pedestrian and bicyclist serious injuries and fatalities. Under the new rules, States and MPOs are required to establish and report annual targets for each measure. FHWA will then assess whether a State has met or made significant progress toward meeting their targets.

These new performance measures require transportation safety stakeholders to collaborate more closely than ever before. State Departments of Transportation, MPOs, and a host of other safety stakeholders are beginning conversations on the new requirements, which became effective on April 14, 2016. States and MPOs are required to set safety targets for the calendar year 2018.

State Highway Safety Plan

The 2022 Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) documents Georgia's continued efforts to reduce highway crashes, injuries, and fatalities. The SHSP incorporates education, engineering, enforcement, and emergency medical services as critical elements for developing safer roads. The SHSP aligns all of Georgia's highway related safety plans and outlines goals and strategies that support the plan's vision statement:

The 2022 SHSP's priority goals and performance measures are summarized in Table 9-1 (below). These targets are developed using annual adjustments to polynomial regression models of actual previous year data. Fatality and injury data for the establishment of these targets is generated from the Georgia Electronic Accident Reporting System (GEARS), using the Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria KABCO scale

SHSP Core Measure	**Baseline (2015 – 2019)**	**Target (2018 – 2022)**	**Metric Type**	**Base Year**				
				2015	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**
Maintain **traffic fatalities** under the projected **1,671** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022	**1,505**	**1,671**	Annual	1,432	1,556	1,540	1,505	1,491
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	1,239	1,305	1,374	1,439	1,505
Maintain **serious injuries in traffic crashes** under the projected **8,443** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022;	**5,836**	**8,443**	Annual	**4,896**	**5,206**	**5,370**	**6,401**	**7,308**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**4,743**	**4,825**	**4,922**	**5,264**	**5,836**
Maintain **traffic fatalities per 100 Million VMT** under the projected **1.21** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022;	**1.19**	**1.21**	Annual	**1.21**	**1.27**	**1.23**	**1.14**	**1.21**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**1.12**	**1.15**	**1.17**	**1.18**	**1.19**
Maintain the **unrestrained traffic fatalities** under the projected **446** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022	**434**	**446**	Annual	**411**	**472**	**464**	**441**	**384**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**338**	**398**	**417**	**430**	**434**
Maintain **alcohol-related fatalities** under the projected **399** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022;	**365**	**399**	Annual	**358**	**378**	**357**	**379**	**353**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**300**	**321**	**334**	**350**	**365**
Maintain **speeding-related fatalities** under the projected **301** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022;	**262**	**301**	Annual	**268**	**266**	**248**	**268**	**260**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**216**	**225**	**238**	**253**	**262**

Table 9-1: Georgia 2022 Statewide Highway Safety Plan Performance Targets

SHSP Core Measure	Baseline (2015 – 2019)	Target (2018 – 2022)	Metric Type	Base Year				
				2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Maintain **motorcyclist fatalities** under the projected **180** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022;	**157**	**180**	Annual	**152**	**172**	**139**	**154**	**170**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**138**	**142**	**143**	**151**	**157**
Maintain the **un-helmeted motorcyclist fatalities** under the projected **26** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022;	**14**	**26**	Annual	**10**	**9**	**18**	**16**	**15**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**9**	**8**	**10**	**12**	**14**
Maintain **young drivers involved in fatal crashes** under the projected **202** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022	**183**	**202**	Annual	**168**	**188**	**194**	**192**	**172**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**159**	**164**	**171**	**178**	**183**
Maintain **pedestrian fatalities** under the projected **281** (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022;	**235**	**281**	Annual	**194**	**232**	**253**	**262**	**236**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**166**	**186**	**204**	**221**	**235**
Increase the annual observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat onboard occupants to 96.0% by 2022;	95.9%	96.0%	Annual	**97.3%**	**97.2%**	**97.1%**	**96.3%**	**95.9%**
Maintain bicyclist fatalities under the projected 25 (2018-2022 rolling average) by 2022	24	25	Annual	**23**	**29**	**15**	**30**	**21**
			5 Year Rolling Avg.	**20**	**23**	**23**	**23**	**24**

Table 9-1 (cont.): Georgia 2022 Statewide Highway Safety Plan Performance Targets

Traffic Crash Data

Table 9-2, 9-3 and 9-4 summarize the traffic injury and fatalities data for the MATS Area for the five most recent years available (2016-2020; N=39,192 crashes; 37.975 in Macon-Bibb County; 768 crashes in the MATS portion of Jones County; 291 crashes in the MATS portion of Monroe County), These crashes were analyzed to identify high crash locations in the MATS region. Crash data was downloaded from the Numetrics crash data warehouse, which is overseen by the Georgia Dept. of Transportation Safety Program Office. The data warehouse is populated by copies of accident records provided to the Georgia Electronic Accident Reporting System (GEARS), which are then cleaned and formatted for general distribution through the Numetrics website.

County	Accident Coding	Total Accidents (2016 - 2020)	Bike Related	Pedestrian Related	Not Bike or Ped Related
N/A	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	1	0	0	1
N/A	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	1	0	0	1
N/A	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	9	0	0	9
N/A	(O) No Injury	141	0	0	141
N/A	Unknown	6	0	0	6
Bibb	(K) Fatal Injury	160	0	51	109
Bibb	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	517	13	61	443
Bibb	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	1,985	29	100	1,856
Bibb	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	8,069	11	104	7,954
Bibb	(O) No Injury	26,629	11	54	26,564
Bibb	Unknown	615	0	0	615
Jones	(K) Fatal Injury	12	0	0	12
Jones	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	24	0	1	23
Jones	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	57	0	0	57
Jones	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	73	0	0	73
Jones	(O) No Injury	601	0	1	600
Jones	Unknown	1	0	0	1
Monroe	(K) Fatal Injury	1	0	0	1
Monroe	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	7	0	0	7
Monroe	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	16	1	0	15
Monroe	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	36	0	0	36
Monroe	(O) No Injury	229	0	0	229
Monroe	Unknown	2	0	0	2
Grand Total	**(K) Fatal Injury**	173	0	51	122
	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	549	13	62	474
	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	2,059	30	100	1,929
	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	8,187	11	104	8,072
	(O) No Injury	27,600	11	55	27,534
	Unknown	624	0	0	624

Table 9-2: Accident Summary for MATS Area, by County and Fatality/Injury Coding: 2016-2020

Figures 9-1 through 9-4 shows the spatial distribution of fatality and serious injury crashes involving pedestrians or cyclists across the MATS area from 2016 through 2020.

Pedestrian Involved Crashes

Between 2016 and 2020, there were 51 crashes in the MATS area resulting in fatal injuries to pedestrians, resulting in 53 total deaths; 62 crashes involving pedestrians resulting in serious injuries to 64 persons; and 100 crashes involving pedestrians that resulted in minor injuries to 101 persons. All except one of these accidents were in located in the Bibb County area.

MATS Fatalities (not # of crashes) (Data from GEARS/Numetrics)

	MATS				Macon-Bibb Co.				Jones Co. (MATS only)				Monroe Co. (MATS only)			
Year	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian
2011	21	18	0	3	19	16	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
2012	18	15	0	3	17	14	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
2013	34	25	1	8	32	24	0	8	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
2014	23	17	0	6	22	16	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	21	16	0	5	21	16	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	30	20	0	10	27	17	0	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	38	31	0	7	34	27	0	7	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	0
2018	36	20	0	16	35	19	0	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2019	39	28	0	11	37	26	0	11	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
2020	42	33	0	9	37	28	0	9	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**302**	**223**	**1**	**78**	**281**	**203**	**0**	**78**	**15**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**5**	**1**	**0**
5 Year Rolling Averages																
2012-2016	25.2	18.6	0.2	6.4	23.8	17.4	0	6.4	1	1	0	0	0.4	0.2	0.2	0
2013-2017	29.2	21.8	0.2	7.2	27.2	20	0	7.2	1.6	1.6	0	0	0.4	0.2	0.2	0
2014-2018	29.6	20.8	0	8.8	27.8	19	0	8.8	1.6	1.6	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0
2015-2019	32.8	23	0	9.8	30.8	21	0	9.8	1.6	1.6	0	0	0.4	0.4	0	0
2016-2020	37	26.4	0	10.6	34	23.4	0	10.6	2.6	2.6	0	0	0.4	0.4	0	0

Table 9-3: Traffic Accident Fatalities for MATS Area, by County, with 5 Year Rolling Averages: 2016-2020

MATS Serious Injuries (using GDOT definition; data from GEARS/Numetrics)

	MATS				Macon-Bibb Co.				Jones Co. (MATS only)				Monroe Co. (MATS only)			
Year	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian	All	Motor Vehicle	Bicyclist	Pedestrian
2011	206	202	0	4	193	189	0	4	5	5	0	0	8	8	0	0
2012	261	244	0	17	259	242	0	17	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	110	99	0	11	107	96	0	11	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
2014	94	85	1	8	91	82	1	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	100	93	0	7	96	89	0	7	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	0
2016	99	85	0	14	96	82	0	14	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	113	91	3	19	110	88	3	19	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	158	147	0	11	155	144	0	11	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2019	126	114	4	8	110	99	4	7	13	12	0	1	3	3	0	0
2020	186	166	6	14	177	157	6	14	5	5	0	0	4	4	0	0
Total	1453	1326	14	113	1394	1268	14	112	41	40	0	1	18	18	0	0
5 Year Rolling Averages																
2012-2016	132.8	121.2	0.2	11.4	129.8	118.2	0.2	11.4	2.4	2.4	0	0	0.6	0.6	0	0
2013-2017	103.2	90.6	0.8	11.8	100	87.4	0.8	11.8	2.6	2.6	0	0	0.6	0.6	0	0
2014-2018	112.8	100.2	0.8	11.8	109.6	97	0.8	11.8	3	3	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0
2015-2019	119.2	106	1.4	11.8	113.4	100.4	1.4	11.6	5	4.8	0	0.2	0.8	0.8	0	0
2016-2020	136.4	120.6	2.6	13.2	129.6	114	2.6	13	5.4	5.2	0	0.2	1.4	1.4	0	0

Table 9-4: Traffic Accident Serious Injuries for MATS Area, by County, with 5 Year Rolling Averages: 2016-2020



Figure 9-1: Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Cyclists or Pedestrians, 2016-2020



Figure 9-2: Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Pedestrian Fatalities, 2016-2020



Figure 9-3: Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Pedestrian Serious Injuries, 2016-2020



Figure 9-4: Distribution of Collisions Across MATS Area Involving Cyclist Serious Injuries, 2016-2020

The primary concentration and concentration of pedestrian-involved accidents for 2016 through 2020 are listed in Table 9-5, below.

Bibb	Total Accidents	Fatal Accidents	# Deaths	Serious Injury Accidents	# Serious Injuries	Minor Injury Accidents	# Minor Injuries
Pio Nono Ave (between Suwanee Ave & Houston Ave/Hawkinsville Rd.)	19	6	6	7	7	6	7
Gray Hwy (Between I-75 and Old ClintonRd.)	11	5	5	4	4	2	2
Eisenhower Pkwy (between Felton Ave. & Brookhave Rd.)	8	4	4	2	2	2	2
Hawkinsville Rd. (from Houston Rd. to Houston County Line)	11	4	4	5	6	2	2
Houston Rd. (from Eisenhower Pkwy to Guy Paine Rd.)	7	0	0	2	2	5	5
Columbus Rd. (Between Bishop Rd. and Brentwood Ave.	3	0	0	0	0	3	3
Jones							
State Route 18/5 Points Rd.	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Monroe							
No Pedestrian Collisions Reported in this part of MATS area for 2016 - 2022							

Table 9-5: Identification of Problem Corridors for Accidents Involving Pedestrians in the MATS Area, based on 2016-2020 GEARS Reporting

Several of these corridors are already well known in the Bibb County area as major accident hot spots. To that end, the Macon-Bibb County Pedestrian Safety Review Board (PSRB) and the Macon-Bibb County Engineering Office have engaged in Road Safety Audits (RSAs) to identify what solutions might be applied in these areas to reduce the number and lethality of accidents in the future. Details on the various RSAs are discussed below.

Bicycle Involved Crashes

Between 2016 and 2020, there were 43 crashes involving cyclists resulting in serious injuries to 13 persons, and 30 crashes involving cyclists that resulted in minor injuries to 30 persons. Fortunately, there were no fatal accidents involving cyclists during this period. All except one of these accidents were in located in the Bibb County area. The primary concentration and concentration of pedestrian-involved accidents for 2016 through 2020 are listed in Table 9-5, below.

Bibb	Total Accidents	Fatal Accidents	# Deaths	Serious Injury Accidents	# Serious Injuries	Minor Injury Accidents	# Minor Injuries
Napier Ave. (between Crescent Dr. and Brookdale Ave.)	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
Log Cabin Dr. (from Mercer Univ. Dr. to Presidential Pkwy)	2	0	0	1	1	1	1
Emry Highway (Maynard St. to Indian Cir.)	3	0	0	0	0	3	3
Mercer Univ. Dr. (from Edna Pl. to Log Cabin Rd.)	3	0	0	0	0	3	3
Jones							
No Bicycle Collisions Reported in this part of MATS area for 2016 - 2020							
Monroe							
Norfolk Southern Railroad Crossing at State Route 19	1	0	0	0	0	1	1

Table 9-6: Identification of Problem Corridors for Accidents Involving Cyclists in the MATS Area, based on 2016-2020 GEARS Reporting

Unlike the results for the pedestrian involved major accident hot spots, there is no discernable spatial clustering for accidents involving cyclists. The only pattern appears to be that accidents involving cyclists seem to be most prevalent when transitioning between a lower and higher service level road (e.g., from Log Cabin Dr., a Local Street, to Mercer University Dr. (a major arterial, and part of the U.S. Highway system).

Analysis of Accident Contributing Factors

While a deadly or serious injury crash can happen anywhere, a variety of factors contribute to crashes with these specific outcomes. These design factors usually coincide with streets running through lower-income neighborhoods where people rely heavily on walking and transit.

Factor: Street Design

The safest streets slow down traffic, provide separation between modes, and provide visual cues that make it clear that people using different modes share the space. These streets keep all people safer—even when they make mistakes.

At the other end of the spectrum, wide streets with four or more lanes of fast-moving traffic, unprotected pedestrian crossings and bike lanes, and longer distances between signals are the places where deadly crashes happen most often.

Factor: Speed

Figure 9-5 shows how speed impacts the severity of a crash. A person walking who is struck by a vehicle traveling at 40+ mph is 8 times more likely to die or receive a serious injury than one struck by a vehicle traveling at less than 20 mph.[15]



Figure 9-5: Impact Speed and a Pedestrian's Risk of Severe Injury or Death

In a community where walkers and bicyclist make up a disproportionate number of traffic deaths, slowing speeds is critical. Obtaining that objective will take a suite of policy, infrastructure, education, and enforcement actions.

Posted speed limits tell drivers the speed at which they should be driving in normal conditions. In turn, the posted speed needs to match the speed that is safe. Street design is integral to achieving the desired driving speed, directly influencing the driving speed that feels comfortable. Street and lane width, signal spacing, markings, buffers, curb extensions, and medians can all affect a driver's speed.

In tandem with design, working to change social norms, education, and enforcement reinforces community expectations about safety and compliance.

Factor: Impairments and Distractions

Since 2016, only one fatal crash in the MATS Area (resulting in two deaths) was attributed to alcohol or drug impairment (crash occurred in Macon-Bibb, 2019). However, there are still other impediments and distractions, such as excessive speed (mentioned above), and distractions from mobile devices. However, by far, the greatest contributing factor to the severity and lethality of vehicle accidents is the unsafe operation of the vehicle by the drivers themselves.

County	Accident Coding	Total Accidents (2016 - 2020)	No Special Contributing Factor	Unsafe Operation of Vehicle	Speeding	Under Influence of Alcohol/Drugs	Distraction by Mobile Device
N/A	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	1	1	0	0	0	0
N/A	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	1	1	0	0	0	0
N/A	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	9	7	1	0	1	0
N/A	(O) No Injury	141	90	46	4	1	0
N/A	Unknown	6	5	1	0	0	0
Bibb	(K) Fatal Injury	160	133	16	9	1	1
Bibb	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	517	424	77	11	5	-
Bibb	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	1,985	1,312	573	69	25	6
Bibb	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	8,069	3,670	4,104	214	69	12
Bibb	(O) No Injury	26,629	12,662	13,241	511	157	58
Bibb	Unknown	615	470	122	19	2	2
Jones	(K) Fatal Injury	12	8	4	-	-	-
Jones	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	24	19	5	-	-	-
Jones	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	57	47	7	1	2	-
Jones	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	73	52	17	-	4	-
Jones	(O) No Injury	601	487	94	12	7	1
Jones	Unknown	1	1	-	-	-	-
Monroe	(K) Fatal Injury	1	1	-	-	-	-
Monroe	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	7	7	-	-	-	-
Monroe	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	16	13	2	1	-	-
Monroe	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	36	23	13	-	-	-
Monroe	(O) No Injury	229	174	44	9	2	-
Monroe	Unknown	2	1	1	-	-	-
Grand Total	**(K) Fatal Injury**	**173**	**142**	**20**	**9**	**1**	**1**
	(A) Suspected Serious Injury	**549**	**451**	**82**	**11**	**5**	**-**
	(B) Suspected Minor/Visible Injury	**2,059**	**1,373**	**582**	**71**	**27**	**6**
	(C) Possible Injury / Complaint	**8,187**	**3,752**	**4,135**	**214**	**74**	**12**
	(O) No Injury	**27,600**	**13,413**	**13,425**	**536**	**167**	**59**
	Unknown	**624**	**477**	**124**	**19**	**2**	**2**

Table 9-7: Description of Contributing Factors for Accidents in MATS Area, by County and Fatality/Injury Coding: 2016 - 2020

Macon-Bibb County Pedestrian Safety Review Board

Responding to concerns about pedestrian safety, the Macon-Bibb County Commission created the multi-department Pedestrian Safety Review Board (PSRB) in April 2015 charging it with finding ways to make all of the county's roads, streets, and alleys safe for pedestrians.

Meeting each month, the Board establishes a forum for the sheriff's department, health department, county schools, traffic engineers, facilities management, planning and zoning, elected officials, American Association of Retired Persons, and concerned citizens to develop strategies for creating a safer environment for pedestrians.

Since the previous transportation plan update in 2017, PSRB has:

- Restriped crosswalks at Napier Ave at Pio Nono Ave and Hillcrest Ave at Pio Nono in conjunction with GDOT striping Cherokee Ave, to facilitate safe pedestrian movement to the teen pregnancy center at Cherokee St.

- Installed Mid-block crossing with Rapid Flashing Beacons (RFB) and refuge-island installed on Montpelier Ave at Bentley's Funeral Home.
- Installed mid-block crosswalk at Ingram Pye School
- Installed speed awareness signs on Anthony Rd. Additionally, speed limits reduced on Anthony Rd with new school flashers installed and changed complete length of Anthony Rd into a school zone.
- Installed speed awareness signs on Nottingham Drive and reduced speed limit.
- Lowered speed limits on Upper River Rd.
- Installed new school flasher for Northeast School Complex (never had them before).
- Refreshed crosswalks in Beall's Hill area, still ongoing/in process.
- Road Safety Audits (RSAs) requested to GDOT have been completed and new projects are being accomplished and designed from those RSAs (see details on RSAs below).
- Eight new crosswalks added in Tindall Fields area to facilitate safer walking to area interests (Ingram Pye School, Buck Melton Center, Little Richard Penniman park)
- Refreshed crosswalks at various intersections: Wesleyan Dr at Forsyth Rd., Napier Ave at Forsyth Rd., Tom Hill Sr Dr. at Northside Dr., Napier Ave at Mumford Rd
- HAWK System (High Intensity Activated cross Walk) installed on College St by Alexander School
- HAWK system installed on Eisenhower Pkwy at C St due to RSA
- Speed bumps and humps have been installed in multiple high pedestrian traffic areas
- Raised crosswalk with RFBs installed in Ingleside village
- Speed tables with signage installed on Smokey Glover Blvd in Central City Park
- LED Streetlights replaced old incandescent lights throughout Macon Bibb to help motorist see the pedestrian traffic better
- Installed new LED streetlights at intersections that were high in pedestrian traffic
- Maintain sidewalk lighting for pedestrian safety, soon to be replaced by LEDs if money is approved
- 29 new LED streetlights added along Eisenhower Pkwy at key intersections with pedestrian facilities in conjunction with Eisenhower Business Improvement District
- Speed limits lowered on several county maintained road with high pedestrian traffic
- Macon-Bibb County approved the Vision Zero Policy
- Macon-Bibb County approved the Complete Streets Policy (locally named "Irene's Law)

Towards Safer Roads: Road Safety Audits

In order to begin addressing issues related to pedestrian and cyclist accidents, in 2016, Macon-Bibb County and GDOT began conducting Road Safety Audits (RSA) on high collision roadways within the county. An RSA is a formal safety performance examination of an existing or future road or intersection by an audit team. RSAs are used to identify potential solutions leading to both short-term improvements and longer term efforts including construction projects. It is a proactive, innovative approach that helps identify safety issues to be considered in future road improvement projects.

The findings of an RSA are unique to the safety concerns identified on each roadway. For example, the Eisenhower Parkway (U.S. Hwy 80) RSA identified high speeds, large

intersections, long distances between protected crossings, and a lack of dedicated pedestrian and bicycle facilities as significant safety challenges confronting people walking, biking and taking the bus on the corridor. Numerous other issues impact the safety of motor vehicle users.

As of October 2016, RSAs have been completed for portions of Eisenhower Parkway (US. Hwy 80), Emery Highway (U.S. Hwy 23), and portions of Jeffersonville Road (U.S. Hwy 80). A county led RSA is under development for portions of Gray Highway (U.S. Hwy 129). All three audits resulted in similar recommendations, including:

1. Complete intersection improvement projects that upgrade signal equipment, provide ADA accessible curb ramps and sidewalks access to bus stops and add intersection lighting.
2. Where appropriate, convert median breaks along the corridor into R-cuts to reduce conflicts and improve safety.
3. Add sidewalks and bike lanes and consider lane reconfigurations that would greatly improve access and safety for people walking, taking transit, and riding bikes, as well as provide a more uniform, predictable, and safe corridor for motor vehicle users.
4. Install raised pavement markings and refreshing all striping to improve visibility.

Conclusion

Safety is an essential consideration in the development and growth of the MATS transportation network. Many federal, state and local directives incorporate safety into the transportation planning process. With new research and available data, safety can be incorporated into the transportation project development process (planning, design, and maintenance) to effectively identify countermeasures to reduce crashes and crash severity throughout the MATS region.

Chapter 10 | Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the current efforts in the MATS area to promote pedestrian and bicycle modes of travel. The crash and safety aspects of these modes were covered in the previous chapter. This chapter focuses on policies and design strategies that have been put in place to support non-motorized modes of travel for all users. Encouraging non-motorized travel modes provides a variety of personal as well as societal benefits, including:

- **Equity** Walking and bicycling are affordable transportation options available to everyone. Walking and bicycling facilities should be designed to be used by all County residents, not just those who are fit and fast walkers or those confident riding bicycles swiftly or in traffic. Designing streets for safe walking and bicycling can also lead to safer driving and fewer mode conflicts.
- **Personal Health** Active transportation helps people meet recommended physical activity levels, thereby reducing chronic disease and associated health care costs. Improved walking and bicycling infrastructure for recreation and daily trips to work, running errands, or taking kids to school creates a sustained increase in physical activity and a healthier community.
- **Economic Benefits** Business and employee relocation decisions are increasingly based on the quality of life considerations such as walking and bicycling facilities. Active transportation infrastructure also generates tourism revenue, supports local business, and creates jobs.
- **Improved Air Quality and Improved Travel Network Congestion** Replacing driving trips with walking and bicycling trips can play an important part in a comprehensive strategy to improve both air quality and travel network congestion throughout the region. Both goals are served by the same basic principle: every trip completed by a non-motorized mode is a car trip that has been avoided. That in turn equates to fuel that isn't burned, and delays that aren't created on the travel network. Both fuel and space are limited resources that need to be managed in order to reduce negative impacts (i.e., pollution, excessive lost time in travel, wear and tear on infrastructure), extend the life of limited resources, and reduced peak hour congestion for motorists.

The strategies for how to best achieve these benefits of non-motorized travel are the subject of a variety of Federal, State and local strategies.

National Guidance for Pedestrian and Bicyclist Transportation Options

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015 continued the emphasis placed under its predecessors (MAP-21) on promoting non-motorized travel. While there are pedestrian and bicyclist references in many provisions, in summary:

- Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure projects remain broadly eligible across Federal-aid highway and transit programs.

- U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), States, MPOs, and cities should continue to promote and adopt design criteria and standards that provide for the safe and adequate accommodation of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorized users.

USDOT policy continues to be the incorporation of safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems.

In support of this commitment, transportation agencies and local communities should go beyond minimum design standards and requirements to create safe, attractive, sustainable, accessible, and convenient bicycling and walking networks. Such actions should include:

- Considering walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes.
- Ensuring that there are transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, especially children.
- Going beyond minimum design standards.
- Integrating bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges.
- Collecting data on walking and biking trips.
- Setting mode share targets for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time.
- Removing snow from sidewalks and shared-use paths.
- Improving nonmotorized facilities during maintenance projects.

The above-referenced code sections describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved throughout the planning process, should not be adversely affected by other transportation projects, and should be able to track annual obligations and expenditures on nonmotorized transportation facilities. (Source: "United States Department of Transportation Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations," signed on March 11, 2010)

This DOT policy is based on various sections of the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in Title 23—Highways, Title 49—Transportation, and Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare. The State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) planning regulations describe how walking and bicycling are to be accommodated throughout the planning process (e.g., see 23 CFR 450.200, 23 CFR 450.300, 23 U.S.C. 134(h), and 135(d)).

In furtherance of these policies, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) of 2021 mandates certain funding set asides for increasing Safe and Accessible transportation options. Specifically:

- Each MPO must use at least 2.5% of its' PL funding allocation (***and each State*** use 2.5% of its State Planning and Research funding awarded under 23 USC 505) on specified planning activities to increase safe and accessible for multiple travel modes of all ages and abilities (Source: PL 117-58 §11206(b));

- A State or MPO has the ability to opt out of this requirement (with the approval of the Secretary of Transportation) ***if*** the State or MPO has Complete Streets standards and policies in place, and has developed an up to date Complete Streets prioritization plan that identifies specific lists of projects to improve the safety, mobility or access of a street (Source: Source: PL 117-58 §11206(e))

The Complete Streets paradigm, and the policies it supports, is discussed below. Macon-Bibb County, the largest entity in the current MATS MPO area, has recently adopted such a Complete Streets policy. It is set to take effect starting July 1, 2022.

State Guidance for Pedestrian and Bicyclist Transportation Options

In the MATS region, both GDOT and the local governments comprising MATS MPO have authority and bear responsibility for implementing road designs, based on adopted design policy guidelines. In support of improved adoption of non-motorized travel modes, both Macon-Bibb County and GDOT have adopted the Complete Streets paradigm regarding infrastructure design and program development for new transportation projects.

Complete Streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities. Complete Streets make it easy to cross the street, walk to shops, and bicycle to work. They allow buses to run on time and make it safe for people to walk to and from train stations.

Complete Streets on State Roads - GDOT's Design Policy Manual

GDOT's primary strategy for implementing Complete Streets is to incorporate bicycle, pedestrian, and transit accommodations into roadway construction and maintenance projects. Local governments and planning agencies can also implement Complete Streets by partnering with GDOT, and by initiating and managing their own locally-funded projects and programs.

The following principles form a basis for the bicycle and pedestrian accommodation policies included in GDOT's Design Policy Manual:

1. Accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians should be integrated into roadway construction projects through design features appropriate to the context and function of the transportation facility.
2. The design and construction of new facilities should anticipate likely demand for bicycling and pedestrian facilities within the design life of the facility.
3. The design of intersections and interchanges should accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a manner that addresses the need to safely cross roadways, as well as to travel along them.
4. The design of new and reconstructed roadways should not preclude the future accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians along and across corridors.
5. While it is not the intent of maintenance resurfacing to expand existing facilities, opportunities to provide facilities or to enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists should be considered during the development of these projects.

The following principles form a basis for the transit accommodation policies presented in the remainder of this chapter:

1. Accommodations for transit should be integrated into roadway construction projects through design features appropriate for the context and function of the roadway, and associated transit facility (e.g., transit stops, stations, or park-and-ride lots).
2. The design of roadways and intersections should address the need of pedestrians to safely walk along and across roadways, to access nearby transit facilities.
3. The design of new and reconstructed roadways should not preclude the accommodation of transit facilities (e.g., for light rail, streetcars, and bus rapid transit) planned and funded for construction within the design life of the roadway project.

The Complete Streets paradigm is reflected in the most recent Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), as well as the 2018 – 2022 Georgia Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Action Plan sets as its goal the reduction of the number of pedestrian deaths to less than 180 per year by 2022. The plan identifies 11 strategies to achieve this goal:

1. Collect, map, and publish data on pedestrian safety, the walking environment, pedestrian crashes, and safety risks;
2. Incorporate pedestrian safety strategies, treatments and performance measures into state transportation plans, policies, and design guides.;
3. Incorporate pedestrian safety strategies and performance measures into regional and local plans
4. Assess new construction and maintenance projects on state routes for opportunities to incorporate pedestrian safety elements early in the process;
5. Use crash data and annual road safety audits to identify roads with ongoing pedestrian issues. Collaborate with regional and local governments to prioritize selection and implementation of safety improvements on those roads;
6. Proactively identify and mitigate systemic pedestrian safety hazards on Georgia roads;
7. Create and distribute educational material to promote safety for pedestrians;
8. Provide annual trainings on pedestrian safety that target transportation and public health professionals, law enforcement officers, elected officials, and community advocates;
9. Increase outreach and education on pedestrian safety for state, regional, and local agencies and facilitate collaboration between them;
10. Allocate target level of HSIP, 402, 405h, regional, and local funds to pedestrian safety projects;
11. Align fund expenditures on pedestrian safety projects and programs with Focus designations, data on pedestrian crash and fatality factors, and proven countermeasures. (Source: Georgia Pedestrian Safety Action Plan: 2018-2022; http://www.dot.ga.gov/DS/Travel/BikePed)

Similarly, the 2018 Georgia Bicycle Safety Action Plan sets a goal of under 15 fatalities and 32 major injuries per year by 2025. The plan identifies the following strategies to help achieve that goal:

Objective - Gather data that helps optimize selection of bicycle safety improvements

1. Continue to map collision data, update annually and use it to target key corridors and hot spots for road safety audits and improvements.
2. Develop method and track the annual miles built of bikeable shoulders, bike lanes, and protected bike lanes.
3. Implement at least two road safety audits per year in each of the GDOT districts that consider bicycle safety when appropriate.
4. Use data on the injury outcomes of bicyclists involved in collisions who are taken to hospitals and trauma centers to guide safety improvements.

Objective - Systematically & reliably incorporate proven bicyclist safety countermeasures during the design process

5. Develop and implement procedures for incorporating bicycle safety improvements into maintenance projects on corridors identified by crash data as high risk for bicyclists ("twinning").
6. Assess state and federally funded projects for bicycle improvements early in the planning stage
7. Incorporate bicycle safety strategies and performance measures into state transportation plans; incorporate bicyclist safety treatments into Complete Streets Guidelines, Georgia Streetscapes and Pedestrian Design Guide, and the Driveway Manual
8. Incorporate bicycle safety strategies and performance measures into regional transportation plans, MPO TIP's, and MTP's;
9. Develop case for funding full time Complete Streets engineer within the Georgia DOT.

Objective - Train and engage partners on strategies that will increase bicyclist safety

10. Develop and implement a targeted "Three Foot Passing Law" campaign using advertising outlets such as billboards, gas pump toppers, bus wraps, and signs on police cars.
11. Document the enforcement of the 3 foot law
12. Provide training workshops on designing streets for bicycle safety to transportation professionals, including for-profit and non-profit, government officials and others.
13. Improve the capacity of school-based and for-profit driver's education programs by assessing current programs, developing and distributing new materials and providing training.
14. Expand the driver's permit test question bank to include questions about the three foot passing law.
15. Engage a law enforcement officer with the Bicycle Safety Task Team to assist with a broader enforcement campaign. Offer a small number of competitive grants to police agencies to implement a pilot targeted 3 foot passing law program
16. Provide annual bicyclist summits or trainings targeting transportation and public health professionals, elected officials, advocates and others.
17. Develop short videos (in the style of public service announcements) explaining bicycle related laws for law enforcement offices to be shown in between officer shifts.

Objective - Establish and allocate funding streams needed to achieve all strategies

18. Document current allocation of HSIP, STP Urban, and 402 funds that are going to bicycle safety education and infrastructure improvements.
19. Use 'Share the Road' tag revenues and funding from other state sources to annually fund bicycle safety outreach and education provided by nonprofit organizations such as Georgia Bikes, BikeAthens, Savannah Bicycle Campaign, the Atlanta Bicycle Coalition, and others.
    (Source: Georgia Bicycle Safety Action Plan: 2018; http://www.dot.ga.gov/DS/Travel/BikePed)

These goals are consistent with those already identified in Chapters 2 and 9 of the 2050 MTP.

Local Policies and Procedures

The main strategies for promoting non-motorized travel are predominantly based on the efforts of Macon-Bibb County. Those efforts fall into three specific examples: The Macon-Bibb County Bikeway and Pedestrian Plan, adoption of the Vision Zero concept, and the recently adopted Complete Streets Ordinance.

The Macon-Bibb County Bikeway and Pedestrian Plan

The Macon-Bibb County Bikeways and Pedestrian Plan (2003) serves as the county's blueprint for making walking and bicycling safe and efficient transportation options for people of all ages and abilities. The pedestrian element explored pedestrian safety improvement needs. The bicycle element identified bike routes that can be improved with relatively minimal local investment and larger bicycle facility upgrades that will require new construction that may need to be coordinated with the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects.

The plan helped guide the establishment of three goals for the development of safe, convenient and accessible bicycle and pedestrian transportation options in the MATS region. These goals were included in the 2040 LRTP (adopted in 2013; updated 2017), and are maintained in this update.

Goal #1: Create a system in the MATS area that will provide safe, convenient, and accessible bicycle and pedestrian facilities for all users.

Objective 1: Develop a connected system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that serve major origins and destination points within the study area such as employment centers, commercial areas, educational/cultural facilities and provide bicycle routes that offer recreational value.

Objective 2: Ensure all recommended bicycle and pedestrian facilities are ADA compliant.

Objective 3: Encourage an interconnection of bicycle and pedestrian facilities with other modes of alternative forms of transportation such as transit in order to reduce dependence on private transportation, reduce traffic and improve air quality.

Objective 4: Examine residential and commercial development regulations and encourage the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian friendly facilities in site plan reviews.

Objective 5: Incorporate a maintenance program to increase the longevity of safe and usable facilities.

Goal #2: Develop an educational and promotional program to encourage bicycling and pedestrian forms of transportation.

Objective 1: Develop a bicycle suitability map that describes the existing conditions of different roadways to allow cyclists to select a route appropriate to their skill level.

Objective 2: Develop pedestrian brochures to encourage walking between major points of interest.

Objective 3: Encourage employers to accommodate the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians.

Objective 4: Encourage and implement a MATS area wide Bike to Workday.

Objective 5: Encourage and implement a bicycle and pedestrian safety program in area schools

Goal #3: Identify funding sources to implement, upgrade and maintain bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Objective 1: Encourage the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the design of scheduled TIP road projects.

Objective 2: Actively pursue all eligible federal and state grants for the bicycle and pedestrian plan, development, and maintenance.

Vision Zero Concept

The Vision Zero concept was created in Sweden in 1997 and is widely credited with a significant reduction in fatal and serious crashes on Sweden's roads since that time. Cities across the United States are adopting bold Vision Zero initiatives that share common principles.

In May 2016, the Macon-Bibb County Commission unanimously passed a resolution supporting Vision Zero strategies in Macon-Bibb County. Macon-Bibb County's Vision Zero goal is an important first step in reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries on our roadways.

Complete Streets

On June 22, 2021, the Macon-Bibb County Board of Commissioners adopted a Complete Streets resolution, updating Chapter 24 of the Macon-Bibb County Code of Ordinances with the objective "*to make the practice of creating Complete Streets a routine part of everyday operations, working in coordination with other departments, agencies, and jurisdictions to*

maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation . . . The policy will promote safety, quality of life, and economic development while striving to support existing neighborhoods and those who reside in them."(Macon Bibb County Ordinance #O-21-0050).

Specifically, the policy directs that:

- Macon-Bibb County shall modify its procedures, documents, training programs, and performance measures by July 1, 2022, to ensure that the needs of all users of the highways, roads, and streets in Macon-Bibb County are included in all phases of all transportation projects, including funding, planning, designing, operating, and maintaining transportation infrastructure.
- Complete Streets projects may contain, without limitation, the following facilities and amenities
    - pavement markings and signs;
    - sidewalks and pedestrian safety improvements such as medians, curb extensions, and crosswalks;
    - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible curb ramps and accessible pedestrian signals;
    - transit stops and signage;
    - improved pedestrian and bicycle access to transit stops and stations;
    - protected or separated bike lanes or shared use lanes;
    - bike lanes;
    - bicycle activated street signals;
    - bicycle parking facilities; and
    - street trees, landscaping, street lighting and street furniture.
- All public departments and private contractors are required to provide accommodations where feasible or reasonable for all modes during construction or repair work that infringes on the right of way of sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or accessibility infrastructure so that all people can continue to use the transportation system safely and efficiently. These temporary accommodations will be provided and maintained by the jurisdiction or entity responsible for necessitating an alternative in the right of way. These jurisdictions or private entities may include a city, county, local agency, or private or institutional development entities.
- The staff of appropriate Macon-Bibb County departments…shall review and develop, or propose revisions to plans, subdivision codes, procedures, rules, regulations, guidelines, programs, templates, design manuals, and other pertinent documents in accordance with their respective areas of expertise annually.
- In coordination with the Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning Commission, MATS MPO, and Georgia Department of Transportation, as appropriate, staff shall consider and, when practical, integrate, accommodate and balance the needs of all users in street projects. (Macon-Bibb County Code of Ordinances, Ch. 24, Sec. 24.23)

In the pursuit of these objectives, the policy also establishes a new Complete Streets Compliance Committee to ensure the enforcement of the ordinance. Voting membership on the Compliance Committee includes:

- The Executive Director of the Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning Commission or his or her designee;
- [Executive Director of] Macon-Bibb County Metropolitan Planning Organization or his or her designee;
- [Macon-Bibb County] Engineering or his or her designee;
- [Macon-Bibb County] Traffic Engineering or his or her designee;
- [Macon-Bibb County] Public Works or his or her designee;
- Citizen's Advisory Committee Chairperson for the MATS Technical Coordinating Committee or his or her designee;
- [Macon-Bibb County] Facility Management or his or her designee.
  (Macon-Bibb County Code of Ordinances, Ch. 24, Sec. 24.30)

The policy further defines what constitutes the factors considered to be in the public interest in the evaluation of a transportation project design proposal:

- Whether there has been a collision involving a bicycle or pedestrian on the roadway in question within the last 5 years;
- Existing annual average daily traffic ("AADT") and projected AADT as determined by the Travel Demand Model;
- Whether the posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour or less;
- The degree of current and potential bicycle or pedestrian use;
- Whether a proposed facility adds connectivity for existing infrastructure or connects destinations;
- Whether a proposed facility is identified in any official planning document that has been adopted by Macon-Bibb County;
- Whether there is demonstrated community support for the proposed facility;
- Whether the proposed facility is redundant or conflicting with other projects;
- Whether funding can be identified for the proposed facility and its maintenance;
- Whether the proposed facility would cause Level of Service to drop below LOS C;
- Whether the proposed facility fits within existing rights of way, if an off-street facility is proposed;
- Whether the proposed facility fits within the existing roadway, if an on-street facility is proposed; and
- Priority in finding feasibility should be given to projects in neighborhoods identified as low-to-moderate income by the most recent census data.
  (Macon-Bibb County Code of Ordinances, Ch. 24, Sec. 24.31)

Finally, the ordinance establishes annual reporting requirements, starting at the end of FY 2022 (i.e., June 30, 2022) on the following criteria

- Mileage of sidewalks created;
- Number of Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb cuts created;
- Mileage of on-street bicycle facilities created;
- Mileage of multi-use facilities created;
- Number of transit stops added;

- Transit ridership;
- Percentage of projects completed with Complete Streets focus and compliance;
- Safety and collision statistics across modes; and
- Number of projects implemented in low-moderate income census-tracts.

Examples of Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

With the policies and goals described above, it is necessary to identify specific strategies that will demonstrate progress towards more convenient, safer non-motorized travel mode options. Accomplishing the identified goals will require a coordinated approach that involves not only education, enforcement, and emergency response, but also innovative engineering. Engineering involves the strategic and prioritized design and installation of effective pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Pedestrian Facilities

Most trips begin and end as walking trips even when a car, bicycle, or bus is also involved. Macon's central business district has a largely complete walking network that extends along several arterials toward outlying neighborhoods. Most of the residential neighborhoods outside of Macon's urban core lack a complete walking network with sidewalks, safe crosswalks, and traffic calming designs that encourage walking.

Linear Facilities

Pedestrians use several different types of facilities in the MATS region, primarily sidewalks. Every street in the County should be designed for pedestrians.

Multi-Use Paths

These facilities are shared by many active transportation and recreation users including pedestrians, bicyclists, and in-line skaters. The Ocmulgee Heritage Trail is the premier multi-use path in the MATS Region. Eleven miles of the trail are currently open with several more miles planned to open over the next few years.

Neighborhood Byways

Neighborhood byways are multi-modal linear facilities on streets with low traffic volumes and speeds. Additionally, intersection improvements that allow bicyclists and pedestrians to cross large or busy streets are critical to their utility. Wayfinding signage and shared lane markings are also important components. Traffic diversion and calming measures are often used when traffic volumes or speeds are higher than desirable.

Sidewalks

Sidewalks are the most common walking facility in the MATS region. In 2016, there were roughly 293 miles of roads with sidewalks on one or both sides of the road in Macon-Bibb

County, which represents only 13% of all of the roads. Since that time, Macon-Bibb County has adopted an update to the County subdivision ordinance which requires that all properties less than 1 acre in size, developed or improved more than 50% of the assessed value “shall have sidewalk and curb and gutter in accordance with the standards set forth” in the County subdivision code (Macon Bibb County Ordinance #O-19-0003 §1; adopted 2/5/2019). Existing properties may be repaired or maintained in their current state, but if they are replaced or improved, they will become subject to the same sidewalk improvement requirements. Some sidewalks are directly adjacent to busy travel lanes and lack a buffer or barrier, while others are buffered and separated from traffic by landscaping, parking, seating, or other physical means.

The identification of gaps in the sidewalk network is a very fine-grained exercise. Aerial photography shows sidewalks missing on some busy arterial corridors, such as Bloomfield Drive, Eisenhower Parkway, and Gray Highway, in some commercial developments, such as in the Plantation Centre and Rivergate, and in many residential neighborhoods. These sidewalks should be filled in as redevelopment allows.

Landscaping & Street Furniture

Landscaping, street trees, and street furniture can have a profound effect on improving the pedestrian feel of a corridor. The County should include the following in appropriate streetscape designs:

- Landscaping and street trees, especially shade trees.
- Planters.
- Benches, tables, and chairs.

Lighting

Street lighting is often designed primarily for the safety and comfort of motorists except at intersections, where crosswalks are typically illuminated. The illumination of sidewalks and other walkways is often a separate consideration. Pedestrian lighting typically includes shorter lights (14-18' maximum pole heights) directly above walkways and accent lighting that illuminates features on or near buildings.

Pedestrian lighting increases drivers' visibility of pedestrians, promotes perceived personal security, illuminates potential hazards, and creates vibrant and inviting streetscapes. The addition of pedestrian-scale lighting should be considered in the urban core and neighborhood business districts, along busy arterials and multiuse paths, and in conjunction with significant street reconstructions.

Crossings and Intersections

The majority of pedestrian deaths occur at uncontrolled crossing locations such as mid-block or un-signalized intersections. These are among the most common locations for pedestrian fatalities generally because of inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities and insufficient or inconvenient

crossing opportunities, all of which create barriers to safe, convenient, and complete pedestrian networks.

Expecting pedestrians to travel significantly out of their way to cross a roadway to reach their destination is unrealistic and counterproductive to encouraging healthier transportation options. By focusing on uncontrolled locations, agencies can address a significant national safety problem and improve the quality of life for pedestrians of all ages and abilities.

Intersections in the region should be designed for pedestrian safety and comfort, with pedestrian enhancements appropriate to traffic speed, traffic volume, pedestrian crossing distance, and other similar factors. The section below, together with the following signals section, describes some of the primary options that should be considered for crossing and intersections improvements. As streets are repaved and reconstructed, pedestrian crossing ramps are being added. When reconstruction projects allow, additional improvements should be considered as part of those projects.

Crosswalks

Crosswalks exist everywhere that sidewalks and streets intersect, whether marked or not. Marked crosswalks provide a delineated space for pedestrians and other sidewalks users to cross. Differences in striping patterns (e.g. double ladder or piano key crosswalks) and paving surfaces (e.g. raised and/or brick crosswalks) offer varying levels of visibility and delineation between pedestrians and automobiles, bicyclists, and other roadway users.

Bulbouts

Bulbouts reduce the width of roadway crossings at intersections and mid-block crossings. They also create a visual traffic calming cue to drivers to slow for pedestrians, improve pedestrian visibility, and protect transit passengers as they board or alight from buses or streetcars. Sufficient space for bicyclists is a necessary design consideration.

Roundabouts

Roundabouts allow for constant vehicular traffic flow through intersections and do provide some benefits to pedestrians and bicyclists, such as reduced traffic speeds. However, they also have drawbacks. Yielding compliance at crosswalks may be reduced if the facility is not designed properly. Also, designs often require bicyclists to merge into traffic through the roundabout, which is uncomfortable for many riders.

Figure 10-1: Oglethorpe Roundabout

Median Refuge Islands

Refuge islands enable pedestrians to cross one direction of a street at a time. They are typically used in conjunction with crosswalks where traffic volumes or speeds are high or roads are wide. Sometimes other traffic control measures such as signals or flashing beacons are also used.

Figure 10-2: Median Refuge Islands - Source Richard Drdul, Flickr

Traffic Signal & Warning Beacon Considerations

Traffic signal standards are well established in the U.S. The MATS region carefully adheres to state and national standards. Typical concerns that pedestrians experience at signalized crossings include:

- Delays caused by long signal cycles.
- Lack of understanding of WALK and flashing DON'T WALK indications.
- Uncertainty about whether the button must be pressed to activate a pedestrian signal, particularly in downtown areas where signals operate differently during different times of day.
- Lack of confirmation that someone has already pressed a push button.
- Conflicts with turning vehicles at intersections.

Pedestrian Countdown Timers

Macon-Bibb County installs pedestrian countdown timers at county-owned traffic signals. Many GDOT owned signals also have pedestrian countdown timers and as GDOT upgrades pedestrian facilities, new countdown timers are installed. Pedestrian countdown timers improve safety by providing information to assist pedestrians with crossing decisions. Pushbuttons with confirmation lights are also sometimes used so that people can see whether the signal has been activated.

Figure 10-3: FHWA Recommended Pedestrian Safety Countermeasures

Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle facilities can generally be grouped into two categories – conventional and low-stress facilities.

Conventional Bike Facilities

Conventional facilities like bike lanes and shared lane markings have been standard practice in the U.S. for many years. They provide dedicated or shared space for confident bicyclists who have experience riding next to traffic.

Conventional Bike Lanes

This type of bikeway uses signage and striping to delineate roadway space for exclusive use of bicyclists. Conventional bike lanes are typically located to the right of the outside car lane. Parking may be allowed to the right of the bike lane.

Shared Lane Markings

Shared lane markings (i.e. "sharrows") indicate a travel lane shared by bicyclists and motor vehicles. According to the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO; https://nacto.org), shared lane markings "reinforce the legitimacy of bicycle traffic on the street and recommend proper bicyclist positioning."

Riding Bicycles on Sidewalks

Riding bicycles on sidewalks is not recommended except for children. Many Georgia cities and counties have regulations regarding where sidewalk riding is legal. Sidewalks were designed to accommodate pedestrians, not bicycles. Motorists are not looking for or expecting bicycles on sidewalks, which is potentially dangerous if you cross a driveway or pull back out onto the road from a sidewalk. A moving bicycle poses a danger to pedestrians. Bicyclists need to slow down or get off and walk if pedestrians are present, and call out or signal a warning if approaching from behind. When in doubt, bicyclists should always yield to pedestrians. Try to avoid sidewalk riding if at all possible. In Macon-Bibb County only children 10 and under are permitted to ride on sidewalks.

Source: GDOT, Georgia BIKE SENSE: A Guide for Cyclists & Motorists

Four Types of Bicyclists

Bicycle riders can be divided into 4 categories …

- **Strong & Fearless** - "will ride regardless of roadway conditions."
- **Enthused & Confident** - "comfortable sharing the roadway with automotive traffic, but they prefer to do so operating on designated bicycle facilities."
- **Interested but Concerned** - "curious about bicycling…they like riding a bicycle, but, they are afraid to ride."
- **No Way No How** - "not interested in bicycling at all, for reasons of topography, inability, or simply a complete and utter lack of interest."

A national survey conducted in 2016 indicates that 10% of respondents fell into the category of "strong and fearless" and another 10% were "enthused and confident." The vast majority of respondents – 50-60% - were "interested, but concerned" and 20-30% were "no way, no how." Though "strong and fearless" and "enthused and confident" bike riders will benefit from new bicycle facilities, it is the "interested, but concerned" members of the community who will most benefit from and be most attracted to expanded bike infrastructure.

Source: http://www.citylab.com/commute/2016/01/the-4-types-of-cyclists-youll-meet-on-us-city-streets/422787/

Low-Stress Bike Facilities

Low-stress bikeways appeal to a broader cross-section of the public than conventional facilities. Their low-stress nature is a result of greater separation from traffic; use of low-volume, low-speed streets depending on the specific facility type; and/ or directional wayfinding signage that directs bicyclists to destinations and specific routes much like interstate highway signage for automobiles.

Multi-Use Paths

A multi-use path is a facility that is physically separated from motorized vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier, and either within the highway or right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way. There are two existing multi-use paths in the MATS region: Tucker Road Trail (pedestrian only) and the Ocmulgee Heritage Trail.

There are two multi-use paths in the MATS region including much of the Ocmulgee Heritage Trail and the Tucker Road multi-use path (pedestrian only).

Tucker Road Multi -Use Trail - The Tucker Road Trail (pedestrian only) extends from Forsyth Road to Brandywine Drive in Macon-Bibb County. Though separated from vehicle traffic, at 5 feet in width does not meet GDOT's minimum width or road separation requirements for a multi-use trail.

Ocmulgee Heritage Trail - The Ocmulgee Heritage Trail is a multi-use trail connecting Central City Park to Amerson Water Works Park – and all of the neighborhoods and commercial areas nearby. Part multi-use trail (paved and gravel), part sidewalk the trail is a tremendous recreational resource that is regularly being improved.

Recent expansions to the trail include connections between Riverside Cemetery and Amerson Waterworks Park (currently gravel) – completed in winter 2017 - and the extension of the trail to Walnut Creek from the Otis Redding Bridge (planned to be under construction beginning in 2017). A 2017 scoping study will explore the potential for developing a Riverside Drive Greenway connecting the Otis Redding Bridge to Madison Street and the entrance to Riverside Cemetery.

Protected Bike Lanes

Protected bike lanes are separated from traffic by a physical barrier of some kind and are also distinct from the sidewalk. Barriers may be in the form of planters, raised curbs, parking, bollards, or other streetscape elements. Protected bike lanes can be configured for either one-way or two-way travel.

Buffered Bike Lanes

These are similar to conventional bike lanes with the difference being a painted buffer between the bike lane and adjacent car lane. Alternatively, the buffer may also be placed between the bike lane and parked cars. Where space permits, buffers are sometimes placed on both sides of the bike lane. Buffered bike lanes differ from protected bike lanes because the buffer space is paint rather than a physical barrier.

Proposed Bikeways

Several bikeways have been proposed in the MATS region that may one day provide safe, comfortable, and attractive bicycling connections to neighborhoods, commercial areas, parks and schools throughout Macon-Bibb County and much of the MATS region. Developing these bikeways is a long-range goal that will take several years to complete. There are currently few, if any, bicycle facilities on these routes and most currently require extensive travel on narrow sidewalks, which were not designed for bicycle travel, and mixed bicycle/motor vehicle travel, which many experienced bicyclists would find uncomfortable, unpleasant, and potentially dangerous and is not recommended for amateur bicyclists.

East Macon Bikeway - The East Macon bikeway (4 miles) traverses a historically and culturally significant portion of Macon and connects Main Street, Fort Hill Street, Shurling Drive, and Millerfield Road. This route provides access to several attractions in East Macon such as Fort Hawkins, Ocmulgee National Monument, Northeast Plaza Shopping Center, Shurlington Plaza, and various schools.

The East Macon Bikeway is challenged by high traffic volume, high vehicle speeds and lack of dedicated bicycle facilities.

Downtown Bikeway - The Downtown Bikeway (3 miles) traverses through many historical areas and neighborhoods in Macon and connects Mercer University to downtown. This bikeway connects Tattnall Square Park, Oglethorpe Street, College Street, Georgia Avenue, New Street and Walnut Street. This route provides access to such facilities as the U.S. Post Office, Washington Park, Macon's City Auditorium, Central City Park, and Tattnall Square Park.

Moderate daily vehicle use and moderate speeds make this route a potentially significant bicycling route if developed. However, on-street parking limits the type, quantity, and location of dedicated bicycle facilities along this route.

In September 2016, a **Macon Connects Pop-Up Bike Network** temporarily expanded upon the Downtown Bikeway. The Macon Connects downtown bikeway (5 miles) connected College Street, Walnut Street, Cherry Street, Poplar Street, Second Street, Third Street, Fifth Street, Oglethorpe Street and Forsyth Street and temporarily installed a variety of bicycle facilities on all of these streets, including: sharrows (i.e., bicycle symbols with chevrons painted on the road surface to indicate direction of travel, and advise motorists to be on alert for cyclists in the lane of traffic), conventional bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, two-way cycle tracks, and two-way median cycle tracks.

Freedom Park Bikeway - Freedom Park Bikeway (6 miles) connects Tattnall Square, Dannenberg Avenue, Holt Avenue, Beech Avenue, Wood Street, Bartlett Street, Roff Avenue, Lake Street, Fairmont Avenue, and Napier Avenue. This bikeway connects numerous residential neighborhoods, schools, and commercial areas.

Moderate daily vehicle use and moderate speeds for several sections of this route make this a potentially significant bicycling route if further developed with dedicated bicycle facilities. Bike lanes have been installed on a ¾ mile section of Napier Avenue between Ayers Road and Forsyth Road – though high speeds (40 mph) may make bicycling here uncomfortable for some. Wide vehicle lanes (15 ft) along this stretch of road could accommodate painted buffering to better protect bicyclists and slow vehicle traffic.

Columbus Road Bikeway - Columbus Road Bikeway (3.5 miles) connects Brentwood Avenue, Churchill Street, Berkner Street, Mercer University Drive, ending at Columbus Road. The route provides access to regional shopping centers such as the Macon Mall, Eisenhower Crossing @ Presidential Parkway, and many commercial establishments.

The majority of this route is on Mercer University Drive, which currently lacks dedicated bicycle facilities and has high daily vehicle use and speeds. To travel this bikeway safely most (if not all) bicyclists would have to use the 5-ft. sidewalks on Mercer University Drive, which were not designed to be and do not meet GDOT's minimum width or road separation requirements for a multi-use trail.

Central Route Bikeway - The Central Route Bikeway route is a state designated bike route and is part of a network of bike routes throughout the State of Georgia. The route spans the entire length of the county beginning on Forsyth Road near the Monroe County line and ending on Industrial Highway near the Houston County line. The route travels along Forsyth Road, Vineville Avenue, Pio Nono Avenue, Hawkinsville Road and Industrial Highway.

There are currently no dedicated bicycle facilities along this route and high daily traffic and high speeds limit the usefulness of this route to only the most experienced bicycle riders.

Sardis Church Road Bikeway - The Sardis Church Road Bikeway (6 miles) – expected to be completed in 2018, will connect Hawkinsville Road to Frank Amerson Parkway. This route will include a 4-ft., unbuffered bicycle lane in each direction.

Bass Road-Bolingbroke Loop Bikeway - Developed as part of a Transportation Enhancement grant application by the Middle Georgia Regional Commission, the Bass Road-Bolingbroke Loop bikeway (19 miles) connects Bass Road, Colaparchee Road, Zebulon Road, Estes Road, Dixie Highway, Pate Road and New Forsyth Road.

Commuting and Recreation Bicycle Routes for Future Consideration

The following routes were proposed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee as part of the 2040 LRTP process. These potential bicycle routes are included in this MTP update as

candidates for further research and possible development in the future. The routes were suggested as commuting or recreation routes. The bicycle routes are briefly summarized below.

North Macon to Downtown Commuter Route – (6 miles) Connects the Ocmulgee Heritage Trail and downtown to north Macon. The route connects Rivoli Drive, Northside Drive, Riverside Drive, Red Oak Drive, Clairmont Avenue, Audubon Drive, Riverview Road, North Pierce Avenue, Ocmulgee Heritage Trail.

East Macon Arc – These two routes are recreational routes that connect the Ocmulgee Heritage Trail and East Macon Park.

Route A – (16 miles) Connects Ocmulgee Heritage Trail Parkview Drive, Nottingham Drive, Curry Drive, Boulevard Drive, Clinton Road, Upper River Road, Stagecoach Road, Graham Road, Walnut Ridge Road, Old Gray Highway, Joycliff Road, New Clinton Road, Millerfield Road, Jeffersonville Road, and Ocmulgee East Boulevard.

Route B – (5 miles) Connects Ocmulgee Heritage Trail, Jeffersonville Road, and Ocmulgee East Boulevard.

Downtown to North Macon Commuter Routes - Located in the heart of Macon-Bibb County, these commuter routes connect the Central Business District, the Historic District, tourist attractions, recreational areas and many cultural and educational facilities. Much of this sector contains existing routes from the previous plans.

Route A - (6 miles) Connects Central City Park, Riverside Drive, Third Street, Mulberry Street, Georgia Avenue, College Street, Walnut Street, Clayton Street, Buford Place, McDonald Street, Pierce Avenue, Elizabeth Street, De Soto Street, Vineville Avenue, Hairmechanics Boulevard, Ridge Avenue, Forest Hill Road, Forsyth Road.

Route B – (7 miles) Connects Central City Park, Walnut Street, Seventh Street, Poplar Street, Fifth Street, Oglethorpe Street, College Street, Coleman Avenue, Napier Avenue, Birch Street, Hillcrest Avenue, Forsyth Road.

Downtown Scenic Circuit – (4 miles) Terminal Station is the focal point of this route, because of the tourist information and maps. This route connects Terminal Station, Fifth Street, Poplar Street, Seventh Street, Oglethorpe Street, College Street, Georgia Avenue, Orange Street, Bond Street, Mulberry Street, Second Street, Cherry Street.

Sub-South Route - (5.4 miles) Houston Road between Hawkinsville Road and Sardis Church Road.

South Lizella Route - (10 miles) Connects Fulton Mill Road, Heath Road, Harley Bridge Road, Sardis Church Road.

Tobesofkee / Wildwood Route (19 miles) - Connects Northside Drive, Rivoli Drive, Old Forsyth Road, Colaparchee Road, Zebulon Road, Lamar Road, Lower Thomaston Road, North Lizella Road, Hopewell Road, and Midway Road.

Conclusions

This chapter summarized the non-motorized travel strategies currently available and under development in the MATS MPO area. For details on specific projects currently under consideration, refer to Table 6-2 MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges Projects List and Table 6-5: Projects Identified for Further Study and Future Consideration in Chapter 6: Roads and Bridges Projects.

Chapter 11 | Freight Improvement and Aviation

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the current efforts in the MATS area to promote freight movement and aviation capabilities.

Overview: The U.S. Freight Transportation System

America's freight system is a complex, interdependent, multimodal system of infrastructure and services owned and operated by a mix of public and private sector entities. The system comprises physical infrastructure or facilities, such as ports, waterways, airports, railroads, pipelines, roadways, and warehouses, as well as diverse carriers, shippers, and suppliers that use this infrastructure to transport goods. The freight system consists of approximately 4 million miles of highways and roads; 140,000 miles of rail lines; 25,000 miles of inland and coastal waterways; 2.8 million miles of pipelines; and more than 5,000 public airports. Industry and consumers depend on the Nation's freight system to carry cargo of all types from raw materials to finished goods to waste products. In 2018, the U.S. transportation system moved a daily average of about 51 million tons of freight valued at nearly $52 billion. Most of this cargo crosses State lines and a significant portion is bound for markets abroad.[1]

However, as these goods and products are transported from its origin to destination, there are challenges impacting freight movement. Challenges affecting our freight system include increasing safety risks, increased congestion, and declining infrastructure conditions. Increasing and shifting demand for freight movement is straining the multimodal freight system on which the Nation's economy and well-being depend. Various institutional, financial, and regulatory barriers also make it difficult to advance freight projects, which can exacerbate these challenges.

Key Freight Trends

Several major economic, demographic, technological, and environmental trends are driving changes to freight supply and demand and use of the freight system.

Growing Population and Economy

Population and economic growth are increasing demand for goods and freight transportation. If long-term economic and demographic trends continue, growth will be concentrated in the southern and western regions of the United States as well as in urban areas throughout the country. Demand for truck transportation will increase faster than demand for other modes leading to more congestion on heavily traveled truck routes.

Diversifying Global Supply Chains

[1] U.S. Department of Transportation: National Freight Strategic Plan – September 2020

Our economy depends on a mix of global and domestic supply chains to provide products and services that meet the demands of U.S. consumers. Supply chains increasingly rely on materials, technologies, labor, and production facilities located abroad. International trade is an important contributor to the Nation's economy, but increased trade places pressure on our ports, border crossings, and intermodal corridors. Growing congestion at our trade gateways could hinder the ability of American firms to integrate global supply chains and compete globally.

Rising Domestic Fuel Production

Over the past decade, U.S. oil and gas production has increased dramatically. The United States has become the largest producer of oil and natural gas in the world and shifted from a net importer of energy to a net exporter. The growth of energy production in new regions and increasing fuel exports has placed new demands on the Nation's freight system. To move these resources safely and efficiently to market, the energy industry is constructing new pipelines and reconfiguring existing pipeline systems. Where pipeline capacity is unavailable, energy shippers rely on trains, trucks, and barges.

Changing Urban-Rural Dynamics

Over the past century, economic and demographic growth has been concentrated in major U.S. metropolitan areas. In 1920, approximately half of the U.S. population lived in rural areas, while today four out of every five U.S. residents live in urban areas. However, urban residents continue to rely on rural areas for agricultural and manufactured products, as well as for energy and natural resources. As the populations and the associated tax bases of rural areas decline, building and maintaining the freight infrastructure necessary to support national economic productivity and competitiveness is a growing challenge.

Increasing E-Commerce

The rise of e-commerce is significantly changing how retailers and consumers interact with each other. Increasingly, consumers now purchase goods online requiring retailers to determine how to deliver those purchases to the consumer's home. E-commerce sales make up more than 11 percent of total retail sales and are growing at double digit rates each year. This trend for e-commerce is increasing the number of new short-haul and last-mile trips made by trucks, straining the Nation's freight system as retailers compete to meet consumer demands.

Advancing Technology

Advances in a wide range of technologies, including information and communications technologies, robotics, artificial intelligence, sensors, and batteries are leading to rapid changes in logistics and freight transportation. These advances have the potential to transform the freight transportation industry by increasing safety and efficiency, altering supply chains, and disrupting business models.

Evolving Workforce

The transportation industry represents over 8 percent of GDP, and some 14.5 million jobs—about 9 percent of civilian workforce in the U.S.—are transportation related, including approximately 2.7 million people employed as truck drivers. As the industry grows and the current workforce ages, millions of workers will be needed to fill vacancies. Yet many in the freight industry are experiencing serious challenges in recruiting and retaining qualified applicants with the right qualifications.

Freight Planning Framework: Legislation, Factors, Goals, Performance Measures

National Freight Goals and Federal Legislation

Freight planning and goods movement has long been an integral part of the metropolitan planning process, and the Federal Government plays an important role to ensure the efficient movement of these goods. The most current transportation legislation covering freight is the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the Bi-Partisan Infrastructure Law (BIL; Pub. L. 117-58) signed into law by the President on November 15, 2021. The IIJA/BIL updates national freight transportation policy in the following ways:

- Continues all funding programs applied to the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) first established under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015. NHFP funds are assigned to States as lump sum funding, pursuant to rations specified in 23 USC 104(b)(5)
- Allows States to transfer up to 50% of NHFP funds in any given fiscal year to the following programs:
    - National Highway Performance Program;
    - Surface Transportation Block Grant Program;
    - Highway Safety Improvement Program;
    - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program;
    - Carbon Reduction Program (newly established under IIJA)
    - Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation (PROTECT) Formula Program (newly established under IIJA)

U.S. DOT: National Freight Strategic Plan

- Allows States to transfer *from* these aforementioned programs, *up to* 50% of funds made in each fiscal year, *into* their NHFP program (subject to limitations; 23 USC 126(a)).

- Increases the eligibility to 30% (vs. 10% under the FAST Act) on the amount of NHFP funding that a State may use on freight intermodal or freight rail projects, subject to certain restrictions (Pub. L. 117-58 § 11114(3)(A) and 23 U.S.C. 167(h)(5)(B), as redesignated)

- Increases the maximum number of miles of highway that a State may designate as critical *rural* freight corridors, as the greater of:

    - 300 miles (vs. 150 miles under the FAST Act); or

    - 20% of the State's Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) mileage.[2] (Pub. L. 117-58 § 11114(1)(A) and 23 U.S.C. 167(e)(2))

- Increases the maximum number of miles that may be designated as critical *urban* freight corridors in a State to 150 miles of highways (vs. 75 under the FAST Act) or 10% of the PHFS mileage in the State, whichever is greater. (Pub. L. 117-58 § 11114(2) and 23 U.S.C. 167(f)(4))

According to the federal laws governing ***metropolitan transportation planning*** (23 USC 134) and ***statewide and nonmetropolitan transportation planning*** (23 USC 135), it is in the national interest to encourage and promote safe and efficient management, operation and development of surface transportation systems that will serve the mobility needs of people and freight. In general, the metropolitan planning process for a metropolitan area shall provide consideration of projects and strategies that will increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight, as well as enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes for people and freight. The same policies are addressed in federal law (49 U.S. Code 5303) and (U.S. Code 5304) governing metropolitan transportation planning and statewide and nonmetropolitan transportation planning for public transportation.[3] These laws require that freight planning be considered in the development of MPO's metropolitan transportation plans, transportation improvement program document and other applicable work elements.

In order to reconcile these planning goals with the specific goals for freight established as part of the IIJA, the IIJA continues the practice originally established under the FAST Act of identifying National Planning Factors, and reconciling them with State and Local goals.

FAST ACT National Planning Factors:

- Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and freight
    - *Goal: To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System*
    - *Goal: To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system*
- Promote efficient system management and operation
    - *Goal: To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System*
    - *Goal: To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system*
    - *Goal: To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through*

[2] PHFS is a subset of the National Highway Freight Network. PHFS must be updated by FHWA every 5 years.

[3] Legislation Information Institute – Cornell University School of Law: https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/23/134

eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices

Georgia Statewide Freight Goal(s):

- *Improve Freight and Economic Development*

Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) MPO Freight Goals:

- Support Economic Vitality
  - *Improve Freight Movement*
  - *Increase funding and funding sources for all transportation modes*
  - *Improve project delivery for all modes*
- Promote Multimodal and Affordable Travel Choices
  - *Improve efficient movement of goods and services within and through the region*
- Manage Congestion & System Reliability
  - *Allow people and goods to move with minimal congestion, time delay and greater predictability*

Overview of Freight Performance Measures

The IIJA continues the mandates originally established under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) that the Secretary develop regulations *(23 CFR 490)* to establish Transportation Performance Management (TPM) requirements to carry out the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Freight Movement on the Interstate, and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program. MAP-21 transformed the Federal-aid highway program by establishing new requirements for performance management to ensure the most efficient investment of Federal transportation funds. Performance management increases the accountability and transparency of the Federal-aid highway program and provides for a framework to support improved investment decision making through a focus on performance outcomes for key national transportation goals. Those goals include:

- **Congestion reduction** - *To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the NHS.*
- **System reliability** - *To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.*
- **Freight movement and economic vitality** - *To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.*
- **Environmental sustainability** - *To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.*

In addition, these rules are intended to:

- *Provides for greater consistency in the reporting of condition/performance;*
- *Proposes requirements for the establishment of targets that can be aggregated at the national level;*
- *Proposes reporting in a consistent manner on progress achievement; and*
- *Proposes a process for determining a State DOT's significant progress.*

State DOTs are expected to use the information and data generated as a result of the new regulations to make better informed transportation planning and programming decisions. Those measures and targets used to monitor freight performance along local and state freight corridors in Macon – Bibb County and the southern portion of Jones and Monroe Counties within the

MATS urbanized area as outlined in Table 11-1. Discussions of Performance Measures and targets generally, and the current status of Freight System Performance Measures relevant to the MATS area, can be found in Chapter 13.

Proposed Performance of the National Highway System, Freight Movement on the Interstate, Congestion and Air Quality Performance Measures*

Part 490 Subpart	Proposed Performance Measures**	Proposed Metrics	Applicability
Performance of the National Highway System (NHS) (Subpart E)	Percent of the Interstate System providing for Reliable Travel Times	Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR)	Interstate System mileage within the State or each MPA
	Percent of the non-Interstate NHS providing for Reliable Travel Times	Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR)	Non-Interstate NHS mileage within the State or each MPA
	Percent of the Interstate System where Peak Hour Travel Times meet expectations	Peak Hour Travel Time Ratio (PHTTR)	Interstate System mileage within each urbanized area with a population over one million
	Percent of the non-Interstate NHS where Peak Hour Travel Times meet expectations	Peak Hour Travel Time Ratio (PHTTR)	Non-Interstate NHS mileage within each urbanized area with a population over one million
Freight Movement (Subpart F)	Percent of the Interstate System Mileage providing for Reliable Truck Travel Times	Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR)	Interstate System mileage within the State or each MPA
	Percent of the Interstate System Mileage Uncongested	Average Truck Speed	Interstate System mileage within the State or each MPA
CMAQ Traffic Congestion (Subpart G)	Annual Hours of Excessive Delay Per Capita	Total Excessive Delay	NHS roads in urbanized areas with populations over one million that are, all or in part, designated as nonattainment or maintenance areas for ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), or particulate matter (PM)
CMAQ On-Road Mobile Source Emissions (Subpart H)	2- and 4-year Total Emission Reductions for each applicable criteria pollutant and precursor	Annual Tons of Emission Reductions by project for each applicable criteria pollutant and precursor	All projects funded by CMAQ program in areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for O_3, CO, or PM for each State or MPA

Table 11-1: Performance Measures for Freight Movement on Interstate Highway System

Purpose and Methodology

It is the purpose of this section of the 2050 MTP update to assess the existing freight and goods movement transportation modes in the MATS area and to recommend to policy and decision makers the needed improvements that should be considered in efficiently moving goods and services throughout the area. In an effort to gather the necessary feedback regarding freight movement by truck in the MATS area, the MPO developed a "Freight and Goods Movement Survey", to be completed by local freight stakeholders. The results of the survey will ultimately assist transportation planners in meeting the needs of the local freight community and can be found in the "Freight & Goods Movement - Truck" portion of this MTP update.

What Is Transportation Planning & Freight Transportation

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) defines transportation planning as: "A continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative process to encourage and promote the development of a multimodal transportation system to ensure safe and efficient movement of people and goods while balancing environmental and community needs." Freight transportation can broadly be defined as the movement of goods from one place to another. Whether the movement of goods are by truck, rail, air or ocean-bound shipping, transportation planners should not only be concerned with the shipment of these goods, but must also consider the movement of these goods within metropolitan areas. Freight considerations within transportation planning practice include: [4]

[4] U.S. DOT: Federal Highway Administration – FHWA Freight and Land Use Handbook April 2012

- *Developing an understanding of the freight volume, value, key commodities and mode splits;*
- *Establishing policies and programs to integrate freight within the overall transportation planning process and account for freight needs in project selection and prioritization; and*
- *Linking freight mobility to other community goals such as economic development and job growth*

Overview of Transportation Freight Movement Modes: Truck, Rail, Aviation, Ports

Georgia's transportation system—a world-class network of roads, bridges, railways, seaports, airports, transit services, and trails—has been a critical foundation for Georgia's growth and competitiveness. The transportation system provides efficient movement of people and freight that connects cities and rural communities, links businesses to suppliers and customers, and carries visitors to destinations throughout Georgia and beyond. Georgians are connected to world markets through Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport and two deepwater seaports, the Port of Savannah and Port of Brunswick. Two Class I railroads and multiple intermodal terminals and shortline railroads facilitate the movement of freight. The system supports the efficient movement of people with 210 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) daily on State roads and more than 142 million trips on the State's 17 urban transit systems.[5] Georgia's transportation system moved a total of 597 million tons of goods valued at $875 billion into, out of, and within Georgia in 2018. In addition, logistics-enabled facilities accounted for 84 percent of private investment by companies that chose to locate new or expanded economic development sites in Georgia in fiscal year 2020. Georgia's freight system must prepare for a growing population and economy, diversifying supply chains and logistics patterns, rapid growth in e-commerce, changing urban and rural dynamics, and emerging technologies for freight vehicles, facilities, and supply chain management. The following image provides an overview of the dynamic transportation modes in Georgia.

[5] 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan: 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan

Mode	Ownership	System Extent
Roadways	**GDOT** – 14% **Counties** – 66% **Towns/Municipalities** – 18% **Other** – 2%	**128,300** Centerline Miles of All Public Roads
Bridges	**GDOT** – 45.8% **Counties** – 49.7% **Towns/Municipalities** – 4.0% **Other** – 0.5%	**14,725** Bridges **109,510,700** Square Feet of Bridge Deck Area
Railways	**GDOT** – 10% **Class I Operators (CSX/Norfolk Southern)** – 69% **Class III Operators** – 21% **Amtrak** – Trains owned by Amtrak	**4,607** Miles of Track **3,288** Miles of Class I Railway Track **1,012** Miles of Class III Railway Track **4** Amtrak Routes
Ports and Waterways	**Georgia Ports Authority** – 2 Deepwater Ports, 2 River Ports, 2 Inland Ports **Joint Ownership** – 1 Inland Port	**2** Deepwater Ports **3** Inland Ports **4** Navigable Waterways
Aviation	Counties or Towns/Municipalities	**105** Public Use **9** Commercial Service **95** General Aviation
Transit and Shared Mobility	**Transit** – Counties, Towns/Municipalities, or Authorities **Intercity Bus** – 3 Providers **Shareable Dockless Mobility Devices** – Multiple Operators	**80** Systems Providing Demand Response Rural Transit Service **17** Urban Transit Systems
Bicycle and Pedestrian	State Bicycle Routes: **GDOT** – 70% **Towns/Municipalities** – 30%	**14** State Bicycle Routes **2,943** Miles **2** U.S. Bicycle Routes **356.5** Miles

Table 11-2: Freight System Elements by Ownership and System Extent

Georgia's Highways and Bridges

A primary mission of GDOT is to plan, maintain, and operate the State's highway system, which includes the critical corridors that enable the efficient and reliable movement of people and freight. Georgia's highway system consists of nearly 128,300 miles of public roads. Most of these public roads are owned by counties (66 percent) and municipalities (18 percent), while GDOT owns 14 percent. The Georgia highway system includes 14,725 bridges and GDOT owns, operates, and manages 46 percent of them. Daily vehicle miles-traveled (VMT) on the GDOT system increased 8.7 percent between 2015 and 2019.

To support Georgia's increasing growth, GDOT continues to expand its fiber optic network statewide to support future mobility options, such as automated/connected vehicles. GDOT invests in strategic projects to improve reliability of key corridors through the Major Mobility Investment Program.[6]

[6] 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan: 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan



Figure 11-1: Georgia Highway System Map

Source: Georgia 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan/2050 Statewide Transportation Plan

Georgia's Railway System

The Georgia rail network is the largest in the Southeast. In 2017, the 4,607-mile network transported over 171 million tons of freight to, from, and within Georgia. Georgia is served by two Class I freight railroads—CSX Transportation and Norfolk Southern Railway. Collectively, they operate 3,288 route miles throughout the State, serving all major economic centers and the State's ports. There are 26 Class III railroads or shortlines, with 1,012 route miles in the State. In addition to freight rail, Georgia is served by four long-distance Amtrak passenger routes with five stations that carried over 75,000 originating or terminating passengers in Georgia in 2016. Amtrak trains run along the Class I network. The Silver Meteor and Silver Star offer service between New York City and Miami through coastal Georgia, the Palmetto offers service between New York City and Savannah, and the Crescent offers daily trips between New York City and New Orleans via Atlanta.[7]

[7] 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan: 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan



Figure 11-2: Georgia Railway System Map
Source: Georgia 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan/2050 Statewide Transportation Plan

Georgia's Ports and Waterways

Georgia is home to an interconnected network of seaports, inland waterways, private marine terminals, and "inland ports." The vast majority of Georgia's marine tonnage moves through terminals owned and operated by the Georgia Ports Authority (GPA). GPA's facilities include the Port of Savannah, which consists of the Garden City Terminal and the Ocean Terminal, North America's busiest single terminal container facility. They also include the Port of Brunswick and its Colonel's Island Terminal, which is the second busiest port in the United States for total roll-on/roll-off cargo. In 2019 over 37.5 million tons of goods moved through these ports. Georgia's deepwater ports were estimated to account for $106 billion in sales, $44 billion in gross state product, and nearly 440,000 jobs statewide in 2017. GPA has identified an "inland port" system to serve the Port of Savannah. This system includes locations in Murray County (Appalachian Regional Port) and Decatur County (Bainbridge Terminal). The Northeast Georgia Inland Port is in early stages of planning in Hall County. While most cargo moves through deepwater ports, Georgia is also home to inland waterways providing mobility to a variety of niche businesses.[8]

[8] 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan: 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan



Figure 11-3: Georgia Ports And Waterways
Source: Georgia 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan/2050 Statewide Transportation Plan

Georgia's Aviation System

Georgia is served by a diverse mix of airports ranging in size from small general aviation airports to busy corporate general aviation reliever airports to Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International, the world's busiest commercial service airport. In 2018, Hartsfield-Jackson had over 51.8 million enplanements and the other eight commercial service airports had over 1.8 million enplanements combined. Hartsfield-Jackson also is a key air cargo facility, the 13th busiest in the United States, moving over 2.9 billion pounds of cargo in 2018. The other major air cargo airport in Georgia is the Southwest Georgia Regional Airport, located in Albany, which moved over 186 million pounds of cargo in 2018. Georgia's aviation system is a major contributor to the Georgia economy. In 2019, the economic impact of Georgia's airports was over $73.7 billion, supporting more than 450,502 jobs with an annual payroll of $20.2 billion, and $196.5 million in direct aviation-related tax revenues to the State.[9]

[9] 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan: 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan



Figure 11-4: Georgia Aviation System
Source: Georgia 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan/2050 Statewide Transportation Plan

Freight & Logistics - Truck

A primary mission of GDOT is to plan, maintain, and operate the State's highway system, which includes the critical corridors that enable the efficient and reliable movement of people and freight. Georgia's multimodal transportation system includes an extensive network of facilities important for moving freight. This includes 128,300 miles of highways, 3,288 miles of Class 1 rail and 1,012 miles of Class 3 rail, two deepwater ports, two inland ports affiliated with the Georgia Ports Authority (GPA) (and a third in early planning), and nine commercial service airports. By both tonnage and value, more than 70 percent of the freight moved into, out of, and within Georgia is shipped via truck. Rail accounts for the next highest share by both tonnage and value – 12 percent and 11 percent, respectively. Pipelines, air, water, and intermodal shipments make up the remainder. **Freight is a significant part of transportation demand.** A total of 597 million tons of goods valued at $875 billion moved into, out of, and within Georgia in 2018. Freight tonnage is projected to increase 48 percent to 885 million tons by 2045, while the value of goods will more than double to $1.8 trillion. **Freight transportation is critical to Georgia's economy.** The freight and logistics industry accounted for more than 181,000 jobs in 15,000 businesses statewide in 2018. Including the multiplier impacts of the direct jobs, freight and logistics accounted for more than 362,000 jobs statewide (one in every 14 jobs) and $33.5 billion in gross domestic product. Industries that rely on efficient freight movement, such as agriculture, forest products, mining, manufacturing, and retail, accounted for more than 2 million jobs statewide.[10] Middle Georgia is well positioned to take advantage of key truck freight corridors providing easy access to key markets within Georgia, and to key domestic markets throughout the U.S. The regional highway network and the key highways serving Middle Georgia are illustrated in Figure 11–5 *(Georgia's Statewide Designated Freight Corridors).* Interstate and State highways are critical to the success of freight operations in Middle Georgia, such as I-75, which is a major north/south freight corridor, and I-16 which connects Middle Georgia with international markets through the Port of Savannah. Highways to the north and south of the Region are also essential, such as I-20 in Atlanta, or I-10 in Florida that establish routes to markets to the east and west.

[10] 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan: 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan



Figure 11-5: Georgia Designated Freight Corridors

Table 11-3 provides a summary of Georgia's highways that should be considered for on-going investment to support freight transportation in Middle Georgia, particularly in the MATS area, providing easy access in all directions.

TABLE 11-3
Key Truck Corridors Supporting Middle Georgia Freight

Highway	Direction	Georgia Location	Description
State Route 11 (SR 11)	North/South	Center	A 375-mile-long (604 km) state highway in the U.S. state of Georgia, traveling through portions of Echols, Lanier, Berrien, Irwin, Ben Hill, Wilcox, Pulaski, Houston, Peach, Bibb, Jones, Jasper, Newton Walton, Barrow, Jackson, Hall, White, Lumpkin, and Union counties. It runs the entire length of the state from south to north, connecting the Florida state line with the North Carolina state line, roughly bisecting the state into two equal parts. It is the longest route in the state.
Interstate 16 (I-16)	East/West	Central	Termini near Macon Georgia, the interchange connection with I-75 (which provides direct access to the Atlanta region, although it does not travel outside the state) The significance of this connection is the ensuing access from the Port of Savannah to the rest of Georgia, and provides linkages to national and North American markets.
State Route 49 (SR 49)	Southwest/ Northeast	Diagonal	A 122.8-mile-long (197.6 km) state highway that runs southwest-to-northeast through portions of Terrell, Sumter, Macon, Peach, Houston, Bibb, Jones, and Baldwin counties, mainly in the central part of Georgia. The route connects SR 45 north of Dawson to SR 22/SR 24/SR 112 in Milledgeville.
Interstate 75 (I-75)	North/South	Center	Runs north–south along the U.S. Route 41 (US 41) corridor on the western side of the state, passing through the cities of Valdosta, Macon, and Atlanta. It is also designated—but not signed—as State Route 401 (SR 401). In downtown Atlanta, I-75 joins with I-85 as the Downtown Connector.
U.S. Route 129 (US 129)	North/South	Center	An auxiliary route of US 29, which it intersects in Athens, Georgia. US 129 currently runs for 582 miles (937 km) from an intersection with US 19/US 27 ALT/US 98 in Chief land, Florida, to an interchange with Interstate 40 (I-40) in Knoxville, Tennessee. It passes through the states of Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. It goes through the cities of Macon, Athens, Gainesville, and Knoxville.

[11]

As illustrated in Figure 11-6, Middle Georgia's total truck freight distribution by flow and mode was 82.7 million tons in 2013 (54.5 percent of total freight). Domestic through accounted for

[11] Middle Georgia Freight and Logistics Study, Middle Georgia Regional Commission, November 2015

61.3 percent of total truck freight, domestic outbound 17.5 percent, domestic inbound 9.2 percent and intra-region 3.1%. International freight accounted for the remaining 8.8 percent.

Figure 10: Middle Georgia Truck Freight by Flow and Mode in 2013



Note: International freight flows may be understated because domestic freight can include international cargo that is "converted" to domestic freight; for example, containerized imports enter an import distribution center and then depart as domestic truckloads.

Source: IHS Transearch database

Figure 11-6: Middle Georgia Truck Freight by Flow and Mode, 2013

Middle Georgia handled 151.6 million tons of freight in 2013, comprised of 21.4 mil tons Inbound, 20.3 mil tons outbound, and 107.4 mil tons "through", meaning transiting the region without stopping, as illustrated in Chart 11-2. [12]

[12] Middle Georgia Freight and Logistics Study, Middle Georgia Regional Commission, November 2015



Figure 11-7: Middle Georgia Truck Freight by Mode, 2013

Recognizing the key role that freight transportation plays in its region, the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission (MPO) developed a survey designed for the trucking industry to provide feedback for an integrated freight program for Macon-Bibb County. The MPO continues to be increasingly focused on freight transportation planning and continues to formally incorporate freight transportation issues into the traditional MPO planning process. It is the attempt of the 2050 MTP Freight and Goods Movement Industry Outreach Initiative survey to collect data that will be used to identify the MPO's freight transportation deficiencies and issues, which will lead to the development of potential recommendations for future actions by the MPO. On October 5, 2016, approximately 43 Freight and Goods Movement Surveys were mailed to several freight companies throughout Macon-Bibb County. The survey was also made available on www.maconmpo.com. Of the 43 surveys, 10 were returned undeliverable and 3 were returned completed that provided some usable information. As part of that effort, industry participants provided an overview of their business and identified problem areas that will assist transportation planners in improving freight flows in the region. While these suggestions have not been endorsed by the MPO, they represent the continuous step in working to develop a regional freight program by identifying and documenting the issues and concerns expressed by the system users. Figure 11-8 shows the truck terminal locations within Macon - Bibb County and Table 11-4 shows a list of freight companies in Macon - Bibb County. Appendix J includes the "Freight & Goods Movement Industry Outreach Initiative letter"; the Freight & Goods

Movement survey instrument, as well as the (3) completed surveys that were used to update this section of the 2050 MTP.

The following is a summarization of comments and recommendations received as a result of the surveys.

How would you describe the primary type of facilities / industries of your company?

- *Truck Terminal* **
- *Freight / Logistics Provider* **
- *Distribution Center* *

What are the primary types of shipments handled at this site?

- *Less than Truckload* **
- *Hazardous Materials* *
- *Truckload* *

During what hours do you usually receive/ship deliveries of your major inbound and outbound products?

- *6AM - 12 Noon* **
- *12 Noon – 4PM* *
- *4PM – 8PM* **
- *8PM – 10PM* *
- *12 Midnight – 6AM* *
- *24 hours a day* *

How many trucks on average does your company use on a daily basis for freight and goods movement in Macon – Bibb County?

- *6 – 10* *
- *11 – 25* **

What roadways are used most by your company's vehicle in the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County? *This information will assist transportation planners with prioritizing future roadway improvements.*

- *I-75* ***
- *I-16* ***
- *I-475* **
- *SR 247 (Pio Nono Avenue)* **
- *SR 49 (Shurling Drive; Industrial Highway)* **
- *SR 74 (Mercer University; Thomaston road)* **
- *US 41 (Forsyth Road; Vineville Avenue; Hardeman Avenue)* **
- *US 80 (Eisenhower Parkway; Jeffersonville Road)* **
- *US 129 (Gray Highway)* **

What other routes would be more preferable to use that are not identified as truck routes? *None*

Which, if any, of the following movement problems does your truck(s) encounter on the local roadway?

- *Narrow Roads* **
- *Difficult Turn Movements (particularly on Lower Poplar Street)* *
- *Other: Trees / Brush*

Where are the specific locations / areas where truck or rail traffic causes recurring congestion in Macon – Bibb County?

- *Allen Road **
- *7th Street ***
- *5th Street **
- *Riverside Drive **

What improvements could be easily made to the roadway system to improve the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County?

- *Remove trees/bushes along Roff Avenue*
- *Improve Intersections*
- *Improve Lane Widths*

Freight and Truck Movement improvements recommended during the public outreach phase:

- **Joe Tamplin Blvd./Chestney Road/Riggins Mills Road:**
  - Improve with the installation of a roundabout
- **Guy Paine Road @ Broadway:**
  - Improve road due to bumpy road conditions along the road and at Broadway
- **Hawkinsville Road (Hwy 247):**
  - Redesign of Allen Road @ Kuhmo Parkway entrance (at the request of Kuhmo representatives)



Figure 11-8: Freight Companies and Truck Terminals Located in the MATS Area

TABLE 11-4

Freight Companies/Truck Terminals

Company Name	Address	Phone #
Liquid or Dry Bulk		
Florida Rock & Tank Lines	2532 Allen Rd. Macon, GA 31216	478.788.5113
Justin Davis Enterprises	2241 Barnes Rd. Macon, GA 31216	478.784.0570
Local Cartage		
Middle Georgia Transportation Services	170 Lower Bay Street Macon, GA 31206	478.742.0890
Stat Medical	455 Lower Boundary St. Macon, GA 31206	478.743.9549
Motor Freight		
AAA Cooper Transportation	3165 Avondale Mill Rd Macon, GA 31216	478.781.1055
ABF Freight Systems, Inc.	711 Guy Paine Rd. Macon, GA 31206	478.788.6424
American Freightways, Inc.	2750 Roff Avenue Macon, GA 31204	
Averitt Express	4750 Ivey Drive Macon, GA 31206	800.283.7488
Baker Distributing Company Store #516	125 Poplar Street Macon, GA 31201	478.742.0737
Bass Pro Shop Sportsman's Distribution Center	5100 Bass Road Macon, GA 31210	478.757.7700
Bonus Enterprises, Inc.	2351 Hubbard Road Macon, GA 31217	478.741.1021
C&A Transportation	2360 Spires Dr. Macon, GA 31216	478.784.8652
Camp Transportation, Inc.	2280 Seventh Street Macon, GA 31206	

Freight Companies/Truck Terminals

Company Name	Address	Phone #
Carroll Fulmer & Company	4661 Mead Rd. Macon, GA 31206	478.784.7333
Central Transport, Inc.	4430 Marion Avenue Macon, GA 31206	
Drug Transport, Inc.	501 Joe Tamplin Industrial Blvd. Macon, GA 31217	
ETA	8345 Grace Road Macon, GA 31216	478.781.9985
Fed Ex Freight	2750 Roff Avenue Macon, GA 31204	478.744.0736
GHS Distribution, Inc.	321 Corporate Parkway Macon, GA 31210	478.750.8548
Hillshire Brands Company	1075 Frank Amerson Parkway Macon, GA 31216	478.812.9130
Inway	6603 Dana Drive Macon, GA 31220	
Kenan Transport, Inc.	2131 Barnes Ferry Road Macon, GA 31216	
Kohl's Distribution Center	3030 Airport E. Parkway Macon, GA 31216	478.785.6000
Kumho Tire Georgia	3051 Kumho Parkway Macon, GA 31216	478.812.9595
MBM Corporation	704 Joe Tamplin Industrial Blvd. Macon, GA 31217	478.741.9706
Milan Express	625 Guy Paine Rd. Macon, GA 31206	
Old Dominion Freight Line	4430 Mead Road Macon, GA 31206	
Overnight Transport	475 Guy Paine Road Macon, GA 31206	

Freight Companies/Truck Terminals

Company Name	Address	Phone #
Parcel Delivery	455 Lower Bay Street Macon, GA 31206	
Roadway Express	2360 Cargill Road Macon, GA 31216	
Ryder/AT&T	587 Guy Paine Road Macon, GA 31206	478.788.9911
Saddle Creek Logistics	440 Joe Tamplin Industrial Blvd. Macon, GA 31217	478.742.8740
Sandifer's Trucking	580 Edgewood Avenue Macon, GA 31201	
Save-A-Lot Distribution Center	7595 Industrial Highway Macon, GA 31216	478.788.6811
Southeastern Freight Lines	801 Joe Tamplin Indust. Blvd. Macon, GA 31206	478.755.8859
Tractor Supply Company Distribution Center	151 Tractor Drive Macon, GA 31216	478.785.6201
Tyner Transport, Inc.	2510 Allen Road Macon, GA 31216	
UPS-Customer Care	235 South Street Macon, GA 31206	800.742.5877
USF Dugan	205 Raines Avenue Macon, GA 31206	
Watkins Motor Lines	4444 Marion Avenue Macon, GA 31206	
Welborn Logistics	195 Spring Street Macon, GA 31201	478.745.0740
Wilson Trucking Corporation	4390 Mead Road Macon, GA 31206	478.781.7170
YRC	4241 Interstate Road Macon, GA 31206	478.474.0221

MATS MPO Initiatives to Improve Freight & Goods Movement by Truck

Within the Macon MPO, planned improvements to highways affecting truck freight in the MATS study area are either being implemented, or are planned for improvements in the future. The following projects are key projects that will improve freight and goods movement when completed.

Seventh Street Truck Route (On-going)

Currently, large trucks hauling logs, gravel and other heavy materials currently utilize Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to travel from points east and north, through the heart of Macon's downtown business district. This truck traffic creates a noisy and dangerous barrier for pedestrians attempting to visit the museum district, Macon's Historic Terminal Station and downtown restaurants, shops and other entities. Macon – Bibb County desires to create a new truck route that will direct the truck traffic away from downtown and through the existing Seventh Street Industrial District, as shown in Figure 11-9. This will result in improved access to downtown passenger vehicles and improves pedestrian safety near Cherry Street and Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard. The planned improvements for the proposed project will consist of a re-constructing the intersection of Walnut Street and Seventh Street by installing a roundabout and other needed improvements.

FIGURE 11-9: Seventh Street Truck Route



Proposed I-14 Corridor Project

The I-14 Corridor project is a proposed highway that will extend from Interstate 10 in West Texas to Interstate 20 in Augusta, Georgia. The project will seek to improve freight movement throughout Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia. On June 19, 2018, Macon-Bibb County Commission signed a resolution to express support for the extension of I-14 into and through Macon-Bibb County; MATS MPO followed suit with a similar resolution on February 3, 2021. If extended to the MATS area, I-14 could run along SR-49, I-75, I-16, US-80, and SR-57.

Figure 11-10 shows the entire proposed route for I-14, while Figure 11-11 shows one possible route alternative heading east from Macon-Bibb County, through Jones County and on to Augusta. This eastbound alternative has been added to the MATS 2050 Roads and Bridges project list in anticipation of the I-14 project moving forward (see Table 6-2 for further details).



Figure 11-10: Proposed I-14 Route from Odessa TX to Augusta, GA



Figure 11-11: Possible Alternative for Eastern Portion of Proposed I-14 Corridor on MATS 2050 Project List

I-16/I-75 Interchange Improvements (On-going)

The I-16/I-75 Interchange Improvement project will enhance safety and mobility of the interchange by widening and reconstructing I-75 from Hardeman Avenue to Pierce Avenue and I-16 from I-75 to Walnut Creek within the City of Macon and Macon-Bibb County. This project represents a **$500** million investment in the city, the Middle Georgia region and the state's transportation system and will support Georgia's growing freight and logistics industry[13].

[13] Website: https://i-16andi-75interchange-gdot.hub.arcgis.com/



Figure 11-12: I-16/I-75 Interchange Project

Freight & Goods Movement - Rail

Railroads are a key feature in Georgia's freight landscape where the rail system plays an essential role in linking Georgia shippers with markets throughout North America and the world. This system serves as an important connection for freight rail, serving two large east coast Class I railroads and many intermodal hubs. At 4,684 miles, Georgia's rail network is the seventh largest in the nation. Most of Georgia's rail network is owned by private freight railroad companies. The following own Georgia's rail network:

- 4,061 miles owned by private freight railroads
- 464 miles are owned by GDOT
- 118 miles are owned by the Georgia State Properties Commission
- 41 miles are owned by the Georgia Ports Authority

Georgia is served by two Class I freight railroads, CSX Transportation (CSX) and Norfolk Southern Railway (NS). All other railroads operating in Georgia fall into the Class III revenue threshold (short lines). Class I railroads tend to focus on providing long-distance line haul service, connecting Georgia with other parts of the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. Short line (Class III) railroads tend to provide last-mile service, connecting Georgia businesses to the rail transportation network. These connections provide access to raw materials and global markets. Class I's operate the majority of trackage in Georgia (68 percent combined). Short lines operate the remaining 32 percent. Railroads have a long history in the state and Georgia's extensive rail network continues to draw business and investment to the state. Table 11-5 and Figure 11-13 summarize the Georgia rail network.

Transportation Network	Mileage	Percentage of Network
Rail Main Lines	2,713	58%
Rail Branch Lines	1,984	42%
Total Rail Network	4,697	100%
Interstates, Freeways, Expressways	1,424	1%
Arterials Roadways	14,238	11%
Collectors and Local Roadways	112,603	88%
Total Public Road Network	128,355	100%

Sources: FHWA *Highway Statistics - 2017*

Table 11-5: Operating Route Mileage in Georgia, 2017
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Table 1-7



Figure 11-13: Georgia Statewide Rail System
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Fig. 2-1

The Class I railroads operate almost 3,200 miles of railroad in Georgia, excluding trackage rights, mostly on track owned by the railroads. Table 11-6, Figure 11-14 and Figure 11-15 break down the operating railroad mileage for Class I railroads.

	CSX	Norfolk Southern
Line Owned	1,382	1,697
Line Operated Under Lease	118	0
Line Operated Under Contract	1	0
Line Operated Under Trackage Rights	75	9
Total Mileage Operated	1,579	1,706

Source: STB Schedule 702 Reports (2019)

Table 11-6: Total Class 1 Rail Mileage Operated in Georgia (2019)
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Table 2-2

CSX Transportation Headquartered in Jacksonville, Florida, CSX Transportation operates about 21,000 route miles nationally, all east of the Mississippi River. CSX owns and operates nearly 1,500 routes miles in Georgia that serve as links in the CSX network.



Figure 11-14: Georgia CSX Rail Network
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Fig. 2-2

Norfolk Southern (now headquartered in Atlanta) operates about 19,400 route miles of track in 22 states. In the state of Georgia, NS owns about 1,735 miles of track and employs 4,710 people. The NS market area overlaps that of CSX and is in the eastern part of the U.S. with most rail lines east of the Mississippi River. NS provides connections with western carriers at multiple locations on its system, many of which are used for shipping freight to and from Georgia. The Norfolk Southern network and major rail yards in Georgia are summarized in Figure 11-14.

Figure 11-15: Georgia Norfolk-Southern Rail Network
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Fig. 2-3

Class II & III Railroads (Short Lines)

In addition to the two Class I railroads, 29 Class III or short line rail carriers operate over 1,600 miles of track, with over 1,400 miles within Georgia. The majority of the mileage operated by short line railroads in Georgia is on rail lines leased from either GDOT, Class I carriers, or the Georgia Ports Authority. Short lines provide crucial transportation connections to businesses throughout Georgia. These connections provide access to raw materials and global markets.

State Owned Rail Lines

There are several rail lines owned by the Georgia Department of Transportation. The right to operate on these lines has then been leased to private companies. They include Chattooga & Chickamauga Railway (CCKY), CaterParrot Railnet (CPR), Georgia Northeastern Railroad (GNRR), Georgia Southwest Railroad (GSWR), Heart of Georgia (HOG), and Ogeechee Railroad Company (ORC). In all, GDOT owns 540 miles of track (465 active). The GDOT owned rail lines are displayed in Figure 11-16.

Georgia's rail rankings by the Association of American Railroads (AAR) highlight the importance of Georgia to the national rail system. As shown below in Tables 11-7a and 11-7b, Georgia is highly ranked across a cross-section of metrics. According to the 2021 Georgia Statewide Rail Plan between 2012 and 2017, Georgia increased its ranking in eight out of twelve railroad criteria, and maintained its relative position in the remaining four.



Figure 11-16: GDOT Owned Rail Lines (Short Lines)
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Fig. 2-4

Tied for 8th	IN	Number of Freight Railroads	28	15th	IN	Total Rail Tons (Mil.)	180.5
7th	IN	Total Rail Miles	4,607	14th	IN	Total Rail Carloads	4,534,400
13th	IN	Originated Rail Tons (Mil.)	36.7	7th	IN	Freight Rail Employees	6,709
6th	IN	Terminated Rail Tons (Mil.)	67.2	7th	IN	Freight Rail Wages ($Mil.)	541.1
5th	IN	Originated Rail Carloads	1,205,900	9th	IN	Railroad Retirement Beneficiaries	16,472
4th	IN	Terminated Rail Carloads	1,625,100	9th	IN	Railroad Retirement Payments ($Mil.)	368.1

Source: Association of America Railroads

Table 11-7a: Georgia Railroad National Rankings, 2017
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Figure 1-1



Source: Association of American Railroads

Table 11-7b: Georgia Railroad National Rankings Change, 2012 - 2017
Source: Georgia Statewide Rail Plan 2021, Figure 1-2

Freight Rail Transportation Network

In addition to railroads being classified by revenue, the rail network is also classified by function. The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) functionally classifies rail lines as "main lines" if they carry over five million gross tons10 or more per mile per year. These are comparable to highways and arterials of the roadway network. Rail lines functionally classified as "branch lines", on the other hand, provide local connections. The branch lines are analogous to collector and local roadways. Georgia has 2,713 route miles of main line rail compared to 15,662 major roadway centerline miles. The rail branch line network has 1,984 route miles, compared to 100,000 centerline miles of a local roadway network. Mainline rail route miles represent more than 50 percent of the rail miles in Georgia while the comparable intercity highway centerline miles are only 12 percent of the Georgia roadway centerline miles. The functional classification of the rail and roadway networks are summarized in Table 11-5, above.

Georgia's rail network carries more freight tonnage per mile than roadways. According to estimates from the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS), annual truck ton-miles in Georgia are approximately 75 million; the annual tonnage that the average mile of roadway carries is between 500,000 and 600,000 tons. Other data from the BTS state that Georgia railroads carry on average 9 to 10 million tons of freight per route mile, thus the average mile of rail carries about 17 times the freight volume of the average mile of roadway.

Freight rail improvement projects were considered in three categories:

- Recent and Current Investments by Class I Railroads;
- Specific projects needed to address current deficiencies; and
- Conceptual projects considered as part of a longer-term rail program to capture future growth opportunities

The State of Georgia has prospered economically through the vision of its leaders and the productivity of its citizens. That vision has always understood the importance of moving freight and people through Georgia's transportation system. Based on the collaborative efforts to develop the vision for rail transportation in Georgia, the following Rail Vision Statement and Goals were developed to address the issues and obstacles facing rail in Georgia.

- **Enhance safety and security:** Typical initiatives could include minimizing grade crossing accidents, hazmat spills, theft from trains and rail facilities, and upgrading deficient rail infrastructure;
- **Provide for a reliable, enhanced and interconnected passenger rail system:** Typical initiatives could include improvements to on-time performance and reliability for existing services, ADA compliance at rail stations, and expansion of intercity and commuter passenger services;
- **Promote and expand intermodal connectivity:** Typical initiatives could include new or improved freight intermodal facilities and highway connectors and better linkages between intercity and urban mass transit passenger services with improved access for pedestrians and cyclists;
- **Develop an energy efficient and environmentally sustainable rail system:** Typical initiatives could include the retrofitting to lower emission diesel electric locomotives and

implementing strategies and policies to encourage the diversion of passengers and freight highways to rail;

- **Preserve and improve the existing infrastructure:** Typical initiatives could include projects to accommodate the higher maximum loaded car weights on Georgia short lines (i.e., 286,000 pounds) and upgrading track and bridges to improve operating efficiency and main line capacity, and improved access to rail users through new sidings and additional car storage capacity;
- **Enhance economic development and competitiveness:** Typical initiatives could entail promoting new rail-served development to attract new rail-oriented industries and the implementation of industrial access funding aimed at lowering transportation costs for rail shippers.[14]



Dating back to history, Macon was known as the railroad hub of the South for passenger and freight trains. Macon was a strategic point in linking the markets in the west with the South Atlantic and the north and south route. But as air travel became the transportation mode of choice for passenger and freight movement, many railroad lines were abandoned, thus causing surface and air transportation networks to serve the Central Georgia region. Home to the largest rail yards in the Central Georgia region, Brosnan Yard has been in full operation since 1966 which keeps Southern's freight moving 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The main purpose of a classification yard is to sort freight cars into groups according to their destination so that blocks of cars may be easily detached when they reach their final terminal. Brosnan yard is centrally located and has tracks running into the facility from seven major points: Atlanta, Jacksonville, Savannah, Augusta, Albany, Columbus and Brunswick. http://southern.railfan.net/ties/1967/67-11/bros.html. These rail lines transport freight into the Macon-Middle Georgia region but do not provide multimodal interconnectivity with other modes of transit in the region. However, Brosnan classification yard is often viewed as a possible future intermodal terminal station for Norfolk Southern. In its current capacity as a classification yard, freight and container cars are re-assigned from inbound trains, and "classified" to outbound trains based on common destinations. Middle Georgia is not likely to generate the cargo volume levels with Atlanta or Savannah freight volumes, which would likely be needed to incentivize NS to establish an additional intermodal hub. Lastly, adding the complexity and space requirements of an intermodal hub to the existing classification yard operation in Macon would be a major challenge, and not likely in the near future. Therefore, it is the intent of this section of the transportation assessment portion of the updated 2050 MTP to examine the rail infrastructure throughout the State of Georgia and the Middle Georgia Region.

[14] GDOT: Georgia State Rail Plan 2015

According to the *Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan 2010 - 2050*, prepared for the Georgia Department of Transportation, there are some current deficiencies in Georgia's rail network that deals primarily with substandard weight limits and vertical clearances on the existing tracks. The plan indicates that the industry standard railcar weight for bulk commodities such as grain, lumber, coal, and paper products, has trended in recent years from 263,000 pounds to 286,000 pounds (commonly referred to in the industry as "286K"). While most of the primary Class I rail lines have achieved 286K capability, many short line railroads in Georgia are not capable of handling 286K railcars. Figure 11-17 shows the Rail Line weight limits for Georgia's Class I and short line railroads. Upgrading lightweight rail track to 286K is a key freight rail improvement project.

Much of Georgia's rail infrastructure was originally built to accommodate rail cars with a height of 15 feet. With the general adoption of larger railcars such as tri-level auto carriers and double-stack intermodal cars, vertical height standard industry requirements have trended to upwards of 20 feet, and the defined height for fully unrestricted clearance was raised to 22' 6". A minimum height of 20' 8" can accommodate a pair of stacked domestic containers (each 9'6" high) and has become a defacto minimum standard for vertical clearance for main lines handling intermodal traffic. Due to bridges and other obstructions, many rail lines in Georgia do not meet this requirement. Vertical clearances on CSXT, NS and many of the State's short line railroads are mapped in Figure 11-18. Increasing vertical height clearance to the 20' 8" minimum standard for vertical clearance is another freight rail improvement project.



Source: Interviews with Class 1 Railroads, American Shortline Railroad Association, Project team Analysis.

Figure 11-17: Rail Line Weight Limits for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia
Source: Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan 2010 – 2050, Fig. 2-1



Figure 11-18: Rail Line Vertical Clearances for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia
Source: Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan 2010 – 2050, Fig. 2-2

It is also noted in the *Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan 2010 - 2050,* that approximately, 95 percent of all mainline trackage, including Class I and short line railroad trackage, in the State of Georgia are single-track. Main Class I routes have passing sidings at regular intervals, which allow trains moving in opposite directions or at different rates of speed to pass one another. While this arrangement is effective for traffic volumes that have historically occurred over Georgia's main lines, as traffic increases and/or there is a greater mix of different types of trains, full double track becomes a necessity. Double tracking key rail segments in the state is a freight rail improvement project recommended as part of this Plan. In addition to the number of main line tracks, another important attribute affecting main line capacity is the type of traffic control system. Railroads in Georgia primarily make use of three different signal systems to control traffic movements on their systems. These are Manual, Automatic Block Signals (ABS) and Centralized Train Control (CTC). CTC systems permit the dispatcher to remotely manage train movements by controlling signal indications and train routing over a geographic jurisdiction such as a subdivision or terminal area. CTC is layered on top of an ABS system, which provides occupied block protection. Implementation of CTC leads to considerable capacity improvements, and is almost always taken as a first less costly step when traffic increases call for increased line capacity. The coverage of CTC systems will need to increase to manage increased volumes and increased double tracking across the state. This will increase the efficiency of rail operations in terms of average speeds and total travel times between origins and destinations. These rail improvements taken together represent a series of steps that would begin to address the rail system bottlenecks identified in the plan. The bottlenecks are shown in Figure 11-19 with the rail track in red the priority rail track in need of improvements to accommodate future demand. As the Central Georgia region continues to grow, it may be necessary for the MATS area to consider the recommended rail improvements (that may apply) as stated in the *Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan 2010 - 2050,* to efficiently move goods and services throughout the region.



Source: Interviews of Class 1 railroads, Project team analysis.

Figure 11-19: Rail System Throughput Bottlenecks - Class 1 Railroads in Georgia
Source: Georgia Statewide Freight and Logistics Plan 2010 – 2050, Fig. 2-3

Middle Georgia's Rail Freight

Middle Georgia's total rail freight was 71.1 million tons in 2013 (45.5 percent of total freight). The distribution by flow and mode is illustrated in Figure 11-20. Domestic through freight accounted for 65.3 percent of total rail freight, domestic inbound 19.5 percent, and domestic outbound 6.8 percent. International freight accounted for the remaining 8.4 percent. However, as stated earlier, the international share is likely understated due to international imports and exports that are partly handled as a domestic move. For example, this could apply to freight exported to Canada and Mexico that is classified as a domestic move from the U.S. origin to border crossing. The dominant rail mode is carload (87.2 percent), which reflects the large volume shipments of bulk commodities that move in carload equipment (e.g., boxcars, hoppers, and tank cars). Carload rail excludes intermodal rail (i.e., 48-ft and 53-ft containers on rail), which accounted for the remaining 12.8 percent of rail freight tons.[15]



Figure 11-20: Middle Georgia Rail Freight By Flow and Mode, 2013
Source: Middle Georgia Freight and Logistics Study, Middle Georgia Regional Commission, November 2015

[15] Middle Georgia Freight and Logistics Study, Middle Georgia Regional Commission, November 2015



Figure 11-21: Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Lane – 2013
Source: Middle Georgia Freight and Logistics Study, Middle Georgia Regional Commission, November 2015

Rail freight associated with the Port of Savannah amounted to 6.3 million tons in 2013, 4.7 million tons moving to Savannah and 1.6 million tons flowing from Savannah. This rail freight is concentrated in the Savannah to Atlanta lane, with a 41.9 percent share of tons (Figure 11-21). The largest commodity from Savannah is Miscellaneous Mixed Shipments (intermodal commodities), accounting for 51.6 percent of rail tons (Figure 11-22). This reflects Savannah's role as a port gateway for containerized imports that move inland by intermodal rail service. Middle Georgia is the largest origin for rail freight moving to Savannah, with a 21.9 percent share, followed by Atlanta at 12.3 percent. The principal commodities moving to Savannah are Pulp, Paper or Allied Products (23.9 percent), Miscellaneous Mixed Shipments (15.7 percent) and Nonmetallic Minerals (10.9 percent). The Metropolitan Transportation Plan project list identifies several projects that will help maintain freight movement throughout the MATS Study area.



Figure 11-22: Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Commodity – 2013
Source: Middle Georgia Freight and Logistics Study, Middle Georgia Regional Commission, November 2015

Freight & Goods Movement - Aviation

Georgia has 104 publicly owned and used airports throughout the State, of which nine (9) offer scheduled commercial service and the remaining 95 are classified as general aviation, as illustrated in Figure 11-23. GDOT is most involved with the general aviation airports and in providing last-mile roadway access to all of the airports. Each airport is classified as a Level I (minimum standard general aviation), Level II (business airport of local impact), or Level III (business airport of regional significance and/or commercial facility) based on the role it plays in the aviation system[16]

[16] GDOT: 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan/2015 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan – January 2016



Figure 11-23: Overview of Public Airports by Level Of Service

Situated in the heart of the State of Georgia, Macon – Bibb County plays host to two airports: the *Macon Downtown Airport* and the *Middle Georgia Regional Airport*. Airports are an important part of the transportation system, as well as the economy and can be characterized by two major categories: (*Air carrier airports and general aviation airports*). *Air Carrier Airports* include facilities that serve regularly scheduled passenger service. They are primarily facilities with the capacity to handle significant volumes of freight/cargo and passengers on a daily basis. The Middle Georgia Regional Airport accounts for the majority of revenue and traffic generated by airports within this classification. *General Aviation Airports* include smaller facilities which are normally located in counties throughout the State of Georgia. These facilities typically have paved runways 2,000 to 5,500 feet in length and are capable of accommodating small (single-engine) and medium sized (multi-engine) aircraft. These airports often provide opportunities for businesses with suitable aircraft to avoid the use of larger facilities and minimize air travel associated lag time.

Macon Downtown Airport

The Macon Downtown Airport (MAC) falls within the description of a public use general aviation airport that serves private, corporate and executive jet aircraft. Macon Downtown Airport covers an area of 401 acres (162ha) at an elevation of 437 feet (133 m) above mean sea level. It has two asphalt paved runways: 10/28 is 4,694 by 100 feet and 15/33 is 2,614 by 75 feet. The Macon Downtown Airport was originally constructed by the U.S. Government during World War II for the purpose of Army Air Force flight training. After World War II, the Airport was deeded to the City of Macon for use as a Civil Aerodrome. Commercial service was initiated by Delta Airlines and remained until the Middle Georgia Regional Airport was developed. However, the airport was retained for general aviation use. Currently, the Macon Downtown Airport is owned and operated by Macon – Bibb County and is located approximately three (3) miles southeast of the Central Business District, as shown in figure 11-24. At the present time, there are no known plans to initiate the movement of freight goods and services from the Macon Downtown Airport.

Figure 11-24: Macon Downtown Airport

Macon Downtown Airport

The Middle Georgia Regional Airport is located in Macon - Bibb County, approximately nine (9) miles south of the Central Business District of Macon, as shown in Figure 11-25. The airport is located to the east of Interstate 75 and to the south of I-16. The airport is situated on approximately 1100 acres of land. In 1940, the City of Macon donated land at the present site of the airport to the U.S. War Department. A military airfield was constructed on the site for flight training and was named Cochran Field. After World War II, the U.S. Government returned the airport with associated facilities back to the city. Commercial air service was initiated in 1948. Cochran Field was renamed Macon Municipal in 1960 and in 1966 was renamed Lewis B.

Wilson Airport, honoring the former mayor, state legislator and airport manager.

Figure 11-25: Middle Georgia Regional Airport

Airport Role

The Middle Georgia Regional Airport operates as a public-use airport facility owned by the Macon – Bibb County government but operated by TBI Airport Management, Inc. At the national level, it is included in the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) National Plan of Integrated Airport System (NPIAS) as a non-primary airport. The NPIAS includes a total of 3,356 airports according to the last updated report presented in 2013-2017. Middle Georgia Regional Airport is one of 99 airports in Georgia that is included in the NPIAS and one of 103 airports in Georgia classified as a commercial service airport. An airport must be included in the NPIAS to be eligible for federal funding. At the state level, the Middle Georgia Regional Airport is included in the Georgia Aviation System Plan which identifies the service area to include the counties of Bibb, Houston, Laurens, Baldwin, Peach, Jones, Dodge, Monroe, Macon, Telfair, Bleckley, Wilkinson, Dooly, Twiggs, Crawford, Pulaski, Taylor, Montgomery, Wilcox,

Treutlen and Wheeler. The purpose of the System Plan is to provide a comprehensive look at each airport and the overall air transportation needs of the State for the next 20 years.[17]

Existing Airside Facilities

Airport facilities can be functionally classified into two broad categories: airside and landside. The airside category includes those facilities directly associated with aircraft operations. The landside category includes those facilities that provide a terminal interface between surface and air transportation, as well as support services such as aircraft storage and maintenance. Airside facilities include runways, taxiways, lightning, signs, marking, and navigational aids.

Runways

The airfield is currently served by two runways designated as Runway 5/23 and Runway 13/31. Runway 5/23 is the primary runway. It is 6,501 feet in length and 150 feet wide, and constructed of asphalt and grooved. Based on FAA data, Runway 5/23 is listed as having a pavement strength of 80,000 pounds (single wheel), 128,000 pounds (dual wheel), and 237,000 pounds (double tandem load). Runway 5/23 consist of three pavement sections that were recently rehabilitated and are in excellent condition. Runway 13/31 is the crosswind runway, or secondary runway. It is 5,001 feet in length and 150 feet wide, and constructed of asphalt. Runway 13/31 is listed as having a pavement strength of 44,000 pounds (single wheel), 65,000 pounds (dual wheel), and 110,000 pounds (double tandem load). Runway 13/31 also consists of three pavement sections where substantial amounts of low and medium severity longitudinal and transverse (L & T) cracking and block cracking was identified. Additionally, the runway has small quantities of low-severity swelling and high-severity raveling.

Middle Georgia Regional Airport *Future Aviation Conditions*

Planning for the future and constructing needed improvements is important for each airport as an individual facility, but also for the national and international system of airports as a whole. When an airport system or an individual facility begins to approach capacity, critical issues arise ranging from continued business viability to safety. Recognizing this need, the Macon – Bibb County Consolidated Government contracted with Barge Waggoner Sumner and Cannon, Inc., to produce an update of the Airport Master Plan Study to determine the aviation needs of the Middle Georgia Regional Airport and its service area for the next 20 years and to ensure safety standards and facility requirements are met and/or planned for. The study is part of the continuing planning process necessary to assure adequate and compatible airport improvements needed to meet the growing aviation demands associated with the Airport. However, the overall goal of the Airport Master Plan update is to provide Macon – Bibb County with an effective planning tool to guide the future development of the Middle Georgia Regional Airport. Accomplishment of this goal requires the evaluation of existing airport activities, facilities and determination of actions needed to maintain an adequate, safe, and reliable airport to meet the needs of the Macon – Bibb County and the entire Middle Georgia Region.

Specific elements of the Master Plan include the following: [18]

[17] Airport Master Plan Update "Final Report": Middle Georgia Regional Airport, Macon-Bibb County, Georgia November 2015

[18] Airport Master Plan Update "Final Report": Middle Georgia Regional Airport, Macon-Bibb County, Georgia November 2015

- *Inventory existing airside, landside, and other support facilities and services currently at the Airport, as well as local and regional economic development and growth affecting the Airport;*
- *Update historical aviation data and develop new forecasts based on historical trends and major changes anticipated for the future;*
- *Document the methodology, findings, analysis and conclusions of the technical investigation of concepts and alternatives which were performed to develop the proposed plan;*
- *Propose a viable, phased 5, 10, and 20-year financial plan for achieving the planned airport development and implementation schedule; and*
- *Identify anticipated Airport funding needs and proposed Airport development policies for consideration by Macon – Bibb County*

The Middle Georgia Regional Airport is located in close proximity to the Warner Robins Air Force Base. Although WRAFB does not accommodate civilian aircraft operations, its location within the Middle Georgia Regional Airport's market area is notable. The proximity of the runways at WRAFB and MGRA requires coordination of aircraft approaches and departures. The proximity of this major military installation provides an important source of demand for both commercial and general aviation services provided at the Middle Georgia Regional Airport. The updated Airport Master Plan study for the Middle Georgia Regional Airport identified and recommends the following airfield improvements in an effort to improve airport capacity and freight movement.

- *Extend Runway 5 – 2500' x 150' (Runway overpass/tunnel for Sardis Church Road Extension and Avondale Mill Road)*
- *North Apron Rehabilitation*
- *Construct Infield Taxiways*
- *Additional airside and landside facilities will need to be improved or expanded to adequately serve the anticipated increase in both aircraft and passengers utilizing the facility.*

The airports, along with the aviation related businesses and facilities, represents a vital and significant regional economic asset. In addition to the many aviation related assets, the airports also provide benefits to local businesses and industry, promotes tourism, as well as encourages additional business development and expansion throughout Macon – Bibb County, surrounding communities, and adjacent counties.

Freight & Goods Movement – Ports

There are three marine port complexes owned and operated by the Georgia Ports Authority (GPA): *the Ports of Savannah, Brunswick, and Bainbridge*, the largest of which is Savannah. There also are dozens of private terminals along the Georgia coast and the inland waterways, typically owned and operated by companies that exclusively ship their own products. GDOT's primary role is to provide last- mile roadway access to the ports.

The Port of Savannah is vital to the State's economy and is, overall, the fourth-largest container port in the U.S., handling about 3 million 20-foot-equivalent (TEU) container units annually. In

addition, it is the second largest export port in the U.S. and has 37 weekly container ship calls, which is the second highest on the East Coast.

The Port of Savannah handles container, refrigerated, break-bulk, and roll-on/roll-off cargo such as automobiles. The Garden City Terminal, located seven miles upriver from downtown Savannah, is the largest GPA facility and the largest single terminal container operation in North America. This contributes to the large variety of commodities that are shipped through the facility, including wood pulp, food, furniture, and paper products, among many others.

The Port of Savannah's current channel depth is 42 feet; however, construction is underway to deepen that to 47 feet to consistently serve larger ships that will start traveling through the Panama Canal. This deepening of the channel also increases the efficiency and safety of cargo vessel operations. Additional landside capacity may be needed and access improvements for both trucks and trains will be critical at the Port of Savannah to accommodate future growth projections. [19]

Recommendations on Network Georgia and Inland Port Development

The Georgia Ports Authority (GPA) announced plans to establish inland ports throughout Georgia to extend Port of Savannah reach by rail to strategic areas, including a yet-to-be identified Middle Georgia location. While this presents a substantial opportunity to elevate Middle Georgia as a logistics hub, several actions should be coordinated to help ensure the success of the Network Georgia initiative:

- *The success of inland ports will depend on the formation of industry clusters and agglomerations that support each proposed site. The roles and industries that these inland ports intend to support should be coordinated to ensure that target users do not overlap, thereby undercutting the success of all inland ports.*
- *The Middle Georgia Inland Port site selection should be in close proximity to major highways, most likely I-75, I-16, or the Fall Line Freeway when completed. A selection on I-16 would also require an upgrade to the NB I-16/I-75 interchange upgrade.*

In January 2021, the Middle Georgia Regional Commission (MGRC) updated their Master Planning for Middle Georgia Intermodal Hub and Prospective Container Port.[20] Inland ports are specialized locations developed to serve the intermodal transportation network. Ordinarily located along railroad lines, inland ports offer intermodal transfer facilities and frequently international trade processing and other services. According to the study, the cost of shipping containers by rail to a location within the Middle Georgia region would not be cost competitive with truck transport. Due to this, the Middle Georgia Regional Commission was not in the plan Georgia Ports Authority (GPA) had laid out to construct an inland port. At present, truckers can carry a container to the Port of Savannah and make a return trip to the Middle Georgia region within one day making this run very attractive to trucking companies.

One of the factors for locating an inland port is the number of container lifts (i.e., container loadings, off loadings from trucks to ship and/or rail) for existing industry in the region. If it

[19] GDOT: 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan/2015 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan – January 2016

[20] Master Planning for Middle Georgia Intermodal Hub and Prospective Container Port – Revised January 2021 ; Prepared for Middle GA Regional Commission, by Topping Consulting LLC

exceeds 15,000 lifts per year, then normally it helps in determining if an Inland Container Port is warranted. The study showed that while although in FY 2017 the Middle Georgia region did produce more than 20,000 total lifts per year, the ratio of outbound export containers vs. inbound import containers was approximately 3.33 to 1. To justify establishing an inland port facility, the ratio should be closer to 1 to 1. Therefore, the report concludes the Middle Georgia region does not currently meet this full criterion for an inland port at this time.

However, the report does suggest the MGRC continue to actively market the region to industries with the foresight that once a large manufacturer opens a facility the need to import raw materials and export finished goods will be paramount. While the Georgia Ports Authority (GPA) did not believe that a rail–served inland port was a current economic viable option in the Middle Georgia region, they strongly stated that in the future a rail served inland port would be competitive. Therefore, the any future container yard or inland port facility should be located adjacent to or near a rail line so that it could utilize this mode as economic conditions change. To that end the MGRC report does identify criteria for container yard selection, and identifies and ranks several possible candidate sites.

Chapter 12 | Plan Considerations

Introduction

This section addresses the environmental justice and environmental mitigation review to be included as part of Metropolitan Transportation Plan development, as required by federal law. This chapter provides an overview of the new Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA; also knows as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL)), and the associated Justice40 Executive Order; a review of Environmental Justice, Title VI, Non-Discrimination and Equity; a review of the Title VI and Americans with Disabilities Act; a cursory review of MATS LEP (Limited English Proficiency) plan; a review of the social, natural, cultural and historic resource setting of MATS area; and a review of the proposed MTP projects that identifies the potential environmental impacts associated with the recommended plan improvements.

Environmental features such as communities of concern (e.g. environmental justice populations), historic lands, as well as wetland and floodplain areas are also considered. During the development of the 2040 LRTP update (produced in 2017), MATS carried over the consultation results from several environmental agencies and the environmental mitigation strategies that were formulated in 2035 LRTP update. With respect to this 2050 MTP, it is thought that the strategies recommended at that time continue to be valid. These strategies should be considered to guide future transportation improvements from the planning stage to the project development stage. It is the intent of the MATS MPO to continue to be in full compliance with all federal and state environmental planning provisions required as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process.

IIJA/BIL Legislation

On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, also knows as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (IIJA/BIL; PL 117-58). The bill sets out approximately $567.1 billion on transportation planning priorities for the period between FY 2022 and FY 2026, with funding coming from the contracting authority sourced from the Highway Trust Fund. The bill contains both new discretionary grants, as well as formula based grants providing dedicated funding to States for specific federal transportation goals. New discretionary grant programs related to eligible activities for the MATS MPO and/or local governments include:

- **$12.5 Billion** "**Bridge Investment Program"** (PL 117-58 §11118) Improve bridge (and culvert) condition, safety, efficiency, and reliability Eligible recipients include States, MPOs with Populations greater than 200,000, Local governments, special purpose districts or public authorities with a transportation function, Federal land management agencies, and Tribal governments.
  Eligible projects include:
  - Project to replace, rehabilitate, preserve or protect one or more bridges on the National Bridge Inventory
  - Project to replace or rehabilitate culverts to improve flood control and improve habitat connectivity for aquatic species

- Key provisions include:
  - At least 50% of funding reserved for certain large projects; option for multi-year funding agreements
  - Different process for funding projects costing $100 Million or less
  - Sets aside average of $40M per FY for Tribal transportation bridges

- **$2 Billion** "**Rural Surface Transportation Grant"** (PL 117-58 §11132) Provide funding through single-year or multiyear grant agreements for eligible surface transportation projects. Eligible recipients include States, Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) Local governments, and Tribal governments.
  Eligible projects include:
  - Highway, bridge, or tunnel projects eligible under NHPP, STBG or the Tribal Transportation Program
  - Highway freight project eligible under NHFP
  - Highway safety improvement project
  - Project on a publicly-owned highway or bridge improving access to certain facilities that support the economy of a rural area
  - Integrated mobility management system, transportation demand management system, or on-demand mobility services
  - Key provisions include:
    - Sets aside each FY: ≤10% for grants to small projects (<$25M);
    - 25% for designated routes of the ADHS;
    - 15% for projects in States with higher than average rural roadway lane departure fatalities

- **$2.5 Billion "Charging and Fueling Infrastructure"** (PL 117-58 §11401) Deploy electric vehicle (EV) charging and hydrogen/propane/natural gas fueling infrastructure along designated alternative fuel corridors and in communities
  Eligible projects include:
  - Acquisition and installation of publicly accessible EV charging or alternative fueling infrastructure
  - Operating assistance (for the first 5 years after installation)
  - Acquisition and installation of traffic control devices
  - Key provisions include:
    - Requirement to redesignate alternative fuel corridors and establish a process to regularly redesignate these corridors
    - Set-aside (50%) to install EV charging and alternative fueling infrastructure on public roads or in other publicly accessible locations, such as parking facilities at public buildings, schools, and parks

- **$1.4 Billion "Promoting, Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost Saving Transportation** (**PROTECT) Grants"** (PL 117-58 §11405: Discretionary Portion) Planning, resilience improvements, community resilience and evacuation routes, and at-risk coastal infrastructure.
  Eligible projects include:
  - Highway, transit, intercity passenger rail, and port facilities

- Resilience planning activities, including resilience improvement plans, evacuation planning and preparation, and capacity-building
- Construction activities (oriented toward resilience)
- Construction of (or improvement to) evacuation routes

- **$1 Billion** "**Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program"** (PL 117-58 §11509) Restore community connectivity by removing, retrofitting, or mitigating highways or other transportation facilities that create barriers to community connectivity, including to mobility, access, or economic development. Eligible recipients include States, MPOs, Local governments, Tribal governments, certain non-profit organizations, and owners of eligible facilities (which may partnership with any of the aforementioned eligible partners).
  Eligible activities include:
  - Planning grants (≤$2M)
  - Grants (≥$5M) for capital construction projects, including the removal and replacement of eligible facilities

- **$5 Billion** "**National Infrastructure Project Assistance Program"** (PL 117-58 §21201) Provide funding through single-year or multiyear grant agreements for eligible surface transportation projects. Eligible recipients include MPOs, Local governments, Special purpose district or public authority with transportation function, and partnerships between Amtrak and one or more other eligible entities.
  Eligible projects include:
  - Highway/bridge projects on National Multimodal Freight Network, NHFN, or NHS
  - Freight intermodal or freight rail projects that provide a public benefit
  - Railway-highway grade separation or elimination projects
  - Intercity passenger rail projects
  - Certain public transportation projects

  Key provisions include:
  - Sets aside 50% of grant funding for projects costing more than $100 M but less than $500 M;
  - Sets aside 50% for projects costing $500 M or more

- **$7.5 Billion "Local Regional Assistance Program"** (PL 117-58 §21202) Projects with a significant local or regional impact that improve transportation infrastructure (Local Governments only; MPOs not eligible for this program)
  Eligible projects include:
  - Highway/bridge projects eligible under title 23
  - Public transportation projects
  - Passenger or freight rail projects
  - Port infrastructure investments
  - Surface transportation components of an airport
  - Projects for investment in surface transportation facilities on Tribal land

- Projects to replace or rehabilitate a culvert or certain projects to prevent stormwater runoff
- Any other surface transportation projects considered necessary to advance program goals

- **$5 Billion** "**Safe Streets and Roads for All"** (PL 117-58 §24112) Support for local initiatives to prevent transportation-related death and serious injury on roads and streets (commonly referred to as "Vision Zero" or "Toward Zero Deaths" initiatives). Eligible projects include:
  - Comprehensive safety action plan (planning grant)
  - Planning, design, and development activities for infrastructure projects and other strategies identified in a comprehensive safety action plan

The new formula based IIJA/BIL grants for the States include:

- **$6.4 Billion "Carbon Reduction Program"** (PL 117-58 §11403) Provide funding for projects to reduce transportation emissions or the development of carbon reduction strategies.
  - Apportionments are assigned to States, by formula. However, 65% of funds are sub-allocated, reserved for use in specific sub-areas of the individual States, based on population.
  - State is required to develop (and update at least every 4 years), in consultation with MPOs, a carbon reduction strategy. Said strategy must be submitted to U.S. DOT for approval, and U.S. DOT must certify a State's strategy meets statutory requirements.

- **$7.3 Billion PROTECT Grants** (PL 117-58 §11405: Formula) Planning, resilience improvements, community resilience and evacuation routes, and at-risk coastal infrastructure. Key provisions of the Formula grant include:
  - Apportionments are assigned to States by formula,
  - Key provisions include:
    - Eligible projects for formula funding: Highway, transit, and port projects that a.) connect a port to other modes of transportation; or b.) improves the efficiency of evacuations and disaster relief
    - For projects qualifying under formula grant section of the PROTECT program, allows States to use Federal funds *other than those apportioned under 23 USC 104(b)(8)* to be used as the match proportion (i.e., for this specific group of transportation projects, the prohibition of not using other Federal funds to provide match for Federally funded transportation projects is suspended)
    - In any given fiscal year, limits States to not using more than 40% of funds for developing new transportation capacity, and not more than 10% for development phase activities (i.e., planning, feasibility analysis, revenue

forecasting, environmental review, preliminary engineering and design work, and other preconstruction activities

- **$5 Billion "National Electric Vehicle Formula Program"** (PL 117-58, Division J Appropriation: Formula, and Discretionary) Strategically deploy electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure and establish an interconnected network to facilitate data collection, access, and reliability.
    - Funds are distributed according to the same formula as Federal aid highway apportionments
    - Key provisions include:
        - Funded projects must be located along designated alt fuel corridors (in the MATS MPO area, that includes Interstate 75, Interstate 16, and U.S. Hwy 23)
        - Sets aside 10% of funding for discretionary grants to State and local governments that require additional assistance to strategically deploy EV charging infrastructure
        - State must submit plan to DOT describing planned use of funds
        - If State doesn't submit plan (or carry it out), DOT may withhold or withdraw funds and redistribute within the State, or to other States
        - Establishes DOT-DOE Joint Office of Energy and Transportation
        - Requires DOT to designate national EV charging corridors to support freight and goods movement

IIJA/BIL makes certain changes to the Metropolitan Planning Program involving representation, data development and modeling support:

- MPO representation - Requirement to consider equitable and proportional representation of population of metropolitan planning area when MPO designates officials or representatives for initial appointments (PL 117-58 §11201)
- Consistency of planning data - When more than one MPO is designated within an urbanized area, requires the MPOs to ensure consistency of planning data to the maximum extent practicable (PL 117-58 §11201)
- Public participation - Encouragement for MPOs to use social media and web-based tools to foster public participation and to solicit public feedback during the transportation planning process (PL 117-58 §11201)
- Travel demand data and modeling - Requirements for DOT to support State/MPO travel demand data and modeling, including a study, data, and an evaluation tool (PL 117-58 §11205)
- Safe and accessible transportation options - Requirement that each MPO use at least 2.5% of funds apportioned for Metropolitan Planning (PL) on one or more activities to increase safe and accessible options for multiple travel modes for people of all ages and abilities (PL 117-58 §11206)

Finally, the IIJA/BIL continues the emphasis on Performance Based Program delivery set forth in preceding legislation (i.e., FAST Act and Map-21).

Justice40 Initiative

All the innovations in the IIJA/BIL take place in the context of existing Executive Orders and federal laws related to protections and guarantees of civil rights. In furtherance of these goals, the Executive Branch has produced interim guidance on the Justice40 Initiative (authorized under Executive Order 14008), which has the stated goal "*that 40 percent of the overall benefits of* [forthcoming Federal investments in housing, transportation, water, wastewater infrastructure and healthcare] *flow to disadvantaged communities.*" With respect to transportation activities, the types of programs covered under the Justice40 Initiative include:

- Improvement in public transportation accessibility, reliability, and options
- Reduction of exposure to harmful transportation-related emissions
- Access to clean, high-frequency transportation
- Access to affordable electric vehicles, charging stations, and purchase programs
- Increased bicycle and walking paths (https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/M-21-28.pdf)

The Justice40 Initiative is an extension of the goals articulated under Executive Order 13985, which states the policy of the Federal government is:

> "[to] *pursue a comprehensive approach to advancing equity for all, including people of color and others who have been historically underserved, marginalized, and adversely affected by persistent poverty and inequality.*
>
> *Affirmatively advancing equity, civil rights, racial justice, and equal opportunity is the responsibility of the whole of our Government. Because advancing equity requires a systematic approach to embedding fairness in decision-making processes, executive departments and agencies (agencies) must recognize and work to redress inequities in their policies and programs that serve as barriers to equal opportunity."* (https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-advancing-racial-equity-and-support-for-underserved-communities-through-the-federal-government/)

While the Justice40 Initiative is focused on engaging in remediation for prior denials of capital development and program benefits, there also exists current obligations with respect to ongoing activities. Those obligations continue to be covered under earlier Federal directives and laws.

Environmental Justice, Title VI, Non-Discrimination, and Equity

Although Environmental Justice (EJ), Title VI, Non-Discrimination, and Equity are distinct elements, collectively they can contribute to the development of an equitable transportation system. These elements are regularly mistaken and used interchangeably, thus, making it essential to understand their differences. EJ at FHWA focuses on identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of the agency's programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations to achieve an equitable distribution of benefits and burdens. This objective is to be achieved, in

part, by actively adhering to the principles and practices of both Title VI and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) during the development and implementation of transportation activities. The classes covered by EJ vary slightly from those covered by Title VI and other nondiscrimination statutes, as depicted in Table 12-1.

Area of Comparison	EJ	Title VI Statute	FHWA Title VI Program
Authorizing Source	Executive Order 12898	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Title VI Program and Related Authorities: 23 CFR 200
Goal	Identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations	Prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin in porgrams receiving Federal assistance.	Ensure that funding recipients comply with Title VI and related civil rights authorities
Protected Classes	Minority and low-income populations	Race, color and national origin	Race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, low-income, and limited English proficiency
Covered Actions	Federal programs, policies and activities	All activities of recipients of Federal assistance	All activities of FHWA assistance
FHWA Lead Office	Office of Civil Rights and Office of Planning, Environment and Realty	Office of Civil Rights	Office of Civil Rights
Entities responsible for implementation	FHWA offices and recipients of Federal assistance	FHWA offices and recipients of Federal assistance	FHWA offices and recipients of Federal assistance
Provides authority for private parties to initiate a lawsuit	No. However, where an agency opts to examine EJ as part of its NEPA analysis, courts may review the EJ analysis under the Administrative Procedure Act	Yes. However, there is only a private right of action in a lawsuit for claims of intentional discrimination and not disparate impact discrimination. Only the funding agency issuing the disparate impact regulation has the authority to challenge a recipient's actions under a disparate impact claim.	No

Table 12-1 Comparison of EJ, the Title VI Statue and the FHWA Title VI Program

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based on race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. More specifically, Title VI provides that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." The use of the word "person" is important as the protections afforded under Title VI are not limited to citizens of the United States; the U.S. Supreme Court has held that undocumented immigrants are considered "persons" under the equal protection clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

"Nondiscrimination" is more inclusive than the Title VI statute as it covers additional classes of individuals, and, pertains to other civil rights authorities with which funding recipients must comply. Under the Title VI statute, protected classes include race, color, and national origin; limited English proficiency is included within the class of national origin. FHWA's Title VI program (in contrast to the Title VI statute) expands the covered classes to include sex, age, disability, and low-income.

Together, Title VI, EJ, and other nondiscrimination authorities protect diverse segments of the population which may be at risk of being unduly impacted by, or which have been historically underrepresented, within the transportation decision-making process. Considering the needs of

and potential impacts of projects on these populations may result in greater transportation equity as benefits are likely to be more equitably distributed amongst the affected communities.

Equity in transportation seeks fairness in mobility and accessibility to meet the needs of all community members. A central goal of transportation equity is to facilitate social and economic opportunities by providing equitable levels of access to affordable and reliable transportation options based on the needs of the populations being served, particularly populations that are traditionally underserved. This population group includes individuals in at least one of the following categories: Low-Income, Minority, Elderly, Children, Limited English Proficiency, or Persons with Disabilities. It is important to note that transportation equity does not mean equal. An equitable transportation plan considers the circumstances impacting a community's mobility and connectivity needs and this information is used to determine the measures needed to develop an equitable transportation network. The graphic illustrates the differences between equality and equity. To attain an equitable transportation network, all components of Title VI, EJ, and Nondiscrimination must be considered.



Figure 12-1: Equality vs. Equity

Environmental Justice and Title VI

While Environmental Justice and Title VI concerns have most often been raised during project development, it is important to recognize that the law also applies equally to the processes and products of planning. There are three fundamental environmental justice principles:

- *To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations;*
- *To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process;*
- *To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.*

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued Policy Directive 15, Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity, in 1997, establishing five minimum categories for data on race. Executive Order 12898 and the DOT and FHWA Orders on Environmental Justice address persons belonging to any minority or low-income populations. Transportation plans for the Macon Area must show compliance with federal laws guaranteeing rights to persons of all races, color or national origins and to persons with disabilities as well. Two policies that must be taken into consideration in transportation process

on the state and local levels are Executive Order 12898, (better known as Environmental Justice (EJ)) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). These policies require local transportation plans to identify and address as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. Macon's metropolitan transportation must also comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that states, "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under and program or activity receiving federal assistance". It must also comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which concentrates on the physical access to services and facilities. Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice (EJ) in Minority and Low-Income Populations*, calls for the identification and addressing of disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. The intent of the Executive Order and the US Department of Transportation's EJ guidance is to ensure that communities of concern, defined as minority populations and low-income populations are included in the transportation planning process, and to ensure that they may benefit equally from the transportation system without shouldering a disproportionate share of its burdens.

Title VI and the Americans With Disabilities Act

Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as well as the requirements of the Environmental Justice Orders and the Americans with Disabilities Act is of major concern to the Macon Area Transportation Planning Study. Title VI states, *"No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal assistance"*. Further, Environmental Justice provides "each Federal Agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations". The Americans with Disabilities Act concentrates on the physical access to services and facilities.

These areas of concern were considered and addressed in the MATS procedure used to develop the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). First, access to the planning process was handled to ensure that the low-income populations and minority populations, and persons with disabilities could participate in the development of the MTP. The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was used as an instrument for identifying, discussing, and documenting diverse positions and sentiments regarding local transportation matters. The CAC has key representation to ensure these protected interests have access to the planning process. While the following does not represent the total membership of the CAC, those listed below do provide input for EJ and ADA concerns:

- One person from each Macon-Bibb County Commission District;
- One person from Jones County Commission District 4;
- One person from Monroe County Commission District 3;
- One person from the AARP (*American Association of Retired Persons*);
- One person representing the Bicycle / Pedestrian community;

- One person from the Board of Education;
- One person representing the Disabled Population;
- One person representing the Disabled Transportation User (ADA Transit Rider);
- One person representing Environmental concerns;
- One person representing the League of Women Voters;
- One person representing the Macon Housing Authority;
- One person representing Transit User

In addition, minority representation on decision-making bodies in Macon - Bibb County is in most cases substantial. The following provides a breakdown of minority representation on many of the major decision making bodies in Macon - Bibb County.

	Members	Minority Members
Jones County Board of Commissioners	5	1
Macon - Bibb County Board of Commissioners	9	4
Monroe County Board of Commissioners	5	1
Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority	7	4
Macon - Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission	5	2
Macon Area Transportation Study		
Policy Committee	13	3
Technical Coordinating Committee	24	4
Citizens Advisory Committee	20	7

Table 12-2 Minority Representation on MATS Area Boards and Commissions

To further solicit minority participation from the general public, notices for public forums are published in a newspaper of general circulation, a minority newspaper and a Spanish language newspaper in the MATS area. Notices are also posted in the Macon – Bibb County Government Center, and the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission's office, and the MATS website (www.maconmpo.com). Other forms of outreach include: announcements on social media, local television station, radio announcements, MATS E-Newsletters and other forms of electronic E-Newsletters to include “The Hub”, Middle Georgia CEO and the Greater Macon Chamber of Commerce.

Executive Order #13166: Limited English Proficiency [LEP] Plan Title VI

On August 11, 2000, President William J. Clinton signed Executive Order 13166, "Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency". The Executive Order requires

Federal agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), and develop and implement a system to provide those services so LEP persons can have meaningful access to them. It is expected that agency plans will provide for such meaningful access consistent with, and without unduly burdening, the fundamental mission of the agency. The Executive Order also requires that the Federal agencies work to ensure that recipients of Federal financial assistance provide meaningful access to their LEP applicants and beneficiaries.

To ensure the MATS MPO is in compliance with Executive Order 13166, the MPO utilized U.S. DOT's Policy Guidance four - factor analysis to ensure that meaningful access is provided for LEP persons. This analysis was last completed in September 2021, as part of a review by Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Division of Intermodal for MATS compliance with LEP policies.

Who Is Considered a LEP Person?

By definition, LEP persons are individuals who are unable to communicate effectively in English because their primary language is not English and they have not developed fluency in the English language and they may have problems reading, writing or speaking English.

Determining The Need For LEP Services

As a recipient of federal financial assistance, MPO's are encouraged to take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to the information and services it provides. As noted in the *[Federal Register, Volume 70; Number 239 on December 14, 2005]*, there are four factors to consider when determining "reasonable steps." The MATS MPO will coordinate the U.S. DOT "four - factor" LEP analysis in determining the need for LEP services.

- ***Factor 1:*** *Identify the number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by MATS Public Transit, MPO's programs, services or activities.*
- ***Factor 2:*** *Determine the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with MATS public transit and MPO programs, services or activities.*
- ***Factor 3:*** *Determine the nature and importance of the MATS public transit, MPO programs, services, or activities.*
- ***Factor 4:*** *Access the available resources and the overall cost to MATS public transit and the MPO.*

MATS Self - Assessment

MATS MPO will seek to identify individuals of the LEP population within the MATS Study area who have limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English. The MPO will use the U.S. Department of Transportation four factor LEP analysis to assess the area:

Factor 1: Identify the number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by MATS Public Transit, MPO's programs, services or activities.

Table 12-3 below provides statistical data on the percentage of LEP persons in the MATS area who speak English only, as well as the percentage of those who speak a language other than English who are eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by MATS Public Transit and MPO programs, services, and activities. The MPO will monitor the release of more current data as it becomes available and make the necessary updates as needed.

	Bibb County	Jones County	Monroe County
Total Population Over Age 5	**142667**	**18016**	**3631**
Speak only English	**134980**	**17699**	**3509**
Speak Spanish:			
Speak English "not well"	503	0	19
Speak English "not at all"	359	0	0
Speak other Indo-European languages:			
Speak English "not well"	62	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	59	0	0
Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages:			
Speak English "not well"	318	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	75	0	0
Speak other languages:			
Speak English "not well"	13	0	0
Speak English "not at all"	0	0	0

Table 12-3 Estimate of English Language Proficiency of Population in MATS Counties | Source: American Community Survey 5 Year Estimate, 2015 – 2019, Table B16004: Nativity By Language Spoken At Home By Ability to Speak English For the Population 5 Years and Over

Factor 2: Determine the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with MATS public transit and MPO programs, services or activities.

Based on the statistical data in Table 12-3, Spanish is the most significant language spoken other than English throughout the MATS Study area. To date, no requests for language assistance services have been made by LEP individuals or groups. However, while currently small, it is anticipated that the size of this LEP population in this area/region will increase and, as a result, so will the likelihood of future contact with the MPO. As the LEP program is further reviewed in the MATS area, any requests for language assistance will be monitored and used to gauge the effectiveness of the MPO's outreach to these populations. As subsequent transit and/or transportation-related plans are produced, the MPO should consider including in the Public Participation plan the need for outreach opportunities that engage populations that have traditionally been underserved and lacked involvement in the transportation planning process. Utilizing the MPO's website should be another method to make contact with the MPO and LEP persons.

Factor 3: Determine the nature and importance of the MATS public transit, MPO programs, services, or activities.

There is no large geographic concentration of any type of LEP individuals in the MATS area that's being served by public transit or benefits from any services, activities or MPO programs. As described in Table 12-3 above, the overwhelming majority of the population in the MATS area over 5 years of age (99.02% in Bibb County; 100% in Jones County; 100% in Monroe County) speak English better than "not well", which is the minimum threshold to require language assistance. As a result, there are few social, service, professional and leadership organizations within the MPO organizational structure as well as the public transit service area that focus on outreach to LEP individuals. Services provided by public transit that is most likely to encounter LEP individuals are the fixed route (city bus) system which serves the general public and the demand response (paratransit and rural transit) systems which serve primarily senior and disabled persons.

Factor 4: Access the available resources and the overall cost to MATS public transit and the MPO.

As the need arise, it is recommended that MATS, the local Macon Transit Authority and the Jones County Transit System seek the services of government and institutional agencies such as the Middle Georgia Regional Commission, Mercer University, Wesleyan College, Central Georgia Technical College and Middle Georgia State University. This effort will create a partnership with foreign and international student programs on the respective campuses. Other programs throughout the county will need to be discovered and an inventory of additional available organizations that could be partnered with for outreach and translation efforts.

Meeting The Requirements And Implementation (Identifying LEP Individuals Who Need Language Assistance)

In November 2014, MATS adopted the *Title VI Documentation Update* which included the Limited English Proficiency Plan and the Participation / Involvement Plan, regarding technical planning assistance. Since the adoption of the Title VI Documentation Update, the MPO has not produced any materials to effectively communicate with LEP persons. However, several materials that can be produced to assist in this effort is, the development of:

- ***Flashcards*** developed by the U.S. Census Bureau (to be used in face-to-face situations). These cards have the phrase, "Mark this box if you read or speak 'name of a language," translated into 38 languages. They were designed for use by government and non-government agencies to identify the primary language of LEP individuals during face-to-face contacts. The Census Bureau's Language Identification Flashcard can be downloaded for free at http://www.lep.gov/ISpeakCards2004.pdf. The MPO plans to make them available at public meetings and the front desk of the MPO offices. Once a language is identified, the Title VI - LEP Officer or relevant point of contact will be notified to assess feasible translation or oral interpretation assistance.

Language Assistance and Translation of Materials

- Language assistance will be provided for LEP individuals through language translations and/ or oral interpretations of some key materials, upon request or as deemed necessary for effective outreach.

- The MPO will research the feasibility of the Google Translate program, http://translate.google.com, for its website to allow users to view HTML content in other languages. Although an imperfect system, this alternative may have the potential to provide enough information for a LEP individual or group to gain some understanding of the MPO and to initiate contact.
- A list of MPO staff who speak and or/write a language other than English and who are willing and able to act as interpreters should be identified.
- The MPO phone recording will be modified to include an option to speak to someone in Spanish.

Providing Notice to LEP Persons

It is important to notify LEP persons of services available free of charge in a language that would be understood. Where appropriate and feasible, the MPO will include the following language in English and Spanish, on meeting notifications and other informational materials, whenever this type of assistance become available. An example of such notice is below:

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services for a meeting (free of charge) should contact Gregory L. Brown at 478.338-9463 or gbrown@mbpz.org at least seven days in advance.

Se solicita La participación del público, sin importar la raza, color, nacionalidad, edad, sexo, religión, incapacidad o estado familiar. Personas que requieran facilidades especiales bajo el Acta de Americanos con Discapacidad (Americans with Disabilities Act) o personas que requieren servicios de traducción (sin cargo alguno) deben contactar a Gregorio L. Brown al teléfono 478.338-9463 at gbrown@mbpz.org por lo menos siete días antes de la reunión.

Staff Training

In order to establish meaningful access to information and services for all, staff members of the MPO who interact with the public will be trained to assist LEP individuals in person and /or by telephone.

LEP Updates

The MPO will consider its most recently adopted LEP Plan as an appendix to its most recently adopted Public Involvement Plan. The MPO understands that its community profile continues to change and that the four-factor analysis may reveal the need for additional LEP services in the future. As such, the MPO will annually examine its LEP Plan to ensure that it remains reflective of the community's needs.

Contact Information

The MPO's intention is not to exclude anyone requiring language assistance and will make every reasonable effort to accommodate requests. As the MPO staff receives more training and become

more knowledgeable, a staff person will be identified to assist those who require special language assistance.

Environmental Assessment of Natural / Historic Resources

The Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) believes that the MPO can best meet requirements first set forth under the FAST Act through a comparison of transportation plans with available conservation plans and maps. If available, comparisons should also be made with an inventory of historic or natural resources and, based on results of the comparison, develop a generalized discussion of potential mitigation activities at the appropriate level. During the development of the 2040 LRTP, the MPO provided opportunities for discussion on the various topics with appropriate federal and state environmental and land management planning agencies. The following agencies were consulted at that time by way of letter correspondence:

- Georgia Department of Community Affairs
- Georgia Department of Economic Development
- Georgia Forestry Commission
- Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Historic Preservation Division, DNR
- Environmental Protection Division, DNR
- Wildlife Resource Division, DNR
- State Parks & Historic Sites, DNR
- Georgia Department of Transportation
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4
- Federal Emergency Management Agency
- U.S. Corp of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- National Park Service

It is believed that the responses received from the consultation outreach efforts to the various environmental agencies during the 2035 and 2040 LRTP updates are substantial responses and can be applied to the current update of the 2050 MTP.

Table 6-2 and Figure 6-5 in Chapter 6 identify the locations of the proposed 2050 MTP projects in the MATS area. Figures 12-1 through 12-12 on the following pages show subsets of MTP projects that may impact bridge & intersection improvement projects, environmental justice areas, community facilities, conservation areas, watersheds, groundwater recharge areas, wetlands, floodplains, historic resources, archaeologically sensitive areas and river/stream corridor protection.

Bridge and Intersection Improvements Projects

Figure 12-2 shows the location of proposed Road and Bridge projects within the MATS area.

MPO Mats 2050 Transportation Projects



Priority	Project Description
1	I-75/I-16 Interchange - Phase 4 - Expansion of I-16 eastbound from I-75 to Walnut Creek
2	I-75/I-16 Interchange - Phase 5 - Expansion of I-16 westbound from I-75 to Walnut Creek
3	Tucker Rd. bridge replacement over I-475Tucker Rd. bridge replacement over I-475Tucker Rd. bridge replacement over I-475
4	Bridge Replacement - Replace Bridge on I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Walnut Creek 1 Mile East of Macon
5	Bass Road widening, Phase 1 Providence Blvd to New Forsyth Rd (widening from 2 to 4 lanes)
6	Bass Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.Bass Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.
7	I-16 bridge replacements over Norfolk Southern railroadI-16 bridge replacements over Norfolk Southern railroad
8	Bridge Replacement--Dames Ferry Rd. (aka SR 18) at Ocmulgee River.Bridge Replacement--Dames Ferry Rd. (aka SR 18) at Ocmulgee River.
9	Bridge Replacement--Hawkinsville Rd. from Bibb County/Houston County border to Feagin Rd. (Northbound lanes), at 3 locations
10	Bridge Replacement--Gray Highway (aka US 129) Northbound & Southbound over Rock Creek
11	Bridge Replacement--Gray Hwy (aka US Hwy 129) over Sand CreekBridge Replacement--Gray Hwy (aka US Hwy 129) over Sand Creek
12	Hawkinsville Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.Hawkinsville Road bridge replacement over Norfolk Southern railroad.
13	Forest Hill Rd. - Widen from 2 to 4 lanes from Vineville Ave./Forsyth Rd. to Wimbish Rd.
14	I-75/I-16 Interchange - Phase 6 - Expansion of I-75 from I-16 to Pierce Ave.
15	7th St. Truck Route - 7th St. @ Walnut & 7th St. @ Eisenhower - Roundabout and Improvements
16	Eisenhower Pkwy bridge replacement at Echeconee Creek (Crawford Co. line)
17	Peake Rd. bridge replacement at Rocky Creek near Stratford AcademyPeake Rd. bridge replacement at Rocky Creek near Stratford Academy
18	Safety Improvements Emery Hwy from Spring Street to Irwinton Highway
19	Emery Hwy bridge replacement at Walnut CreekEmery Hwy bridge replacement at Walnut Creek
20	Safety Improvements Eisenhower Parkway from Bloomfield Dr to C Street
21	Pierce Ave pedestrian and bicycle improvements from Ingelside Ave. to Riverside Dr.
22	Safety Improvements Gray Hwy from I-75 to Jones County LineSafety Improvements Gray Hwy from I-75 to Jones County Line
23	Jeffersonville Rd. widening - Norfolk Southern bridge replacementJeffersonville Rd. widening - Norfolk Southern bridge replacement
24	I-75/Riverside Drive Interchange - Signalize interchange. Modify ramps to add turn lanes & storage. Run fiberoptic.

25	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive- Northbound and Southbound ramp intersection signalization and improvement (as a result of failing 201
26	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway- Northbound ramp intersection signalization and improvement (as a result of failing 2040 Level of Service)
27	I-75 Corridor: Pio Nono Avenue-Northbound ramp intersection signalization and improvement
28	I-75 Corridor: Riverside Drive to Arkwright Road- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 Level of Service)
29	I-75 Corridor: Between Bass Road to Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2040 Level of Service)
30	I-75 Corridor: Pierce Avenue at intersection with Riverside Drive (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 Level of Service)
31	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street- Northbound off ramp (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 Level of Service)
32	I-75 Corridor: Forsyth Street to Mercer University Drive- Both Directions (as a result of failing 2012 and 2040 LOS)
33	I-75 Corridor: Mercer University Drive to Eisenhower Parkway- both directions (as a result of failing 2040 LOS)
34	I-75 Corridor: Eisenhower Parkway to Pio Nono Avenue in Both Directions
35	Bass Rd. widenting, Phase II - Providence Blvd. to Zebulon Rd. widened from 2 to 4 lanes
36	Henderson Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 57 to Griswoldville Rd.Henderson Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 57 to Griswoldville Rd.
37	Griswoldville Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from Henderson Rd. to SR 49Griswoldville Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from Henderson Rd. to SR 49
38	Joycliff Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 49 to US 129Joycliff Rd. - Widen to 4 lanes from SR 49 to US 129
39	Sardis Church Rd. Extension from SR 247 to Sgoda Rd. - New Road on new location project. Includes study
40	Bolingbroke Bike Loop - Bolingbroke to Estes Rd, to Zebulon Rd., to Bass Rd., to New Forsyth Rd., to Macon-Bibb County Line
41	Proposed pedestrian/bike trail from macon-Bibb County to Milledgeville (Jones County).
42	Gray Hwy (aka State Route 49) widening from Griswoldville Rd. to State Route 18 (Jones Co.)
43	Widen New Forsyth Rd from 2 to 4 lanes with turn lanes as needed from Bass Rd. to Riverside Dr., with major intersection reconfiguration with
44	Widen Bass Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes from New Forsyth Rd. to Riverside Drive, and Interchange Improvements
45	Zebulon Rd. - Widen Zebulon Rd. from Lake Wildwood entrance to Lamar Rd. from 2 to 4 lanes. Add turn lanes at Lamar Rd. and Zebulon Rd.

The Macon-Bibb County's Infrastructure records, drawings, and other documents have been gathered over many years, using differing standards for quality control, documentation, and verification. All of the data provided represents current information in a readily available format. While the data provided is generally believed to be accurate, occasionally it proves to be incorrect; thus its accuracy is not warranted. Prior to making any property purchases or other investments based in full or in part upon the material provided, it is specifically advised that you independently field verify the information contained within our records. Date: 3/30/2022

Legend

- Traffic Signals
- Bridges
- Bridge Replacement
- Auxiliary Lanes
- Turn Lanes
- Intersection/Signal/Safety
- Safety Project
- TE/Bike/Ped
- Roadway Project
- MPO Boundary
- Bibb
- Jones
- Monroe

1 inch = 20,000 feet

Map Maker: Les Hampton Lesley G

MATS Macon Area Transportation Study

Figure 12-2: Location of Bridge and Intersection Projects Throughout MATS Area

Environmental Justice Areas

Several block groups within the MATS region have a population primarily comprised of minority and/ or poor residents. These blocks are classified as Environmental Justice (EJ) areas and most are located within the urbanized areas of Macon – Bibb County. Figure 12-3 displays the location of these areas and the MTP projects that traverse these areas.

A GIS analysis highlights the results of a spatial query and shows all MTP projects that intersect all or part of any block group meeting EJ specifications. The query indicated that approximately 14 projects MTP projects will impact the MPO environmental justice area. These 14 projects are listed on the map below, with their corresponding priority number in Table 6-2..



Figure 12-3: Location of MTP Projects In Relation To Environmental Justice Areas

Community Facilities

Community facilities are diverse. They include utilities such as water collection, treatment, and distribution; wastewater collection and treatment; and sometimes electrical distribution. They also include schools, parks, fire and police stations, jails, libraries, convention centers, and solid waste treatment and storage faculties, hospitals, clinics, community centers, shelters, and other public and quasi-public facilities to name a few. These facilities are a vital part of the well-being of the community; therefore, consideration in the transportation planning process must be given.

A GIS analysis highlights the results of a spatial query and shows all MTP projects that are within 500' of a Georgia Department of Community Affairs recognized community facility. Figure 12-4 displays the approximate location of all community facilities within the MATS study area, as well as those community facilities that may be in the immediate area of a proposed MTP project. These 10 with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2.



Figure 12-4: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Community Facilities

Conservation Areas

There were three land areas within the MATS area that are in a state of conservation recognized by the federal government. These areas include The Ocmulgee National Monument, Bond Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, and the Echeconnee Creek reserve. Bond Swamp, as the name implies, is a protected habitat for wildlife such as endangered bald eagles. It is important that these resources are given adequate consideration to avoid any adverse encroachment.

The GIS indicated that there were 4 Bridge projects, 1 Safety project, 1 Roadway Capacity project, and 1 Transportation Enhancement/Bike/Pedesrian project that were within 500' of one or more of these areas. The 500' buffers are shaded in **green** and the affected projects are shown in Figure 12-5. These 7 projects are listed with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2.



Figure 12-5: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Conservation Areas

Watersheds

Watershed basins are areas drained by a single watercourse such as a river. They have the basic function of converting precipitation into stream flow and ground water. Therefore; the protection of these resources are very important. There are two basins in the MATS area. The two basins are the Ocmulgee River and Oconee River watershed basins.

The GIS analysis indicated there are a total of 15 MTP projects that will impact one of the two basins in the MATS area. Figure 12-6 displays the MTP projects that may impact watershed areas. These 15 projects are listed with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2.



Figure 12-6: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Watersheds

Ground Water Recharge Areas

Groundwater recharge areas are locations in which underground aquifers are replenished or recharged by rainwater. These areas typically have soils and rocks that are porous and permeable to allow ground water seepage into the underground aquifer. It is estimated that 97% of the world's supply of liquid fresh water is held in aquifers (Owen & Chiras, 1990). The protection of these areas must be taken into consideration.

GIS Data acquired from the Georgia Department of Community Affairs revealed that there are many large aquifers in the MATS region. The GIS analysis indicated that there are 19 MTP projects that may potentially be constructed on known recharge areas in MATS. Figure 12-7 displays these MTP projects, along with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2.



Figure 12-7: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Ground Water Recharge Areas

Wetlands

Wetlands are lands that are considered wet for most of the year. They include swamps, bogs, salt marshes, lagoons, bays and mangrove swamps. Wetlands serve important functions to the ecosystem by acting as natural water filtration centers, animal habitats, and providing flood control to name a few.

GIS Data acquired from the Georgia GIS Clearinghouse revealed that there are many areas classified as wetlands in the MATS region. The GIS analysis indicated that there are 31MTP projects that will somehow involve wetlands in the MATS region. These projects are identified in Figure 12-8, along with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2.



Figure 12-8: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Wetland Areas

Floodplains

Floodplains are low-lying lands that are generally susceptible to flooding. They are usually found along with bodies of water such as rivers, lakes, and streams. However, they can be found where no substantial body of water exists. The floodplains in the MATS region are found in the same locations as wetlands. However, there are many places where a floodplain exists and no wetland exists.

GIS Data acquired from the Georgia GIS Clearinghouse revealed that there are many areas classified as floodplain in the MATS region. The GIS analysis indicated that there are approximately 29 MTP projects that will encroach upon floodplains in the MATS region. These projects are identified in Figure 12-9, along with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2..



Figure 12-9: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Floodplain Areas Feb 13 2017

Historic Resources

The historic resources analyzed in this section were compiled by the Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Natural Resources. The data is made available to the general public by way of the Natural, Archaeological, and Historic Resources GIS (NAHRGIS) database, which is maintained by the University of Georgia. According to NAHRGIS, most of the unrestricted resources in the database have been assessed by the Historic Preservation Division for their significance and eligibility in terms of the National Registry of Historic Places criteria evaluation.

GIS data acquired from NAHRGIS revealed that there are approximately **71 historic** resources in the MATS region. GIS analysis indicates that, for the entire MATS region, there are 9 MTP projects within a 500 buffer of a recognized historic resource.See the downtown Macon inset map for details on the location these projects with respect to historic neighborhoods and structures in the Macon downtown area. Figure 12-10 Shows the location of these historic neighborhoods and structures, along with the identified MTP projects their corresponding project priority number, found in Table 6-2.



Figure 12-10: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Historic Resources – MATS Area (with Macon Specific Inset)

Archaeologically Sensitive Areas

The archaeological resources analyzed in this section were compiled by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. The data is also assessable from the NAHRGIS. Unlike the historical resources, specific location information on the archaeological sites is purposefully ambiguous. This is to protect the integrity of the sites. The data is provided on the block group level.

GIS data revealed that there are approximately 150 Census Blocks in the MATS region that contain archaeological resources. The GIS analysis also revealed that approximately 13 MTP projects will traverse through these selected block groups. These projects are identified in Figure 12-11, along with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2.

It should be kept in mind that the data is at the block group level; therefore, an MTP project could be located miles away from a sensitive area..



Figure 12-12: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to Archaeologically Sensitive Areas

River and Stream Corridor Protection

The Ocmulgee River is a significant part of the river system in Georgia. The Ocmulgee combines with the Oconee River to form the Altamaha River which flows into the Atlantic Ocean. This river is very important due to the fact the Ocmulgee River serves as the primary water source for the MATS region. It is important that this resource is given adequate consideration to avoid any adverse encroachment.

The GIS analysis revealed that there are 17 MTP projects that will traverse rivers and streams in the MATS study area. These projects are shown in Figure 12-13 along with their corresponding priority number found in Table 6-2..



Figure 12-13: Location of MTP Projects in Relation to River and Stream Corridor Protection

Potential Mitigation Measures / Environmental Mitigation Activities

SAFETEA-LU has defined Environmental Mitigation Activities as strategies, policies, programs, actions, and activities that, over time, will serve to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for (by replacing or providing substitute resources) the impacts to or disruption of elements of the human and natural environment associated with the implementation of a long-range statewide transportation plan or metropolitan transportation plan. This same definition from the SAFETEA-LU legislation can be applied to the most recent authorized IIJA/BIL legislation.

The human and natural environment includes, for example, neighborhoods and communities, homes and businesses, cultural resources, parks and recreation areas, waters of the US, forested and other natural areas, endangered and threatened species, and the ambient air. The environmental mitigation strategies and activities are intended to be regional in scope, even though the mitigation may address potential project-level impacts. The environmental mitigation strategies and activities must be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies during the statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes and be reflected in all adopted transportation plans.

Suggested Mitigation Measures

The most protective measure that can be employed in transportation planning is to avoid cultural and environmentally sensitive areas. However, many times that is not possible or feasible to do. When this is the case, the following suggestions should be considered as mitigating measures. The measures are modeled after the Georgia Department of Transportation's document entitled, *"Potential Planning Level Environmental Impacts & Mitigation Measures."*

Environmental Justice Impacts

- Residential and commercial relocation;
- Efforts during project development to identify and engage Environmental Justice populations (including those identified as part of the Justice40 initiative, as described in Executive Order 14008);
- Involve community in articulating project need/project development and way to improve community

Community Facilities Impacts

- Sidewalks;
- Maintain or enhance community services;
- Traffic calming measures;
- Park improvements such as upgraded pedestrian facilities and bike pathways;
- Land dedication

Conservation Areas/Wildlife Areas

- Fencing to direct wildlife away from roadway;
- Modification of design;
- Preservation (via acquisition or conservation easement) of existing habitat;
- Creation of new habitats;
- Establishment of buffer areas around existing habitats

Watershed Basins/ Groundwater Recharge Areas

- Provide protected designated areas for the use of construction site chemicals such as oils, gasoline, degreasers, antifreeze, concrete & asphalt products, sealers, paints and wash water associated with the products;
- Minimize the use of fertilizers to promote vegetation growth on disturbed earth to reduce the introduction of excessive nitrates and phosphates into surface waters;
- Compliance with best management practices for stormwater management and erosion control

Wetlands/ Floodplains

- *Establishment (Creation)*: The development of a wetland or other aquatic resources through manipulation of the physical, chemical or biological characteristics where a wetland did not previously exist. Successful creation results in a net gain in wetland acres;
- *Restoration:* Re-establishment or restoration of a wetland or other aquatic resources with the goal of returning natural or historic functions and characteristics to a former or degraded wetland. Restoration may result in a gain in wetland function and/or wetland acres;
- *Enhancement:* Activities conducted within existing wetlands that heighten, intensify, or improve one or more wetland functions. Enhancement is often undertaken for the specific purpose such as to improve water quality, flood water retention or wildlife habitat. Enhancement results in a change in wetland function(s) but does not result in a gain in wetland acres;
- *Protection/Maintenance (Preservation):* The protection of ecologically important wetlands or other aquatic resources into perpetuity through the implementation of appropriate legal and physical mechanisms (i.e. conservation easements, title transfers). Preservation may include protection of upland areas adjacent to wetlands as necessary to ensure proper protection;
- Elevation of road bed onto pylons through floodplain areas

Historic Sites

- Relocation of a historic property may be utilized to avoid its acquisition or minimize impacts;
- Design modification to the project to avoid or complement the property;
- Landscaping to reduce visual impacts;
- Photo documentation;

- Historic archival recording, possibly including photos, plans, historic documentation, etc., to preserve historic resource information to the public.

Archaeological

- Design modifications so that impact on archaeology is avoided;
- Full excavation is used as a method of preservation by record;
- Develop educational activities to educate public about archaeology and prehistory/history

River and Stream Corridors

- "Standard Operating Procedures for Compensatory Mitigation" (US Army Corps of Engineers);
- Purchase stream credit in State-owned or commercial banks-cost, dependent upon area of State;
- Stream restoration;
- Planting of vegetative buffer zones;
- Strict erosion and sedimentation control measures;
- Design features to avoid impacts (such as bridges and bottomless culverts)

Additional Planning Considerations – Inter Agency Coordinating Committee Consultation

During the development of the 2050 MTP, MATS consulted with various partner agencies tasked with helping to ensure that the MATS planning area continues to conform to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).[1]

The group responsible for assisting MATS in maintaining compliance with the NAAQS standards is known as the Inter Agency Coordinating (IAC) Committee. For the MATS planning area, IAC is composed of the following members:

- U.S. EPA Region 4
- U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Region 4
- Georgia Department of Transportation, Office of Planning
- Georgia Department of Transportation, Intermodal Division
- Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority
- Macon Area Transportation Study MPO
- Georgia Environmental Protection Division

IAC Committee members were provided opportunities in late January and early February 2021 to review and comment on individual 2050 MTP chapters covering Roads and Bridges Projects (Chapter 6), Public Transportation (Chapter 7), and Fiscal Balancing (Chapter 8), as well as the

[1] The full background on the status of the MATS area with respect to NAAQS (specifically, the 1997 NAAQS for Ozone) is discussed in Chapter 1. For additional specifics on how MATS demonstrates conformity, please see: *Macon Area Transportation Study 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program Transportation Conformity Determination Report for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS*

full *Macon Area Transportation Study 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program Transportation Conformity Determination Report for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS* (AQ-CDR).

In addition to the preview of these specific draft chapters, the IAC Committee was provided the opportunity to review the full 2050 MTP document from February 3, 2022 through the close of the public comment period on March 17, 2022.[2] The final drafts of the MATS 2050 MTP and AQ-CDR documents reflect the comments received from the IAC Committee members from February 3, 2022 through March 17, 2022. Appendix K contains a copy of the original e-mail asking for IAC Committee comments, and a chart of the compiled comments received and the MATS staff responses.

[2] See Chapter 4 for full discussion of the public comment periods and public engagement methods employed during the development of the 2050 MTP and AQ-CDR.

Chapter 13 | Performance-Based Transportation Planning and Programming

Introduction

This Performance-Based Transportation Planning and Programming section of the MATS 2050 MTP is meant to show how the MATS MPO is conforming to the adopted Statewide Performance Measures and Performance Targets, as part of the strategic Transportation Performance Management (TPM) framework. The following sections describe:

- The pattern of adopted Statewide Performance Measures and Performance Targets; and,
- Next steps for the MPO to build its TPM practices, process, and policies.

This section is broken into two parts. The first covers those Performance Measures related to highways, roads and bridges (including the related air quality impacts). The second covers those Performance Measures related to provision of public transportation.

Background

In 2012, Congress passed the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act. MAP-21 introduced a new emphasis in the MPO transportation planning process, towards measurable performance and outcome-based metrics in the evaluation of projects and programs receiving federal support. MAP-21 focuses on 7 performance goal areas:

- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition
- Congestion Reduction
- System Reliability
- Freight Movement and Economic Vitality
- Environmental Sustainability
- Reduced Project Delivery Delays

In December 2015, President Obama signed the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act into law. The FAST Act continued the emphasis raised in MAP-21 on performance-based outcomes and requires federally funded transportation projects to support national goals for the nation's transportation system by focusing on projects that:

- Achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads;
- Maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair;
- Achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System;
- Improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system;
- Improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development;
- Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment;
- Reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the

project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices. (23 U.S. Code § 150).

Through the federal rulemaking process, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires State DOTs and MPOs to monitor the transportation system using specific performance measures prescribed in MAP-21 and the FAST Act. Table 13-1 describes national goal areas, Performance Areas, and Performance Measures. What the table describes is the minimum that must be addressed. An MPO can, of its own initiative, take additional measures beyond those described.

Performance-based planning and programming refers to transportation agencies' application of performance management as standard state of the practice. This approach results in a planning process called Transportation Performance Management. The Federal transportation legislation and rules identifying Performance Measures also describes how States and MPOs are to incorporate these measures into their planning processes. [1]

Targets

- MPOs are required to establish performance targets no later than 180 days after the state or public transportation operator sets said performance targets;
- For each roadway performance measure, a MPO can decide to commit to support a statewide target, or to establish a quantifiable target specific to its planning area;
- Both State and MPO targets for roadway performance measures will be set at two-year and four-year intervals;
- States, MPOs, and public transit operators must coordinate their respective targets for performance measures with each other to ensure consistency, to the maximum extent practicable.

Reporting

- State and MPO Transportation Plans must describe the Performance Measures and Performance Targets used to assess system performance, evaluate the performance of the transportation system with respect to the federally required performance targets, and report on progress made;
- State Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs) and MPO TIPs must link investment priorities to the targets in their respective LRTPs and describe, to the maximum extent practicable, the anticipated effect of the program toward achieving established targets;
- MPOs must report baseline roadway transportation system condition and performance data and progress toward the achievement of targets to their respective state Departments of Transportation (DOT).

Assessments

- FHWA will determine whether state DOTs have met or have made significant progress towards meeting targets for the highway system. Progress at the state level would be considered significant if an actual outcome is either equal to or better than the established target, or better than the baseline condition;
- FHWA and FTA will not directly assess MPO progress towards meeting targets for required performance measures. Instead, these agencies will review MPO performance as part of ongoing transportation planning process reviews, including Transportation Management

[1] FHWA, Metropolitan Planning Organization Safety Performance Measures Fact Sheet, http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/spm/docs/mpo_factsheet.pdf

Area certification reviews and the Federal Planning Finding associated with approval of the STIP.

Highway Performance Measures			
National Goal		**Performance Area**	**Performance Measure**
PM 1	Safety- *To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads*	Injuries & Fatalities	• Number of fatalities • Fatality rate (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled) • Number of serious injuries • Serious injury rate (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled) • Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries
PM 2	Infrastructure Condition – *To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair*	Pavement Condition	• Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition • Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition • Percentage of pavements on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in Good condition • Percentage of pavements on the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition
		Bridge Condition	• Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Good condition • Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Poor condition
	System Reliability - *To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system*	Performance of the National Highway System	• Percent of person miles traveled on the Interstate System that are reliable • Percent of person miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable
PM 3	Freight Movement and Economic Vitality- *To improve the National Highway Freight Network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development*	Freight Movement on the Interstate System	• Truck Travel Time Reliability Index
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement – *To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System*	Traffic congestion	• Annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay per capita • Percent of non-single-occupant vehicle travel
		Air Quality Improvement	• Emissions Reduction Targets (2 Year and 4 Year) for VOC and NOx

Table 13-1: Highway Performance Measures, as Identified by FHWA

MATS Support of GDOT Adopted Performance Measures and Targets

As part of developing the 2050 MTP, MATS staff reviewed the original goals and targets specified by the Georgia Dept. of Transportation, developed in conjunction with FHWA. These goals and objectives reflect State or regional priorities and policy directions while supporting national goals specified in MAP-21 and the FAST Act. The MATS staff also proposed transportation related objectives for which future performance measures can be developed. Table 2-1 in the MTP shows how the updated goals and objectives approved by the MATS Policy Committee build upon the general goals areas specified in MAP-21, FAST Act, the System Performance Report for the Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan/2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan and objectives adopted as part of the 2050 MTP.

Performance Measures related to Highways, Roads and Bridges

PM 1 - Safety Performance Measures

The Safety Performance Management is part of the overall Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program. The Safety PM Final Rule supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP; 23 CFR 148), as it establishes safety performance measure requirements for carrying out the HSIP and to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures as the five-year rolling averages to include:

- Number of Fatalities
- Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- Number of Serious Injuries
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
- Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

The Safety PM Final Rule also establishes the process for State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to establish and report their safety targets, and the process that FHWA will use to assess whether State DOTs have met or made significant progress toward meeting their safety targets.

Transportation Safety in Georgia

The Safety Performance Measures Final Rule on the HSIP became effective on April 14, 2016. Table 13-2 shows the trend in Safety Performance Measures for both the State HSIP, and the MATS MPO area since the original adoption of the targets. Cells highlighted in green show where MATS MPO has been achieving the Statewide goals that are normalized by VMT.

The MATS MPO will demonstrate its continued support of the State's safety targets through its planning and programming process by:

- Addressing areas of concern for fatalities or serious injuries within the metropolitan planning area through coordination with GDOT and incorporation of safety considerations on all projects;
- Integrating safety goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets into the planning process; and

- Including the anticipated effect toward achieving the targets noted above within the MPO's MTP, TIP and UPWP, effectively linking investment priorities to safety target achievement.

Pursuant to directions originally established by MATS Policy Committee under the resolution adopted on 8/1/2018, the MATS MPO anticipates updating Safety Performance Measure targets into the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and current Transportation Improvement Plan through the Administrative Modification process. The Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) outlines the State's methods for developing annual Performance Measure targets and strategies to achieve those targets. The 2022 Georgia Strategic Highway Safety Plan can be found at https://www.nhtsa.gov/document/georgia-fy-2022-highway-safety-plan

PM 2 – Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures

On January 18, 2017, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published in the Federal Register rules to establish measures to assess the condition of pavements and bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) to carry out the National Highway performance program (NHPP) (82 Fed. Reg. 5886). The pavement and bridges rule addresses requirements establishing performance measures for State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), as mandated by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and reflects passage of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. On May 20, 2017, the final rule was put into effect.

The measures for bridges on the National Highway System are:
- Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Good condition; and
- Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Poor condition.

The measures for pavement on the National Highway System are:
- Percentage of Interstate pavements in Good condition;
- Percentage of Interstate pavements in Poor condition;
- Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition; and,
- Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition.

On May 16, 2018, GDOT established two- and four-year Statewide Pavement and Bridge Condition performance targets for the first performance measurement period. Table 13-3 describes the most recent performance targets adopted by GDOT, as reflected in the GDOT System Performance Report for the 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan (adopted by GDOT Statewide Transportation Board on April 9, 2021).

MATS adopts these Statewide targets for Pavement and Bridge Conditions as presented.

Pursuant to directions originally established by MATS Policy Committee under the resolution adopted on 8/1/2018, the MATS MPO anticipates updating Pavement and Bridge Conditions Performance Measure targets into the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and current Transportation Improvement Plan through the Administrative Modification process.

Safety Performance Measure	5 Year Rolling Average Reporting Period											Calendar Year
	2011-2015	2012-2016	2013-2017	2014-2018	2015-2019	2016-2020	2017-2021	2018-2022	2019-2023	2020-2024	2021-2025	CY 2026
	# Fatalities											
Statewide 5 Year Avg. Goal	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	1593	1655	1698	1715	1671	1680	1680	1600	1,574
MATS Value	23.8	25.2	29.2	29.6	32.8	37	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available		
	Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT											
Statewide 5 Year Avg. Goal	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	1.320	1.31	1.28	1.23	1.21	1.36	1.36	1.25	1.245
MATS Value	1.026	1.07	1.21	1.17	1.29	1.51	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available		
	# Serious injuries											
Statewide 5 Year Avg. Goal	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	19643	24324	24094	6407	8443	8966	8966	7,109	8103
MATS Value	293.4	341.6	344	359.9	374.3	406.4	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available		
	Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT											
Statewide 5 Year Avg. Goal	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	16.318	18.9	21.8	4.422	4.61	7.679	7.679	5.711	6.408
MATS Value	12.759	14.54	14.22	14.26	14.75	16.63	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available		
	# of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious injuries											
Statewide 5 Year Avg. Goal	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	Targets Not Set For this Period	1027.2	1126	1163	686.5	793	802	802	799	1,312
MATS Value	25.2	33.8	38.8	41	40.4	43.6	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available	Forthcoming, as Data Available		

Table 13-2: GDOT Safety Performance (PM1) Targets, 5 Year Rolling Averages

Asset	Performance Measure	Description	Baseline	2019 Actual	2-Year Target (2019)	4-Year Target (2021)	2-Year Target (2023)	4-Year Target (2023)
Bridge Structures	Percent of NHS Bridges in **Good condition** as a percentage of total NHS bridge deck area	Bridges rated as "Good" will be evaluated as to cost to maintain Good condition. Bridges rated as "Fair" will be evaluated as to cost of replacement vs. rehabilitation to bring the structure back to a condition rating of Good.	60%	57.0%	N/A	≥ 50%	≥ 50%	≥ 50%
Bridge Structures	Percent of NHS Bridges in **Poor condition** as a percentage of total NHS bridge deck area	Bridge Conditions are based on the result of inspections on all Bridge structures. Bridges rated as "Poor" are safe to drive on; however, they are nearing a point where it is necessary to either replace the bridge or extend its service life through substantial rehabilitation investments	4.0%	0.3%	N/A	≤ 5%	≤ 5%	≤ 5%
Interstate NHS	Percentage of NHS pavements in **Good condition**	Interstate pavement rated as good will be considered for potential pavement preservation treatments to maintain the "good" rating	44.0%	46.5%	≥40%	≥ 40%	≥ 40%	≥ 40%
Interstate NHS	Percentage of NHS pavements in **Poor condition**	Pavement conditions are measured through field inspections. Pavements in "poor" condition are in need of work due to either the ride quality or due to a structural deficiency.	10.0%	0.8%	≤12%	≤12%	≤12%	≤12%
Non-Interstate NHS	Percentage of NHS pavements in **Good condition**	Non-Interstate NHS pavements in "good" condition will be evaluated for potential preservation treatments	47.3%	67.5%	≥ 50%	≥ 60%	≥ 60%	≥ 60%
Non-Interstate NHS	Percentage of NHS pavements in **Poor condition**	Non-Interstate NHS pavements in "poor" condition are in need of major maintenance. These will be evaluated for potential projects.	1.1%	0.8%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%

Table 13 – 3: Current GDOT Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) Performance Targets

PM 3 – System Performance and Freight Performance Measures

On January 18, 2017, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published in the Federal Register (82 FR 5970) rules to establish performance measures that State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) will use to report on the performance of the Interstate and Non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) to carry out the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP); freight movement on the Interstate system

to carry out the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP); and traffic congestion and on-road mobile source emissions for the purpose of carrying out the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program. The rule addresses requirements established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and reflects passage of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. On May 20, 2017, the final rule took effect.

On May 16, 2018, GDOT established specific Performance Measures for two- and four-year statewide targets for National Highway System Performance, Freight Movement, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality. Table 13-4 describes the current performance targets adopted by GDOT.

Performance Measure	Area	Baseline Value	2-Year State Target (2019)	2019 State Actual Value	2019 MATS Value	4-Year State Target (2021)	2021 MATS Value	2-Year State Target (2023)	4-Year State Target (2023)	2023 MATS Value
Percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable	Statewide	80.2%	≥73.0%	80.8%	98.4%	≥67.0%	97.8%	≥73.9%	≥67.0%	n/a
Percent of person-miles traveled on non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	Statewide	84.9%	n/a	86.5%	89.2%	81%	84.9%	87.3%	85.3%	n/a
Truck Travel Time Reliability Index	Statewide	1.44	≤1.66	1.44	1.61	1.78	1.20	≤1.62	1.65	n/a
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Per Capita*	Atlanta Urbanized Area	20.4 hours	n/a	18.9 hours	n/a	24.6 hour	n/a	23.7 hours	27.2 hours	n/a
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Travel*	Atlanta Urbanized Area	22.8%	≤23.2%	22.1%	n/a	22.1%	n/a	≤22.7%	22.7%	n/a
Total Emissions Reduction	Statewide	VOC 839.0 kg/day NOx: 1,594 kg/day	VOC: 215.992 kg/day NOx: 732.850 kg/day	VOC: 205.7 kg/day NOx: 563.3 kg/day	n/a	VOC: 386.6 kg/day NOx: 1,085.0 kg/day	n/a	VOC: 157.200 kg/day NOx: 510.900 kg/day	VOC: 257.100 kg/day NOx: 904.200 kg/day	n/a

Table 13 – 4: GDOT Highway System Performance, Freight Movement, and Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (PM3) Targets

Where applicable, the values for the MATS area for specific performance measures are included. Only three of the six Performance Measures in Table 13 – 4 apply to the MATS area; Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita, Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle Travel apply only to the Atlanta urbanized area, and the Emissions Reductions Targets apply to the State overall. They are included here only for the sake of a comprehensive listing of the performance measures adopted by GDOT. For the performance measures in Table 13-4 that are applicable to the MATS area, the values demonstrate MATS is meeting or exceeding State goals.

MATS continues to adopt the most recent System Performance and Freight Movement performance targets set by the State as the targets for the MATS area, as reflected in the GDOT System Performance Report for the 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan (adopted by GDOT Statewide Transportation Board on April 9, 2021). Pursuant to directions originally established by MATS Policy Committee under the resolution adopted on 8/1/2018, the MATS MPO anticipates updating System Performance and Freight Movement targets into the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and current Transportation Improvement Plan through the Administrative Modification process

Public Transit Performance Measures

Transit Asset Management

In July 2016, FTA issued the final rule (49 CFR 625.17) establishing Transit Asset Management (TAM) requirements for recipients and sub-recipients of federal funds. Based on the requirements established under 23 CFR 450.324 and 23 CFR 450.326, acknowledgement of this final rule also must be reflected in the MATS transportation planning documents.

On August 24, 2018, Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Intermodal Division published finalized Group TAM Plans and targets for Tier II sub-recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds. The Group TAM Plan covers the four year period FY 2019 through FY 2022, and includes both preliminary assessments relative to TAM Plan targets (Table 13-5, below), and a detailed breakdown of TAM targets by asset class and initial FY 2019 TAM Plan targets (Table 13-6, below).

Asset Category	Performance Measure	Initial Target FY 2017	Actual Performance
Rolling Stock – Revenue Vehicles by Mode	**% of vehicles met or exceeded Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)**	**<15.0%**	**12.4%**
Equipment – non-revenue support service and maintenance vehicles	**% of vehicles met or exceeded ULB**	**<50%**	**42.6%**
Facilities – maintenance and administrative facilities, passenger stations (buildings); and parking facilities	**% of assets with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA TERM scale**	**<40%**	**8.4%**

Table 13-5: Summary of Initial GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds
Source: GDOT Group Transit Asset Management Plan, Table 4.2 – Summary of Initial Performance Targets, 24 August 2018.

Because both Jones County Transit (JCT) and Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) are specifically identified as being covered under the GDOT Group TAM Plan, the targets identified in that plan are applicable by reference in the MATS 2050 MTP.

Asset Category/Class	Total Number	Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	Number Exceeding ULB/3.0 TERM Rating	Exceeding ULB/3.0 TERM Rating	Proposed FY 2019 Targets
Rolling Stock	**775**		**96**	**12.4%**	
BU-Bus (35' – 40')	82	14 yrs.	8	9.8%	<15%
BU-Bus (29' – 30')	54	12 yrs.	21	38.9%	<35%
CU – Cutaway Bus	593	7 yrs.	52	8.8%	<10%
MV – Minivan	1	8 yrs.	1	100.0%	<50%
SB – School bus	33	15 yrs.	8	24.2%	<50%
VN – Van	12	8 yrs.	6	50.0%	<50%
Equipment	**55**		**23**	**42.6%**	
AO – Automobile	18	8 yrs.	11	61.1%	<55%
Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles	31	10 yrs.	11	35.5%	<55%
Equip. > $50,000	6	14 yrs.	n/a	n/a	n/a
Facilities	**83**		**7**	**8.4%**	
Administration	62	n/a	2	3.2%	<25%
Maintenance	11	n/a	5	45.5%	<25%
Passenger/ Parking Facilities	10	n/a	0	0%	<10%

Table 13-6: Detailed Breakdown of GDOT TAM Targets for Tier II Sub-Recipients of FTA 5307 Operating Funds, and Proposed FY 2019 TAM Targets
Source: GDOT Group Transit Asset Management Plan, Table 4.1 – Summary of Asset Performance by Asset Class, 24 August 2018.

Public Transit Agency Safety Planning

On July 19, 2018, the Federal Transit Administration published final rule 49 CFR 673, which requires agencies that receive money under 49 USC 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (aka "5307 funds") to establish a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP). The PTASP must include the following:

- Documents the processes and activities related to safety management system implementation;
- Includes performance targets measures established under the National Public Transportation Safety Plan;

- Establish a process and timeline for conducting annual reviews and updates for performance targets

On June 20, 2020, Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) adopted a PTASP document consistent with the requirements set forth by FTA. As the sole recipient of 5307 funds in the MATS planning area, the Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority Safety Plan (MTA-SP) document is the controlling reference for transit related Safety Performance Measures in the MATS region.

Section 4.2 of the MTA-SP identifies the following performance measures required by the National Public Transportation Safety Plan, and sets the target values to be achieved:

- Fatalities - Total number of reportable fatalities and rate per total vehicle revenue miles (VRM) by mode (The thresholds for "reportable" fatalities, injuries, and events are defined in the NTD Safety and Security);
- Injuries - Total number of reportable injuries and rate per total VRM by mode;
- Safety Events - Total number of reportable events and rate per total VRM by mode; and
- System Reliability - Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode.

Specific targets safety performance measures are updated annually. Section 5 of the MTA-SP identifies the specific methods used to attain and maintain the targets.

Pursuant to directions originally established by MATS Policy Committee under the resolution adopted on 8/1/2018, the MATS MPO anticipates updating Transit Asset Management Plan and/or Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) targets adopted by Georgia Dept. of Transportation into the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and current Transportation Improvement Plan through the Administrative Modification process.

Administrative Modifications

Administrative Modification #1 (2/1/2023) - On December 14, 2022, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective planning documents. On December 21, 2022, GDOT informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for Safety (PM1) specified under 23 CFR 490.105. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Performance Measure (To Remain Below)	**5-Year Rolling Average**
Number of Fatalities	1,680
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT	1.36
Number of Serious Injuries	8,966
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT	7.679
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	802

Under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT. Pursuant to guidance issued by FHWA on January 11, 2023, and the original adoption resolution for the 2050 MTP dated May 3, 2022, MATS MPO hereby modifies the 2050 MTP to reflect the new Calendar Year 2023 PM1 Safety performance targets set by GDOT as referenced in the December 21, 2022 e-mail by the Administrative Modification process. This Administrative Modification was affirmed by the MATS Policy Committee at their meeting on this date.

Administrative Modification #2 (5/1/2024) - On August 31, 2023, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective planning documents. On September 28, 2023, GDOT informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for Safety (PM1) specified under 23 CFR 490.105 for Calendar Year 2024. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Performance Measure (To Remain Below)	**5-Year Rolling Average (2020 – 2024)**
Number of Fatalities	1,680
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT	1.36
Number of Serious Injuries	8,966
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT	7.679
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	802

Under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT. Pursuant to guidance issued by FHWA on January 11, 2023, and the original adoption resolution for the 2050 MTP dated May 3, 2022, MATS MPO hereby modifies the 2050 MTP to reflect the new Calendar Year 2024 PM1 Safety performance targets set by GDOT as referenced in the September 28, 2023 e-mail.

Administrative Modification #3 (11/6/2024) - On August 31, 2024, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective planning documents. On September 12, 2024, GDOT informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for Safety (PM1) specified under 23 CFR 490.105 for Calendar Year 2025. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Performance Measure (To Remain Below)	**5-Year Rolling Average (2021 – 2025)**
Number of Fatalities	1,600
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT	1.25

Number of Serious Injuries	7,109
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT	5.711
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	799

Under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT. Pursuant to guidance issued by FHWA on January 11, 2023, and the original adoption resolution for the 2050 MTP dated May 3, 2022, MATS MPO hereby modifies the 2050 MTP to reflect the new Calendar Year 2025 PM1 Safety performance targets set by GDOT as referenced in the September 12, 2024 presentation to the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

Administrative Modification #4 (11/5/2025) - On August 31, 2025, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective planning documents. On September 25, 2025, GDOT informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for Safety (PM1) specified under 23 CFR 490.105 for Calendar Year 2026. Pursuant to consultation with the National Highway Safety Administration and FHWA, starting in Calendar Year 2026, GDOT shifted from a 5-Year rolling average to Calendar Year specific target setting, with a Vision Zero goal of zero injuries or fatalities across all categories by Calendar Year 2106 (Reference: 90 Fed. Register 731; 90 Fed. Register 734). Specifically, the updated Statewide CY 2026 targets are:

Performance Measure (To Remain Below)	**Calendar Year 2026 Target**
Number of Fatalities	1,574
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT	1.245
Number of Serious Injuries	8,103
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT	6.408
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries	1,312

Under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT. Pursuant to guidance issued by FHWA on January 11, 2023, and the original adoption resolution for the 2050 MTP dated May 3, 2022, MATS MPO hereby modifies the 2050 MTP to reflect the new Calendar Year 2024 PM1 Safety performance targets set by GDOT as referenced in the September 25, 2025 presentation to the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Amendments

Amendment #1 (5/3/2023) - On December 14, 2022, Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) informed FHWA of the adoption of new targets for performance measures specified

under 23 CFR 490.105. This notification started a 180 clock for adoption of performance measures by MPOs into their respective planning documents. On December 21, 2022, GDOT informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of new of updated performance measure targets for Pavement and Bridge Condition Targets (PM2) and System Performance/Freight Movement (PM3) specified under 23 CFR 490.105.
Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Pavement and Bridge Condition Targets (PM2) – Calendar Year 2023

Performance Measure	2-Year Rolling Average	4-Year Rolling Average
Percentage of Interstate Pavements in **"Good"** condition	≥50%	≥50%
Percentage of Interstate Pavements in **"Poor"** condition	≤5%	≤5%
Percentage of Non-Interstate Pavements in **"Good"** condition	≥40%	≥40%
Percentage of Non-Interstate Pavements in **"Poor"** condition	≤12%	≤12%
Percentage of National Highway System bridges (by deck area) in **"Good"** Condition	≥60%	≥60%
Percentage of National Highway System bridges (by deck area) in **"Poor"** Condition	≤10%	≤10%

System Performance/Freight Movement (PM3) – Calendar Year 2023

Performance Measure	2-Year Rolling Average	4-Year Rolling Average
Percentage of person-miles on Interstate system that are "reliable"	≥73.9	≥68.4%

Percentage of person-miles on non-Interstate system that are "reliable"	≥87.3%	≥85.3%
Truck Travel Time Reliability Index	≤1.62	≤1.65
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Per Capita*	23.7 hours	27.2 hours
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Travel*	22.7%	22.7%
Total Emissions Reduction	VOC: 157.200 kg/day; NOx: 510.900 kg/day	VOC: 257.100 kg/day; NOx: 904.200 kg/day

Under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii) MATS MPO has the option to either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT. Pursuant to guidance issued by FHWA on January 11, 2023, the PM2 and PM3 standards must be adopted by resolution (i.e., a formal amendment), in contrast to the Administrative Modification process available for the PM1 Safety Standards.

The MATS MPO hereby formally amends the 2050 MTP to reflect the new Calendar Year 2023 PM2 and PM3 performance targets set by GDOT as referenced in the December 21, 2022 e-mail.

APPENDIX A:

Data Development Methodology Notes for MATS 2015 Baseline Population and Employment Estimates

General Notes on MATS Preliminary 2015 Base Year Data Assembly

1. All GIS and data assembly tasks were performed using the following software packages:
    a. Spatial Analysis/GIS – ArcGIS 10.7.1, ArcINFO license
    b. Tabular data organization:
        i. Microsoft® Access® for Microsoft 365 MSO (Version 2202 Build 16.0.14931.20118) 32-bit
        ii. Microsoft® Excel® for Microsoft 365 MSO (Version 2202 Build 16.0.14931.20118) 32-bit
        iii.
2. All GIS and Spatial Analysis tasks were standardized to the NAD 1983 Georgia Statewide Lambert Conical Form coordinate system. Unless otherwise noted, measurement units are in U.S. Feet.

3. All variable names listed below are <u>underlined</u>

4. Contact information/questions regarding data development:

Mike Greenwald
Planning Director/MPO Technical Coordinator
Macon-Bibb Co Planning & Zoning Commission
200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201
478-338-9472;
MGreenwald@mbpz.org

Data Assembly Notes v. 6/17/2021

GIS Methodology

Census Blocks

Census blocks were assigned to a specific TAZ based on which TAZ the Census Block centroid fell within; centroids for convex polygons were assigned to a location inside the interior of the polygon boundary (using ArcGIS 10.7.1 Feature to Point tool, with "Inside" option selected.

Census blocks with multi-part polygons either had no households and no population associated with them (n=6), or were editing errors associated with neighboring counties not within the jurisdictional boundaries covered by this project (i.e., Crawford County blocks on the border with Bibb and/or Monroe County; Jasper and/or Putnam County blocks bordering Jones County; n=11)

Original Data Source: N=13,394 Census Blocks across Bibb, Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe Peach and Twiggs Counties

Final Dataset: N=13,394 Blocks, comprising 139 block groups across 976 Transportation Analysis Zones spanning all of Bibb, Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe Peach and Twiggs Counties.

Primary and Secondary Schools, Universities and Technical Colleges

Primary and secondary school locations were obtained from the Bibb County School District (private schools operating in Macon-Bibb County), Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Department archives (public schools only), and the Middle Georgia Regional Commission (public schools only). According to the Jones County School District there were no private schools operating in Jones County in 2010. Only one private school was located in that portion of Monroe County covered by the MATS MPO jurisdiction, and that was identified through the data provided by the Bibb County School District.

Locations for private schools were geocoded using the multi-phasic composite geocoder maintained by the Macon-Bibb County GIS Manager. These results were then validated against Google Earth satellite imagery to ensure proper placement in the TAZ system. Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe, Peach and Twiggs County locations were similarly validated. Finally, all records were consolidated into a single, MPO region wide, school location point file. This master file was then edited to remove closed or ineligible sites, and then spatially joined to the TAZ system map layer.

Final Data Set: N = 140 primary and secondary school locations (public and private) across Bibb, Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe, Peach and Twiggs Counties.

County	Total Schools	Charter School	Private School	Public School
Crawford	4	0	1	3
Houston	47	0	10	37
Jones	10	0	1	9
Macon-Bibb	62	2	19	41
Monroe	6	0	1	5
Peach	7	0	1	6
Twiggs	4		1	3

University and technical college campuses were collected individually, and then geocoded using the same data assembly and spatial validation procedures as for primary and secondary schools.

Final Data Set: N = 23 university and technical college campuses across Bibb, Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe, Peach and Twiggs Counties. Details of each campus can be found in the *College Enrollment and On-Campus Housing Estimates* variable description, below

Variable Definitions

Indexing Variables

These variables are used to uniquely identify each TAZ in the data set. The combination of values for these three variables provides a primary key index for all TAZs in this data set.

MPOArea_EDITED – The MPO area associated with each Transportation Analysis Zone. This variable is necessary because the indexing system for TAZs repeats depending on the MPO Area where the zone is located (e.g., there is a TAZ #1 for the MATS MPO area, and also a TAZ #1 for the WRATS MPO area, etc.).
This variable takes on one of three values:

MATS MPO – The TAZ is associated with the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) MPO area

WRATS MPO - The TAZ is associated with the Warner Robins Area Transportation Study (WRATS) MPO area

Outside MPO Boundary – The TAZ falls outside the currently defined boundaries of an MPO area.

TAZ_NEW_EDITED – The Transportation Analysis Zone for which the data is being collected. TAZ indexing reflects the zone systems developed by GDOT and HNTB for the MATS area, WRATS area and Crawford, Jones, Monroe, Peach and Twiggs County areas not covered by an existing MPO boundary.

County_EDITED – The County in which the TAZ is located. By definition, a TAZ cannot span a County boundary; all TAZs must be fully contained within an individual county.

Land Area and Population

These variables contain information on the size and composition of the land mass and population for each TAZ

TAZCalcAcres – The total acreage of the TAZ, as calculated by ArcMap 10.7.1.

LandOnlyAcres – The total amount of TAZ area that is identified as exclusively Land. This value is calculated by taking all Census Blocks within the TAZ that are identified as ALAND>0 and AWATER=0, calculating the area in ArcMap. 10.7.1, and summing up the individual Census Block areas by TAZ.

WaterOnlyAcres – The total amount of TAZ area that is identified as exclusively Water (i.e., rivers, lakes, tributaries, etc.). This value is calculated by taking all Census Blocks within the TAZ that are identified as ALAND=0 and AWATER≠0, calculating the area in ArcMap. 10.7.1, and summing up the individual Census Block areas by TAZ.

LandAndWaterAcres – The total amount of TAZ area that is identified as both land area and water bodies. This value is calculated by taking all Census Blocks within the TAZ that are identified as ALAND≠0 and AWATER≠0, calculating the area in ArcMap. 10.7.1, and summing up the individual Census Block areas by TAZ.

TAZ_TtlPop2015 – The estimated number of persons identified as living in the specific TAZ, as of July 1, 2015. Values are based on U.S. Census 2010 population counts reported at the block level of geography (U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1, Table P12: SEX BY AGE), broken down by the following age groups.

Age 0 to 4 Years
Age 5 to 9 Years
Age 10 to 14 Years
Age 15 to 19 Years
Age 20 to 24 Years
Age 25 to 29 Years
Age 30 to 34 Years
Age 35 to 39 Years
Age 40 to 44 Years
Age 45 to 49 Years
Age 50 to 54 Years
Age 55 to 59 Years
Age 60 to 64 Years
Age 65 to 69 Years
Age 70 to 74 Years
Age 75 to 79 Years
Age 80 to 84 Years
Age 85 Years and Older

These values were then multiplied by an expansion factor for each age group, in each county. Factor was developed as follows:

$$\frac{\textit{Estimated Population as of July 1, 2015 for Age Group in Specific County}}{\textit{Reported Population as of April 1, 2015 for Age Group in Specific County}}$$

Source: "US Census Annual County Resident Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019" (https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2010-2019/counties/asrh/cc-est2019-alldata-13.csv)

Block estimates were then aggregated to each TAZ to generate TAZ population estimates.

TAZ_TtlHh2015 – The estimated total number of households identified as living in the specific TAZ, as of July 1, 2015. Values are based on the number of occupied housing units reported at the block level of geography (U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1, Table H3: Housing Units—Status=OCCUPIED), multiplied by a countywide expansion factor based on the number of estimated housing units for the county.

Factor was developed as follows:

Estimated number of Housing Units as of July 1, 2015 for a Specific County
Reported number of Housing Units as of April 1, 2010 for a Specific County

Source: "Annual Estimates of Housing Units for Counties in Georgia: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019" (https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/tables/2010-2019/housing/totals/CO-EST2019-ANNHU-13.xlsx)

Block estimates were then aggregated to each TAZ to generate TAZ population estimates.

Supplemental: There are additional fields for TAZ Population and Household Estimates, based on ethnic groups recognized by U.S. Census: White {White}, African American {AfrAm}, American Indian/Alaskan Native {AIAN}, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander {NHPI}, Other {Other}, Two or More Races {TwoRace}, Hispanic Origin {Hisp}. Those population and household estimates were generated as follows:

TAZ_{Ethnic Group}TtlPop2015 – The estimated number of persons in a particular census ethnic category living in a specific TAZ, as of July 1, 2015. Estimation method is similar to that for TAZ_TtlPop2015, with the following modifications:

- Population values are based on U.S. 2010 Census Summary File 1, Tables P12A: SEX BY AGE (WHITE ALONE) through P12H: SEX BY AGE (HISPANIC OR LATINO)
- Expansion factors are calculated by specific ethnic group, rather than for county overall population. The same core dataset ("US Census Annual County Resident Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019"; see link above) provides the necessary information to create expansion factors by age and ethnic categories

TAZ_{Ethnic Group}Hh2015Est – The estimated number of households of a particular census ethnic category living in a specific TAZ, as of July 1, 2015. Estimates were created using the following process:

- Calculate the average household size, by ethnic group, for 2010, using the following formula:

$$\frac{\sum_{B=1}^{n} U.S.\ Census\ 2010\ Block\ Count\ of\ Total\ Population\ in\ Occupied\ Housing\ Units\ (Table\ H11X)}{\sum_{B=1}^{n} U.S.\ Census\ 2010\ Block\ Count\ of\ Occupied\ housing\ units\ of\ particular\ ethnic\ group\ (Table\ H16X)}$$

Where *B* = set of all block groups within a specific TAZ

X = Relevant ethnic group data subset (A = White; B = African American; C = American Indian/Alaskan Native; D = Asian, E = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; F = Other; G = 2 Or More Races; H = Hispanic or Latino)

- If the TAZ had no 2015 population estimate for of a particular ethnic category (see variable description above), or there was no estimated 2010 average household size based on the previous step, the value was assigned to be **Null**. Otherwise, the estimated number of households for a particular ethnic category was calculated as:

$$\text{TAZ_\{Ethnic Group\}Hh2015Est} = \frac{\text{TAZ_\{Ethnic Group\}TtlPop2015}}{\text{Average Hh Size \{Ethnic Group\} 2010}}$$

Household Income Data Source

Household income information was collected from the American Community Survey 5 Year Estimate data release for 2013-2017 (ACS13_17), at the Census Block Group level of geographic detail. This data source and version release was chosen because:

1. Census Block Group is the highest level of geographic detail (i.e., the smallest geographic area) at which household income estimates are provided;
2. The 2015 base year falls exactly in the middle of the 2013-2017 time period covered by the ACS13_17 data release;

Dollar values from the ACS13_17 are reported in 2017 constant adjusted dollars. To adjust for inflation back to the 2015 base year, all ACS13_17 estimates were adjusted using the U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Historical Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the South, Not Seasonally Adjusted. (https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/CUUR0300SA0?amp%253bdata_tool=XGtable&output_view=data&include_graphs=true). These adjustments to the ACS13_17 estimates were incorporated before any additional steps were applied to create the variables described below.

TAZAvgHhInc2015 – The estimated average household income (in 2015 Constant Dollars) for the TAZ. Because TAZs and Census Block Groups are not necessarily fully encapsulated, the following rules were developed to estimate average household income:

1. If a TAZ has no households in 2010, the average household income assigned to it is $0;
2. If a TAZ spans one or more Census Block Groups, the average household income is assigned using the following formula

$$\sum_{b=1}^{B} \frac{2010\ Households\ in\ Specific\ Block\ and\ TAZ}{ALL\ 2010\ Households\ in\ TAZ}\ x\ (2015\ Block\ Group\ Household\ Avg.Income)_b$$

Where:
B = set of all block groups intersecting a specific TAZ

Supplemental: There are additional fields for Average Income Estimates, based on ethnic groups recognized by U.S. Census: White {White}, African American {AfrAm}, American Indian/Alaskan Native {AIAN}, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander {NHPI}, Other {Other}, Two or More Races {TwoRace}, Hispanic Origin {Hisp}. Those population and household estimates were generated as follows:

TAZ{EthnicGroup}AvgHhInc2015 – The average household income (in 2015 Constant Dollars), for households of a particular ethnic group, in the TAZ. Because TAZs and Census Block Groups are not necessarily fully encapsulated, the following rules were developed to estimate average household income:

1. **If a TAZ has no households in 2010, the average household income assigned to it is $0;**

2. **If a TAZ spans one or more Census Block Groups, the average household income is assigned using the following formula**

$$\sum_{b=1}^{B} \left(\frac{2010\ Households\ of\ Ethnic\ Group\ [X] in\ Specific\ Block\ and\ TAZ}{ALL\ 2010\ Households\ of\ Ethnic\ Group\ [X] in\ TAZ} \right) x\ (2015\ Block\ Group\ Household\ Avg. Income\ of\ Ethnic\ Group\ [X])$$

Where:

***B* = set of all block groups intersecting a specific TAZ**

***[X]* = Relevant ethnic group data subset for the U.S. 2010 Census (A = White; B = African American; C = American Indian/Alaskan Native; D = Asian, E = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; F = Other; G = 2 Or More Races; H = Hispanic or Latino)**

EstMedHhInc2015 – The estimated 2015 median household income for the TAZ, as computed from ACS13_17, Table B19013. Because TAZs and Census Block Groups are not necessarily fully encapsulated, the following rules were developed to estimate average household income:

1. If a TAZ has no households in 2010, the median household income assigned to it is $0;
2. If a TAZ is fully covered by a single Census Block Group, the median household income assigned to it is the median household income of the Census Block Group. Block Group median household income is taken from ACS13_17, Table B19013, with adjustment to 2015 Constant Dollars)
3. If a TAZ is covered by multiple Census Block Groups, the median household income is estimated using the frequency distribution of all the composite Block Groups intersecting the TAZ.

$$\sum_{b=1}^{B} \frac{2010\ Households\ in\ Specific\ Block\ and\ TAZ}{ALL\ 2010\ Households\ in\ TAZ}\ x\ (2015\ Block\ Group\ Household\ Median\ Income)_b$$

Where:

B = set of all block groups intersecting a specific TAZ

Group Quarters Housing

Group Quarters residency information was estimated using the values in the categories for U.S. 2010 Census, Summary File 1, Table P42 - Group Quarters Population by Group Quarters Type, using Census Block geography. The 2010 Block values were then aggregated to each TAZ to generate TAZ level population estimates. These values were then multiplied by a Group Quarters expansion factor for each county, based on U.S. Census estimates. Factor was developed as follows:

$$\frac{Estimated\ Group\ Quarters\ Total\ Population\ as\ of\ July\ 1,\ 2015\ for\ Specific\ County}{Estimated\ Group\ Quarters\ Total\ Population\ as\ of\ April\ 1,\ 2010\ for\ Specific\ County}$$

Source: "Annual Resident Population Estimates, Estimated Components of Resident Population Change, and Rates of the Components of Resident Population Change for States and Counties: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019" (https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2010-2019/counties/totals/co-est2019-alldata.csv)

TAZ_GQTtlPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in group quarters, across all categories of group quarters. This is effectively a control total across all sub-categories listed below.

TAZ_GQInstPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Institutionalized*** group quarters (Adult Correctional Facilities, Juvenile Facilities, Nursing Homes, and Other Institutional Facilities). This is effectively a control sub-total for group quarters institutionalized populations across all sub categories listed below.

TAZ_JailAdultPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Adult Correctional Facilities***.

TAZ_JailJuvPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Juvenile Facilities***.

TAZ_NursHmPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Nursing Homes***.

TAZ_OthrGQInstPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Other Institutional Facilities***.

TAZ_GQNonInstPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Non-Institutionalized*** group quarters (College/University Dormitories, Military Quarters, Other Non-Institutional Facilities). This is effectively a control sub-total for group quarters non-institutionalized populations across all sub categories listed below.

TAZ_DormPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***College/University Domitories***.

TAZ_BaracksPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Barracks/Military Quarters***.

TAZ_OthrGQNonInstPop2015Est – The 2015 estimate of total population living in ***Other Non-Institutional Facilities***.

Student Enrollment

Student enrollment totals for the Academic Year 2015/2016 were obtained from the Georgia Dept. of Education annual reporting website (https://oraapp.doe.k12.ga.us/ows-bin/owa/fte_pack_enrollgrade.entry_form).
Enrollment data was collected for the 2015 Fall Quarter, by grade level, for public schools and State recognized charter schools. The 2015 Fall Quarter was chosen as the reference value because that value would most accurately correspond to the July 1, 2015 County population estimates (see description of TAZ_TtlPop2015, above, for further details). Data for private schools was obtained by contacting the County School District Office, or the individual school directly.

Individual schools were spatially joined to the TAZ where they were located, and then the total enrollments by grade level across all schools were aggregated for the corresponding TAZ.

ERRATTA NOTES:

- The data for student enrollment does not include the totals for the Head Start program. The only known Head Start locations in the study area were associated with Macon-Bibb County Equal Opportunity Commission. The enrollment totals for the 2015 Program Year were lost in the migration to a new database system.

The Head Start locations associated with the 2015 Program Year have subsequently been closed and their activities re-assigned to different locations in Macon-Bibb and Monroe Counties.

- Two private schools in Houston County (Christ School, and The Winning Academy) did not respond to multiple requests for their 2015 enrollment information.

EnrollmentTtlK12Fall2015: – The total primary and secondary school enrollment, as of Fall 2015, in the TAZ.

StudentsPreK2015 – The total number of Pre-Kindergarten students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

StudentsKind2015 – The total number of Kindergarten students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students1stGrade2015 – The total number of 1st Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students2ndGrade2015 – The total number of 2nd Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students3rdGrade2015 – The total number of 3rd Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students4thGrade2015 – The total number of 4th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students5thGrade2015 – The total number of 5th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students6thGrade2015 – The total number of 6th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students7thGrade2015 – The total number of 7th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students8thGrade2015 – The total number of 8th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students9thGrade2015 – The total number of 9th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students10thGrade2015 – The total number of 10th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students11thGrade2015 – The total number of 11th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Students12thGrade2015 – The total number of 12th Grade students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.

Employment Data Sources

All employment data for the 2015 base year are collected from the National Establishment Time-Series Database, 2019 Release (NETS 2019), produced by Walls & Associates. This data was obtained as part of a purchase through Dun & Bradstreet. The particular version of the NETS 2012 obtained covers all economic activities in Bibb, Crawford, Houston, Jones, Monroe Peach and Twiggs Counties from 1990 through 2019, and includes the total employment at the particular establishment, along with the 8 digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code (version 1987) and 6 digit North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) for up to six economic activities at a particular establishment.

Summary Statistics for the NETS 2019 data set for the Macon-Warner Robins Census Combined Statistical Area (CSA)

Total Number of Records for CSA:	92,840
• Within 7 County Area (By County FIPS):	85,606
o Bibb	40,056
o Jones	4,448
o Monroe	5,338
o Houston	27,075
o Peach	5,457
o Crawford	1,919
o Twiggs	1,313
• **And has reported 2015 employment (By County):**	25,898
o Bibb	11,888
o Jones	1,446
o Monroe	1,900
o Houston	8,102
o Peach	1,617
o Crawford	561
o Twiggs	384

Employment and Geographic Code Detail Breakdown, by County

County Name	Establishment Employment Level of Detail	Total	Census Block	Street Level	Census Tract Centroid	Zip Code Centroid
Bibb County	Actual Employment Figure	6819	6772	21	0	26
Bibb County	Bottom of Range	118	118	0	0	0
Bibb County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	1693	1625	7	1	60
Bibb County	Walls & Associates Estimate	3258	3163	6	0	89
Jones County	Actual Employment Figure	297	271	16	0	10
Jones County	Bottom of Range	4	4	0	0	0
Jones County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	108	99	3	1	5
Jones County	Walls & Associates Estimate	152	137	4	2	9
Monroe County	Actual Employment Figure	4577	4513	24	1	39
Monroe County	Bottom of Range	69	69	0	0	0
Monroe County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	1197	1129	3	1	64
Monroe County	Walls & Associates Estimate	2259	2183	8	0	68
Houston County	Actual Employment Figure	775	757	7	1	10
Houston County	Bottom of Range	7	7	0	0	0
Houston County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	270	259	0	0	11
Houston County	Walls & Associates Estimate	394	371	3	0	20
Peach County	Actual Employment Figure	1043	1016	12	0	15
Peach County	Bottom of Range	8	8	0	0	0
Peach County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	353	326	2	0	25
Peach County	Walls & Associates Estimate	496	465	3	0	28
Crawford County	Actual Employment Figure	957	902	37	0	18
Crawford County	Bottom of Range	9	9	0	0	0
Crawford County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	222	209	3	0	10
Crawford County	Walls & Associates Estimate	429	400	6	0	23
Twiggs County	Actual Employment Figure	216	210	3	0	3
Twiggs County	Bottom of Range	3	1	1	0	1
Twiggs County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	78	74	0	0	4
Twiggs County	Walls & Associates Estimate	87	81	1	0	5

Employment and Geographic Code Detail Breakdown, by County (Marginal Percentages; All Counties Total 100%, each)

County Name	Establishment Employment Level of Detail	Total	Census Block	Street Level	Census Tract Centroid	Zip Code Centroid
Bibb County	Actual Employment Figure	57.36%	56.97%	0.18%	0.00%	0.22%
Bibb County	Bottom of Range	0.99%	0.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bibb County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	14.24%	13.67%	0.06%	0.01%	0.50%
Bibb County	Walls & Associates Estimate	27.41%	26.61%	0.05%	0.00%	0.75%
Jones County	Actual Employment Figure	52.94%	48.31%	2.85%	0.00%	1.78%
Jones County	Bottom of Range	0.71%	0.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Jones County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	19.25%	17.65%	0.53%	0.18%	0.89%
Jones County	Walls & Associates Estimate	27.09%	24.42%	0.71%	0.36%	1.60%
Monroe County	Actual Employment Figure	56.49%	55.70%	0.30%	0.01%	0.48%
Monroe County	Bottom of Range	0.85%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Monroe County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	14.77%	13.93%	0.04%	0.01%	0.79%
Monroe County	Walls & Associates Estimate	27.88%	26.94%	0.10%	0.00%	0.84%
Houston County	Actual Employment Figure	53.60%	52.35%	0.48%	0.07%	0.69%
Houston County	Bottom of Range	0.48%	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Houston County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	18.67%	17.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.76%
Houston County	Walls & Associates Estimate	27.25%	25.66%	0.21%	0.00%	1.38%
Peach County	Actual Employment Figure	54.89%	53.47%	0.63%	0.00%	0.79%
Peach County	Bottom of Range	0.42%	0.42%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Peach County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	18.58%	17.16%	0.11%	0.00%	1.32%
Peach County	Walls & Associates Estimate	26.11%	24.47%	0.16%	0.00%	1.47%
Crawford County	Actual Employment Figure	59.18%	55.78%	2.29%	0.00%	1.11%
Crawford County	Bottom of Range	0.56%	0.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Crawford County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	13.73%	12.93%	0.19%	0.00%	0.62%
Crawford County	Walls & Associates Estimate	26.53%	24.74%	0.37%	0.00%	1.42%
Twiggs County	Actual Employment Figure	56.25%	54.69%	0.78%	0.00%	0.78%
Twiggs County	Bottom of Range	0.78%	0.26%	0.26%	0.00%	0.26%
Twiggs County	Dun & Bradstreet Employment Estimate	20.31%	19.27%	0.00%	0.00%	1.04%
Twiggs County	Walls & Associates Estimate	22.66%	21.09%	0.26%	0.00%	1.30%

TAZTtlEmp2015 – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across all categories classified by GDOT.

Emp2015AgMinConst – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 11 (Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Related Activities), 21 (Mining), 22 (Utilities Service Employment) and 23 (Construction).

Emp2015ManufTCUW – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 31-33 (Manufacturing), 42 (Wholesale Trade), and 48-49 (Transportation and Warehousing).

Emp2015Retail – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 44-45 (Retail Trade).

Emp2015Service – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 51 (Information), 52 (Finance and Insurance), 53 (Real Estate and Rental and Leasing), 54 (Professional, Scientific and Technical Services), 55 (Management of Companies

and Enterprises), 56 (Administration and Waster Services), 61 (Educational Services), 62 (Health Care and Social Assistance), 71 (Arts, Entertainment and Recreation), 72 (Accommodation and Food Services), 81 (Other Services, except Public Administration), and 92 (Government and Government Enterprises).

College Enrollment and On-Campus Housing Estimates

Estimates for university and technical college enrollments and on-campus housing estimates for Fall 2015 were collected by contacting the individual campus registrar offices. For the study region, there were eight (23) institutions identified:

Institution Name	Street Address	City	ZIP	MPO
Central GA Technical College - Aerospace Traning Center #1	1821 Avondale Mill Rd.	Macon	31216	MATS MPO
Central GA Technical College - Aerospace Traning Center #2	199 East Dr.	Macon	31216	MATS MPO
Central GA Technical College - Crawford County	640 GA Hwy 128	Roberta	31078	Outside MPO Boundary
Central GA Technical College - Jones County	161 West Clinton St.	Gray	31032	Outside MPO Boundary
Central GA Technical College - Jones County Career Academy	129 Gordon St.	Gray	31032	Outside MPO Boundary
Central GA Technical College - Macon	3300 Macon Tech Dr.	Macon	31206	MATS MPO
Central GA Technical College - Monroe County	433 US Hwy 41 S	Forsyth	31029	Outside MPO Boundary
Central GA Technical College - Peach County	425 James E Khoury Dr.	Fort Valley	31030	Outside MPO Boundary
Central GA Technical College - Twiggs County	952 Main St.	Jeffersonville	31044	Outside MPO Boundary
Central GA Technical College - Warner Robins	80 Cohen Walker Dr.	Warner Robins	31088	WRATS MPO
Fort Valley State University	1005 State University Dr.	Fort Valley	31030	Outside MPO Boundary
Georgia College	433 Cherry St.	Macon	31201	MATS MPO
Georgia Military College-Warner Robins	801 Duke Avenue	Warner Robins	31093	WRATS MPO
Mercer Downtown	433 Cherry St.	Macon	31201	MATS MPO
Mercer University	1501 Mercer University Dr.	Macon	31207	MATS MPO
Mercer University Law School	1021 Georgia Ave.	Macon	31201	MATS MPO
Mercer University Med School	1501 Mercer University Dr.	Macon	31206	MATS MPO
Middle GA State University - Macon Bibb	100 University Pkwy	Macon	31206	MATS MPO
Middle GA State University - Warner Robins	100 University Blvd.	Warner Robins	31093	WRATS MPO
Miller Motte Technical College	175 Tom Hill Sr. Blvd	Macon	31210	MATS MPO

Navicent Medical Center	790 First St.	Macon	31201	MATS MPO
VECTR Center	1001 S Armed Forces Blvd.	Warner Robins	31088	WRATS MPO
Wesleyan College	4760 Forsyth Rd.	Macon	31210	MATS MPO

Institutions were geocoded according to their respective campus addresses, then joined to their respective TAZs. Special note should be taken of the following:

a. Estimates for Macon State College/Middle GA State University on campus housing are not fully validated. The 2010-11 academic year was the first year that campus housing was offered as an option, and the staff person in charge of keeping those records has since left the institution.
b. Mercer University Medical School is on the same campus as the main Mercer University campus. However, the entire campus has been segmented into 3 distinct TAZs.
c. Miller Motte Technical College (TAZ #407, MATS MPO Area) refused to provide any information on 2015 enrollment totals

UnivTtl2015 – The total college population across all undergraduate, graduate and/or professional programs attending classes at campuses located within the TAZ.

UnivFT2015 – The college population across all undergraduate, graduate and/or professional programs attending classes **full time** at campuses located within the TAZ.

UnivPT2015 – The college population across all undergraduate, graduate and/or professional programs attending classes **part time** at campuses located within the TAZ.

List of Non Local Supplemental Data Sets Used

1. American Community Survey 2013-2017 5 Year Averages (Block Group Geography)
    a. Table B19013 – Median Household Income
    b. Table B19025X – Aggregate Household Income In The Past 12 Months (In 2012 Inflation Adjusted Dollars)
        i. *X* = Relevant ethnic group data subset (A = White; B = African American; C = American Indian/Alaskan Native; D = Asian, E = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; F = Other; G = 2 Or More Races; H = Hispanic or Latino)
2. U.S. 2010 Census, Summary File 1, Tables
    a. H11X - TOTAL POPULATION IN OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE
        i. *X* = Relevant ethnic group data subset (A = White; B = African American; C = American Indian/Alaskan Native; D = Asian, E = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; F = Other; G = 2 Or More Races; H = Hispanic or Latino)
    b. H16X - TENURE BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE [17] (Universe: Occupied Housing Units)
        i. *X* = Relevant ethnic group data subset (A = White; B = African American; C = American Indian/Alaskan Native; D = Asian, E = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; F = Other; G = 2 Or More Races; H = Hispanic or Latino)
    c. P12X – AGE BY SEX
        i. *X* = Relevant ethnic group data subset (A = White; B = African American; C = American Indian/Alaskan Native; D = Asian, E = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; F = Other; G = 2 Or More Races; H = Hispanic or Latino)
    d. P42 - Group Quarters Population by Group Quarters Type
3. U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Historical Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the South, Not Seasonally Adjusted. (https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/CUUR0300SA0?amp%253bdata_tool=XGtable&output_view=data&include_graphs=true)
4. "Annual Estimates of Housing Units for Counties in Georgia: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019" (https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/tables/2010-2019/housing/totals/CO-EST2019-ANNHU-13.xlsx)
5. "Annual Resident Population Estimates, Estimated Components of Resident Population Change, and Rates of the Components of Resident Population Change for States and Counties: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019" (https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2010-2019/counties/totals/co-est2019-alldata.csv)
6. National Establishment Time-Series Database, 2019 Release, produced by Walls & Associates
7. Georgia Dept. of Education: Enrollment By Grade Level 2015Q3 (https://oraapp.doe.k12.ga.us/ows-bin/owa/fte_pack_enrollgrade.entry_form)

TAZ Errata and Future Year Conditions

1. Bibb County
    a. Attribution Errors for population and housing (i.e., population>0, but households=0):

i. TAZ #46 – Topology rule misattributes 904.426375805652 inmates from Law Enforcement Center to this TAZ. Jail inmates should be counted as group quarters residents in TAZ #56
ii. TAZ #45 – Residents appear to be part of Dismas re-integration facility (i.e., halfway house; site permanently closed sometime after 2015).
iii. TAZ #346 - Topology rule misattributes 904.426375805652 inmates from Central State Prison to this TAZ. Prisoners are moved to relevant group quarters categories in TAZ #347 (i.e., neighboring zone immediately to the South)

2. Jones County
    a. Gray Elementary School moves from TAZ 542 to TAZ 543 starting in 2015/16 school year

APPENDIX B:

Data Development Methodology Notes for MATS 2050 Population and Employment Forecasts

General Notes on MATS 2050 Forecast Year Data Assembly

1. All GIS and data assembly tasks were performed using the following software packages:
    a. Spatial Analysis/GIS – ArcGIS 10.7.1, ArcINFO license
    b. Tabular data organization:
        i. Microsoft® Access® for Microsoft 365 MSO (Version 2202 Build 16.0.14931.20118) 32-bit
        ii. Microsoft® Excel® for Microsoft 365 MSO (Version 2202 Build 16.0.14931.20118) 32-bit

2. All GIS and Spatial Analysis tasks were standardized to the NAD 1983 Georgia Statewide Lambert Conical Form coordinate system. Unless otherwise noted, measurement units are in U.S. Feet.

3. All variable names listed below are underlined

4. Contact information/questions regarding data development:

Mike Greenwald
Planning Director/MPO Technical Coordinator
Macon-Bibb Co Planning & Zoning Commission
200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201
478-338-9472;
MGreenwald@mbpz.org

Continuity with 2015 Base Year Data Assembly

This forecast data uses the same TAZ zone system and base year data as the 2015 Base Year data assembly for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update (2040 LRTP Update).

Estimates in this data set are expressed as marginal changes (i.e., increases or decreases) over the 2015 Base Year estimate. In many cases, the corresponding original 2015 Base Year estimate is included as a frame of reference. In those cases where the original 2015 Base Year is included in this data set, these base year values are the same (and therefore follow the same definitions and data assembly methodology) as those delivered on July 28, 2021. For full details on base year variables see **FINALIZED__MATS_Area_2015_TAZ_ForUpdate_20210929.xlsx**, or contact Dr. Michael J. Greenwald, AICP at the Macon-Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission (see contact information on previous page).

Sources for Population Growth Estimation

The jurisdiction of the MATS area covers the entirety of Bibb County, and portions of neighboring Jones and Monroe Counties (see red outline in Fig. 1, below)



Population forecasts for Bibb, Jones and Monroe Counties were obtained by starting from the 2010 U.S. Census and 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File for Georgia. From these values, a county-wide estimated growth factor was calculated according to the following formula:

County Growth Factor =

$$\frac{\text{2020 RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRR PPPPPPPPPPPPRRRRPPRR VVPPPPPPRR}}{\text{2010 CCRRRRRRPPRR CCPPPPRRRRCC PPPPPPPPPPPRRRRPPRR}}$$

Using that growth factor, the population was expanded from 2020 forward to 2050. Because of the level of geographic detail in the 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, it was possible to calculate separate population growth rates (and forecasts) for the individual counties overall, and for the corresponding MATS areas. The results of this method are:

Table 1: Total MPO Population Estimates through 2050, By County

	2010 Census Totals		2020 Redistricting File		Annualized Growth Rate (over 10 years)		Projected 2050 Population (Based on Annualized Growth Rate Carried Forward over 30 Years)	
County	Total Pop	MATS MPO	Total Pop	MATS MPO	Total Pop	MATS MPO	Total Pop	MATS MPO
Jones County	28,669	11,800	28,347	12,244	0.998871	1.00370048	27,403	13,679
Macon-Bibb County	155,547	155,547	157,346	157,346	1.001151	1.00115059	162,869	162,869
Monroe County	26,424	1,707	27,957	1,695	1.005655	0.99929478	33,111	1,660

Carrying the 2015 Population Estimates over from the base year dataset, the following 2050 population projections were generated:

Table 2: Estimated Marginal Population Growth 2015 – 2050, By County and by MPO Sub Area

	Pop Est 2015		Pop Est 2050		Margins		% Growth (Loss)	
County	TtlPop2015	MATS MPO	TtlPop2050	MATS MPO	Ttl Pop	MATS MPO	Ttl Pop	MATS MPO
Jones County	28441	11700	27403	13679	-1038	1979	-3.6497%	16.9145%
Macon-Bibb County	153945	153945	162869	162869	8924	8924	5.7969%	5.7969%
Monroe County	26708	1749	33111	1660	6403	-89	23.9741%	-5.0886%

Population Growth and Household Increase Apportionment

Using the county marginal totals from Table 1 as upper limits of anticipated growth in each county, population was assigned to households based on the following rules:

1. Macon-Bibb County

   a. Step 1 – Assessment of Existing Capacity

   TAZs where future growth is anticipated were identified by conversations with Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission Staff. From those conversations, the operating assumptions used to develop the future population allocations are:

   Population growth will continue to follow where existing residential capacity exists, until exhausted, then:

Population will extend to land available for residential development (i.e., Zoned Agricultural, Single Family/Multi-Family Residential, Planned Development Extraordinary and/or Planned Development Residential).

Parcels that were identified as either completely or partially within the 100 yr. floodplane were removed from consideration. It is the normal practice in Macon-Bibb County to prohibit new residential construction on parcels within the 100 yr. floodplane.

Finally, parcels that were identified as either having received residential development between 1/1/2015 and 12/31/2015 (based on a search of the issued Zoning Permits), or being located in a Census Block having at least one estimated housing unit in 2015 in the Census Block, were removed from consideration. This allowed for identification of parcels which were vacant and open for development.

Available parcel acreage was then estimated using the following rule:

- If a parcel was listed as undeveloped and the number of housing units in the Census Bloc was equal to 0, the total acreage of the site was identified as available;
- If either of the conditions was not true, the available acreage on the parcel was multiplied by the estimated vacancy rate (i.e., Unoccupied Housing Units/Total Housing Units) to estimate the number of possible available acres.

Available acreage was cross tabulated by TAZ and Zoning category. Each category of aggregated acreage was multiplied by the maximum residential density allowed under the Macon-Bibb County Zoning code, to estimate the number of potential dwelling units available for development on the site.

Next, the aggregated units were multiplied by the Average Household Size in the TAZ, in order to estimate the total population capacity currently available within a specific TAZ.

Finally, the TAZs with permits issued from 2015 through 2020 were prioritized as most ready to accept the anticipated growth.

Step 1 Result: **5,415 persons** capable of being accommodated in Macon-Bibb County TAZs with pattern of development consistent with what was observed from 2015 through 2020

b. *Step 2 – Accounting for Multi-Family Growth from 2015 through 2020*

In addition to the TAZs identified in Step 1, there was also additional new development from 2015 through 2020, involving new multi-family and condominium developments not identified as part of the original Zoning permit review. According to a review of the 2020 Census State Redistricting Data , compared with local knowledge, this increase corresponds with a marginal population increase of approximately **2,443 persons** across **986** housing units. The affected TAZs are: 30, 31, 34, 37, 80, 313, 395 and 416. While this additional population does not significantly affect the results from Step 1, it does result in additional potential for student enrollment that needed to be accounted

for. See discussion on methodology for Pre-K and Kindergarten through 12th grade growth apportionment, described in *School Age Population Growth Estimation* below.

c. Step 3 – Identification of Where Balance of Future Growth Is Anticipated To Go

The results from Step 1 leaves a balance of 3,509 persons to be accounted for in the projected population growth. Based on conversations with the Zoning Director for Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning, applications for development were identified in the following Bibb County TAZs:

Table 3: Estimated Marginal Population Growth in Future Development TAZs in Macon-Bibb County

TAZ_NEW_ED_1	MPOArea_EDITED	County_EDITED	TAZ DU Capacity (Rounded)	TAZ_AvgHhSize_2010 (Rounded)	TAZ Pop Capacity (Rounded)
286	MATS MPO	Macon-Bibb County	262	3.5	916
346	MATS MPO	Macon-Bibb County	0	2.5	0
358	MATS MPO	Macon-Bibb County	8	2.54	20
365	MATS MPO	Macon-Bibb County	575	2.66	1529
381	MATS MPO	Macon-Bibb County	823	2.31	1905

Step 2 Resulst: **4,370 persons** capable of being accommodated in Macon-Bibb County TAZs identified for forthcoming future development.

Grand Total: 12,228 persons accommodated, out of an estimated potential **8,924**

2. Jones County

The methods used to distribute anticipated Jones County growth are similar, though not absolutely identical to, the methods used for Macon-Bibb County. Based on conversations with Jones County Planning & Zoning staff, it appears that the practice has been for new residential development on new sites rather than in-fill development.

Starting from that assessment, MATS MPO staff geocoded all residential permits issued by Jones County Planning & Zoning and certified for occupancy, from 1/1/2015 through 12/31/2015. These permits were then spatially joined to both the underlying parcel layer (to identify which parcels were associated with the issued permits; data from Jones County permitting system is not currently GIS enabled), and to the TAZ layer (to place the permits in their respective TAZs).

Removing all the parcels from the Jones County Parcel layer that were already developed or otherwise encumbered, MATS MPO staff was able to estimate how much remaining land was available for residential development in each TAZ. The MATS MPO portion of Jones County is primarily designated future land use Suburban Residential or Rural Residential (as per maps on pg. 132 of the 2017 Joint Comprehensive Plan for Jones County and the City of Gray; https://www.jonescountyga.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Jones-County-the-

City-of-Gray-Adopted-Updated-Comprehensive-Plan.pdf) , which corresponds with Single Family Dwelling type development. The amount of available acreage was multiplied by the average household size for the TAZ (based on 2010 Census data), which resulted in an estimate of the amount of marginal population carrying capacity available in each TAZ.

At this point in the process, Jones County Planning & Zoning was provided with a draft map showing how the geocoded permits data overlaid the TAZs for the MATS MPO, for the purpose of identifying the priority in which TAZs could be expected to develop from 2020 through to 2050. Using priority of development provided by the Jones County Planning and Zoning Office, the MATS MPO staff took samples of the residential parcels in the Jones County TAZs most likely to develop (n=896 parcels, across 7 TAZs), and calculated an average parcel size for residential developments.

The amount of available acreage in each high development priority TAZ was divided by the average parcel size for residential development, in order to estimate the potential for new dwelling units. The number of potential dwelling units was multiplied by the average household size for the TAZ (based on 2010 Census data), which resulted in an estimate of the amount of marginal population carrying capacity available in each TAZ. Expressed mathematically:

$$\text{TAZ Raw Population Capacity} = \frac{\textbf{Net Acreage Available for Residential Development in a TAZ}}{\textbf{Average Parcel Size for Residential Development in a TAZ}} \times \textbf{Average TAZ Household Size (based on 2010 U.S. Census)}$$

After calculating these Raw Population Capacity values for the TAZs identified by Jones County, it was observed that any one TAZ could handle the entire estimated population growth within it's own boundaries. Since it is unlikely that all future growth would concentrate to a specific TAZ, MATS MPO staff chose to allocate the future growth according to the proportions observed in the patterns of residential permits issued between 2015 and 2020. The results are as follows:

Table 4: Estimated Marginal Population Growth in Future Development TAZs in Jones County

TAZ_NEW	MPO Area	Growth Priority	Avg Residential Parcel Acre Size	Future Acres Available	Max Hh Growth Capacity (Rounded)	TAZ Avg Hh Size (Based on 2010 Census)	Max Pop Growth Capacity (Rounded)
507	MATS MPO	Very High	0.346666667	1111.25	3206	3.404761905	10914
528	MATS MPO	Very High	0.4304	3052.74	7093	2.803278689	19883
518	MATS MPO	High	0.803157895	2688.12	3347	2.707964602	9063
526	MATS MPO	High	7.83625	527.48	67	2.794117647	188
500	MATS MPO	High	0.876666667	412.54	471	2.83011583	1332
529	MATS MPO	High	1.56	3326.91	2133	2.657894737	5668
505	MATS MPO	High	1.5	962.82	642	2.668831169	1713
Group Totals				**12081.86**	**32634**		**48761**

TAZ_NEW	MPO Area	Growth Priority	Residential Permits 2015 Thru 2020	Estimated Proportional Hh Growth (Rounded)	Estimated Proportional Pop Growth (Rounded)
507	MATS MPO	Very High	51	918	269
528	MATS MPO	Very High	26	468	167
518	MATS MPO	High	19	342	126
526	MATS MPO	High	8	144	52
500	MATS MPO	High	3	54	19
529	MATS MPO	High	2	36	14
505	MATS MPO	High	1	17	7
Group Totals			**110**	**1979**	**654**

Result: 1,979 persons capable of being accommodated in Jones County TAZs identified for forthcoming future development.

3. Monroe County – This portion of the MATS area is a special case. According to review of the 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File for Georgia, this area is anticipated to lose **89 persons** based on current growth patterns. This population forecast cannot be used because:
    a. Modeling guidance from HNTB documentation specifically prohibits reducing population and households from TAZs, absent a clear explanation (such as re-development). No such explanation is readily apparent; and
    b. Field review of TAZ #601 indicates there is a new single family subdivision currently under development (N = 55 units)

    Based on these findings, **55 households** have been manually added to TAZ #601. Using Average Household Size for the TAZ (based on 2010 Census values), this translates into approximately **141 additional persons** being added to the population for this area.

Employment Growth Apportionment

Future year employment estimates were generated by expanding the employment estimates generated as part of the base year dataset, using the factors identified in the REMI 2020 dataset, provided by Georgia Dept. of Transportation on 8/18/2021. The REMI dataset estimated employment for the 2050 target year for Macon-Bibb and Jones County, in their entirety. The method for distributing that anticipated growth was performed as follows:

a. **Classify the REMI Employment Categories according to the 2-digit NAICS categories, and their associated TDM employment groups.** This was done by reconciling the REMI Employment classifications with the classifications codes provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (https://www.bls.gov/bls/naics_aggregation.htm) and the TDM Category groupings found on pg. 5 of the HNTB data Development Guide (Georgia MPO Travel Demand Models Socio-Economic Data Development Guides, HNTB Corporation, August 2018)

b. Reduce Growth Factors by removing employment in TDM Categories identified by partners as location specific development. The reduced jobs are added back later in the process, as specific adjustments to the individual TAZs where the future jobs are to be located.
The only specific employment adjustments made at this point in the process were the result of advice provided by Macon-Bibb County Industrial Authority, based on the following:

Table 5: Adjustments to REMI 2050 Forecast Data, by TDM Employment Categories, Prior to Development of Adjusted Employment Expansion Factors

TDM Employment Category	Adjustment	Justification
Manufacturing/TCUW	-610	New Recycling Plant announced for South Bibb County (-110 jobs); Forthcoming development of Industrial Park near Middle GA Regional Airport (-500)
Agriculture/Mining/Construction	-100	New jobs anticipated at aircraft painting and repair facility near Middle GA Regional Airport
Retail	-75	Anticipated new jobs related to forthcoming medicinal cannabis dispensary (-50 to -100; avg. 75)

c. After making the adjustments in Part b.), aggregate the 2015 Employment Counts and Adjusted 2050 Employment Counts by TDM Category

d. Divide the results in Part c.) to generate Employment Expansion Factors for each TDM grouping, based on REMI forecast data. The specific values for the Employment Factors are:

Table 6: Adjusted Employment Expansion Factors, by TDM Employment Categories, based on REMI 2050 Employment Forecast

Calculate EmpExpansion Factors by TDM Industry Grps_20210926				
TDM Employment Category	**TDM Employment in 2015 (From REMI dataset)**	**TDM Employment in 2050 – Original (From REMI dataset)**	**TDM Employment in 2050 – Adjusted (based on explanations in Part a.)**	**2015 – 2050 Employment Expansion Factor (reflecting Adjustments described in Part a.)**
Agriculture, Mining & Construction	**4.86699981591664**	**5.42169341106048**	**5.32169341106048**	**1.09342379542667**

Calculate EmpExpansion Factors by TDM Industry Grps_20210926				
TDM Employment Category	**TDM Employment in 2015 (From REMI dataset)**	**TDM Employment in 2050 – Original (From REMI dataset)**	**TDM Employment in 2050 – Adjusted (based on explanations in Part a.)**	**2015 – 2050 Employment Expansion Factor (reflecting Adjustments described in Part a.)**
Manufacturing & TCUW	**12.8869999933522**	**14.5157047350239**	**13.9057047350239**	**1.07904902166503**
Retail	**15.4449996948242**	**12.7178880323686**	**12.6428880323686**	**0.818574832125467**
Service	**86.6859997939318**	**98.8529185389804**	**98.8529185389804**	**1.14035621408268**

e. **Apply Expansion Factors to each TDM Employment Group for 2015.** This expands the TDM category for each TAZ up to it's 2050 anticipated level, based on all available background information *except* local knowledge. This necessarily assumes growth/expansion is contained within the TDM (i.e., no relocations).

f. **For adjustments made in Part b.), add the employment reduced as part of generating the Adjusted Expansion Factors back to the individual TAZs where they will eventually be assigned.** This inflates the TAZ anticipated employment growth back to it's anticipated correct level, *based on* local knowledge. The individual TAZ adjustments are as follows:

Table 7: Post Expansion Adjustments to Employments, by TAZ and TDM Employment Categories,

TAZ	Employment Category	Amount	Justification
287	Manufacture/TCUW	+110	New recycling plant announced by Macon-Bibb County Industrial Authority
292	Manufacture/TCUW	+500	Reflect plans by Macon-Bibb County Industrial Authority for industrial park near Middle GA Regional Airport
293	Ag/Mining/Const	+100	New jobs anticipated at Dean Baldwin aircraft painting & repair facility
333	Retail	+75	Anticipated new jobs at Fine Fettle medicinal cannabis dispensary (50 to 100 jobs; avg. 75)

g. **Sum TDM Employment Groups across categories to develop a Total Employment Estimate for target year 2050.**

h. **Round results from Part f. and Part g. into integer values.** This step is performed because the GDOT modeling consultant has indicated in previous e-mails that they require/prefer integer values for their modeling process.

i. **Using the results from Part h., calculate marginal change from 2015 to 2050 in each Employment Category, and for Total Employment Overall**. This step is not critical; it is

performed for the convenience of the modeler using the data set to help with analysis of the impact of any marginal employment changes within a TAZ, or set of TAZs.

With the noted exceptions identified in Part b.) and Part f.) above, the data model assumes growth at existing establishments, as opposed to generation of new business entities at greenfield or infill locations. Therefore, while the total employment growth estimate is presumed to be accurate in the aggregate, the future location is subject to revisions.

Public School Enrollment Changes, College/University Enrollments and On Campus Housing Growth

All estimates of 2015 student enrollment and on-campus housing estimates are carried over from the 2015 base year data set; please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706** for full details.

Student growth at the elementary and secondary levels were deconstructed into components based on:

a) How much growth could be anticipated from population growth; and
b) How would that growth be distributed, based on service areas for schools within MATS MPO planning area

MATS MPO has not been advised of any changes to school facilities/capacities out to the 2050 target year, in either Macon-Bibb or Jones Counties. The most recent school adjustment in the MATS area was the movement of Gray Elementary School from TAZ 542 to TAZ 543 during the 2015-2016 School Year. This adjustment should already be reflected in the MATS 2015 Base Year dataset.

School Age Population Growth Estimation

School growth anticipated by population growth was estimated in a multi-step process:

1. Calculate the anticipated growth rate in school age population, for each county, using the proportions for the plan year 2050 found in the "Governor's Office of Planning & Budget County Population Projection by Age 2020 to 2065," adjusting the population totals for the revised MATS Area Population the revised based on the following formula:
    a. **Estimate Marginal Proportion of Population Estimated in Each Age Group (Updated to Revised 2050 Total), for each County;**
    b. **Estimate Proportion of Population that Falls Within Each Age Group within MATS MPO area, for each County;**
    c. **Divide Results from Part b.) by MPO Area Total Population Estimates for each County (see Table 1) to generate a marginal population proportion for each age group.**
2. Once the proportion by Age Group were estimated for the county specific MATS Areas, the proportions were further apportioned by percentages for individual grade level, using the following logical rules (source: Georgia Dept. of Education Ask DOE- New Student Requirements: https://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/AskDOE/Pages/New-Student-Requirements.aspx):
    a. All Children age 4 were considered eligible for Pre-K and/or daycare;
    b. The minimum age for enrollment in Kindergarten in Georgia is 5 years old;
    c. The minimum age for enrollment in 1st Grade in Georgia is 6 years old;

d. Rules for Part a.) and Part b.) establish minimum age thresholds for the remaining grades.

See Table 8 (below) for anticipated specific school age population proportions for the MATS MPO Area

3. The marginal proportions by grade level, for each county, are multiplied by the anticipated 2050 marginal population for each TAZ where growth is anticipated
Result: Estimate of the 2050 school age population generated in each growth TAZ. This student growth will be distributed to destination TAZs in subsequent steps.

School Age Population Growth Distributions

Once the marginal increases in school age population were forecast for the originating TAZs, the next step was to distribute said growth proportionally to the TAZs where the schools are located. The methods for achieving this were conducted as follows:

Pre-K Marginal Growth Destination Assignment

1. Generate a list of immediately neighboring TAZs for each TAZ in the MATS area (using ArcGIS 10.7.1 "Polygon Neighbors" Proximity Tool)
2. For all TAZs with new population growth, use the list developed in Step 1 to identify neighboring TAZs which have Pre-K enrollment in 2015.
3. From Step 2, for each originating TAZ, distribute the new originating Pre-K Enrollment to the neighboring destination TAZs, based on the marginal proportions of 2015 Pre-K enrollment in the destination TAZs (Pre-K enrollment for TAZs would have been generated as part of 2015 Base Year dataset).

Table 8: Marginal Percentages of Population By Age, Anticipated in 2050 (Adjusted for Updated Population Forecasts from Table 1)

		0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85+	Total
Original Projection	**Bibb County**	8,654	9,038	8,924	9,467	9,287	9,415	9,865	9,637	9,531	8,674	9,370	10,321	9,107	7,427	6,340	6,227	5,014	1,607	147,905
Revised Projection	**Bibb County**	9530	9952	9827	10425	10227	10368	10863	10612	10495	9552	10318	11365	10028	8178	6981	6857	5521	1770	162869
MATS Area Proportion		9530	9952	9827	10425	10227	10368	10863	10612	10495	9552	10318	11365	10028	8178	6981	6857	5521	1770	162869
Marginal Percentage		5.8513%	6.1104%	6.0337%	6.4008%	6.2793%	6.3659%	6.6698%	6.5157%	6.4438%	5.8648%	6.3352%	6.9780%	6.1571%	5.0212%	4.2863%	4.2101%	3.3898%	1.0868%	100.00%
Original Projection	**Jones County**	1,323	1,478	1,660	1,791	1,766	1,813	1,686	1,838	2,016	2,019	1,772	1,787	1,626	1,649	1,685	1,685	1,511	459	29,564
Revised Projection	**Jones County**	1226	1370	1539	1660	1637	1680	1563	1704	1869	1871	1642	1656	1507	1528	1562	1562	1401	425	27402
MATS Area Proportion		612	684	768	829	817	839	780	851	933	934	820	827	752	763	780	780	699	212	13680
Marginal Percentage		4.4737%	5.0000%	5.6140%	6.0599%	5.9722%	6.1330%	5.7018%	6.2208%	6.8202%	6.8275%	5.9942%	6.0453%	5.4971%	5.5775%	5.7018%	5.7018%	5.1096%	1.5497%	100.00%
Original Projection	**Monroe County**	1,592	1,692	1,735	1,878	2,055	1,959	1,913	1,906	1,943	1,939	1,742	1,508	1,667	1,490	1,452	1,509	1,464	852	30,296
Revised Projection	**Monroe County**	1740	1849	1896	2052	2246	2141	2091	2083	2124	2119	1904	1648	1822	1628	1587	1649	1600	931	33110
MATS Area Proportion		87	93	95	103	113	107	105	104	106	106	95	83	91	82	80	83	80	47	1660
Marginal Percentage		5.2410%	5.6024%	5.7229%	6.2048%	6.8072%	6.4458%	6.3253%	6.2651%	6.3855%	6.3855%	5.7229%	5.0000%	5.4819%	4.9398%	4.8193%	5.0000%	4.8193%	2.8313%	100.00%

Sources:

Georgia Governor's Office of Planning & Budget "County Projections by Age 2020 to 2065"

U.S. Census 2020 Redistricting Files

U.S. Censu 2010 Population Files

Marginal Population Percentages by Grade Level		**Pre-K**	**Kindergar**	**Grade 1**	**Grade 2**	**Grade 3**	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**Grade 9**	**Grade 10**	**Grade 11**	**Grade 12**	**Sub-Total**
Macon-Bibb		1.1703%	1.2221%	1.2221%	1.2221%	1.2221%	1.2221%	1.2067%	1.2067%	1.2067%	1.2067%	1.2067%	1.2802%	1.2802%	1.2802%	21.8360%
Jones		0.8947%	1.0000%	1.0000%	1.0000%	1.0000%	1.0000%	1.1228%	1.1228%	1.1228%	1.1228%	1.1228%	1.2120%	1.2120%	1.2120%	18.7237%
Monroe		1.0482%	1.1205%	1.1205%	1.1205%	1.1205%	1.1205%	1.1446%	1.1446%	1.1446%	1.1446%	1.1446%	1.2410%	1.2410%	1.2410%	20.2892%

4. For originating TAZs where no immediately neighboring TAZ had any 2015 Pre-K enrollment, assign destination TAZs were manually
5. Sum marginal Pre-K enrollment assignments for destination TAZs to generate total estimated Pre-K enrollment.

Kindergarten through 12th Grade Destination Assignment

Macon-Bibb County

1. For all TAZs generating new elementary, middle and/or high school population marginal growth, the TAZ was intersected with the Macon-Bibb County consolidated school service areas. Areas of overlap were identified and calculated (using ArcGIS 10.7.1 "Intersect" Overlay Tool). Each consolidated school service area polygon identified the combination of public elementary, middle and high school covered by the particular boundary.
2. Using the school service area overlap, each origin TAZ with marginal population growth assigned student growth to destination school based on proportion of service area overlap, and grade level.
3. Proportional estimates from Step #2 were multiplied by each school grade level marginal enrollment increase.
4. Individual schools were associated with the Destination TAZ in which they were located
5. The resulting proportional enrollments from Step 3 were given the Destination TAZ for their schools, based on the results in Step 4
6. Using the results in Step 5, the grade specific marginal enrollments proportions were summed up by Destination TAZs for the schools.

Result: Marginal enrollments, by grade, for public school Destination TAZs (based on a full population growth capacity of 9,785 persons, exceeding the 8,924 persons anticipated; approximately 1680 students across all grades).

Jones County

Jones County public schools did not provide service area polygons like the ones available to Macon-Bibb County. So, the Jones County student growth for the TAZs exhibiting population growth were distributed according to proportional balance of students, by grade level, in 2015.

Although the forecasted population growth originated from TAZs in the MATS MPO area, the majority of the school destination zones are outside the MATS MPO area. Table 9 lists where the Jones County schools are located, relative to the MPO boundary area.

Table 9: Jones County Schools, by Type and TAZ

TAZ	County	MPO Area	TYPE	Public/Private
500	Jones County	MATS MPO	Middle School	Public School
507	Jones County	MATS MPO	Elementary School	Public School
524	Jones County	MATS MPO	Indeterminate	Private School
533	Jones County	Outside MPO Boundary	School	Public School
536	Jones County	Outside MPO Boundary	Elementary School	Public School
542	Jones County	Outside MPO Boundary	Pre-K Program	Public School
542	Jones County	Outside MPO Boundary	Middle School	Public School
542	Jones County	Outside MPO Boundary	High School	Public School
543	Jones County	Outside MPO Boundary	Elementary School	Public School
552	Jones County	Outside MPO Boundary	Elementary School	Public School

Result: Marginal enrollments, by grade, for public school Destination TAZs (based on a full population growth capacity of 1,979 persons; approximately 340 students across all grades)

Monroe County

While it is anticipated that the assigned growth of **141** persons in Monroe County will result in approximately **23** total new school aged children, across all grades, between 2015 and 2050, there is insufficient information to determine where those students should be assigned w/r/t TAZs for the purposes of future trip estimation. All schools of significant size (i.e., schools other than home schools and/or charters with single digit enrollments; all public schools) in the Monroe County area are located outside the County portion of the MPO planning area.

University Population Estimation

For University population estimates, the 2015 population was simply expanded by the percent population growth for each County (see Table 2). MATS MPO is not aware of any immediately plans for the local universities to significantly expand their campus footprints to incorporate more on campus residents in the MPO planning area.

Variable Definitions

Indexing Variables

These variables are used to uniquely identify each TAZ in the data set. The combination of values for these three variables provides a primary key index for all TAZs in this data set.

MPOArea_EDITED – The MPO area associated with each Transportation Analysis Zone. This variable is necessary because the indexing system for TAZs repeats depending on the MPO Area where the zone is located (e.g., there is a TAZ #1 for the MATS MPO area, and also a TAZ #1 for the WRATS MPO area, etc.).
This variable takes on one of two values:

MATS MPO – The TAZ is associated with the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) MPO area

Outside MPO Boundary – The TAZ falls outside the currently defined boundaries of an MPO area.

TAZ_NEW_EDITED – The Transportation Analysis Zone for which the data is being collected. TAZ indexing reflects the zone systems developed by GDOT and HNTB for the MATS area, WRATS area and Crawford, Jones, Monroe, Peach and Twiggs County areas not covered by an existing MPO boundary.

County_EDITED – The County in which the TAZ is located. By definition, a TAZ cannot span a County boundary; all TAZs must be fully contained within an individual county.

Land Area and Population

These variables contain information on the size and composition of the change in total population for each TAZ, from the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year

TAZ_TtlPop2015 UPDATED RAW – An updated value corresponding to the TAZ TtlPop2015 value (see definition below). This is the raw, unadjusted population value (i.e, does not correct for discounts like various forms of group quarter housing, or other population not identified as living in households). This value is included as a reference value for the TAZ. When summarized by the County_EDITED variable, the sum total will aggregate to the 2015 population control values found in Table 2 (above).

TAZ_TtlPop2015 UPDATED RAW Rounded – The rounded version of the variable TAZ_TtlPop2015 UPDATED RAW, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

TAZ_TtlPop2015 – The estimated number of persons identified as living in the specific TAZ, as of July 1, 2015. Values are based on U.S. Census 2010 population counts reported at the block level of geography (U.S. Census 2010 Summary File 1, Table P12: SEX BY AGE), broken down by the following age groups. This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Pop2015Diff – The difference between the values for TAZ_TtlPop2015 UPDATED RAW Rounded and TAZ_TtlPop2015.

MarginalPopGrowth2050 – The marginal change in population anticipated to occur in the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

MarginalPopGrowth2050Round – The rounded version of the variable MarginalPopGrowth2050, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

TAZ_TtlHh2015 – The total number of households identified as living in the specific TAZ. Values are based on the 2015 estimated household counts reported at the block group level of geography, summed up to the TAZ level.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see
LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706

MarginalHhGrowth2050 – The marginal change in households anticipated to occur in the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

MarginalHhGrowth2050Round – The rounded version of the variable MarginalHhGrowth2050, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

TAZ MedHhInc2015 – The average household income for the Census Block Groups covering the TAZ, in 2015 constant dollars.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see
LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706

Student Enrollment

These variables contain information on the size and composition of the change in student population arriving in each TAZ, from the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year

StudentsPreKFall2015 – The total number of Pre-Kindergarten students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see
LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706

StudentsPreK2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in Pre-Kindergarten students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

StudentsPreK2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable StudentsPreK2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

StudentsKindFall2015 – The total number of Kindergarten students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see
LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706

StudentsKind2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in Kindergarten students enrolled at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

StudentsKind2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable StudentsKind2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students1stGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 1st Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students1stGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 1st Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students1stGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students1stGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students2ndGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 2nd Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students2ndGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 2nd Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students2ndGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students2ndGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students3rdGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 3rd Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students3rdGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 3rd Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students3rdGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students3rdGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students4thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 4th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students4thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 4th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students4thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students4thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students5thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 5th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students5thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 5th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students5thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students5thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students6thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 6th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students6thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 6th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students6thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students6thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students7thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 7th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students7thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 7th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students7thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students7thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students8thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 8th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students8thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 8th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students8thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students8thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students9thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 9th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students9thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 9th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students9thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students9thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students10thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 10th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students10thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 10th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students10thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students10thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students11thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 11th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students11thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 11th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students11thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students11thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

Students12thGrdFall2015 – The total number of students enrolled in 12th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ, as of Fall 2015.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

Students12thGrade2050_Marginal – The anticipated growth in students enrolled in 12th Grade at all public and private school facilities located within the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

Students12thGrade2050_Marginal_Round – The rounded version of the variable Students12thGrade2050_Marginal, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

UnivTtl2015 – The total college population across all undergraduate, graduate and/or professional programs attending classes at campuses located within the TAZ.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

UnivTtl2050 Est – The estimated total college population across all undergraduate, graduate and/or professional programs attending classes at campuses located within the TAZ, in the 2050 Plan Horizon Year, based on the calculation methodologies described in the previous section.

UnivTtl2050 Est Round – The rounded version of the variable UnivTtl2050 Est, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

UnivTtl2050 Marginal – The difference between the values for UnivTtl2050 Est Round and UnivTtl2015. This value represents the anticipated growth in university enrollments expected to be associated with this TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year

Employment Growth

These variables contain information on the size and composition of the anticipated changes in employment in each TAZ, from the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year

TtlTAZEmp2015 – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across all categories classified by GDOT.
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

TtlTAZEmp2050_Est – The total employment anticipated in the TAZ in 2050, estimated by the procedures described in the methodology above. This variable is the sum of the estimates for the EmpAgMinConst_2050Est, EmpManufTCUW_2050Est, EmpRetail_2050Est and EmpServ_2050Est. It is intended to serve as a control total.

TtlTAZEmp2050_Est_Rounded – The rounded version of the variable TtlTAZEmp2050_Est, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

TtlEmpMarginal_2050 – The difference between the values for TtlTAZEmp2050_Est_Rounded and TtlTAZEmp2015. This value represents the anticipated growth in total employment expected in the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year.

Emp2015AgMinConst – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 11 (Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Related Activities), 21 (Mining), 22 (Utilities Service Employment) and 23 (Construction).
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

EmpAgMinConst_2050Est – The amount of employment anticipated in the TAZ in 2050 Planning Horizon Year, in the TDM Category Agriculture, Mining & Construction, as estimated by the procedures described in the methodology above (Note: For adjustments to specific TAZs for employment values in this category, please refer to the **Employment Growth Apportionment** section, above).

EmpAgMinConst_2050Est_Rounded – The rounded version of the variable EmpAgMinConst_2050Est, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

EmpAgMinConstMarginal_2050 – The difference between the values for EmpAgMinConst_2050Est_Rounded and Emp2015AgMinConst. This value represents the anticipated growth in the TDM Category Agriculture, Mining & Construction expected in the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year.

Emp2015ManufTCUW – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 31-33 (Manufacturing), 42 (Wholesale Trade), and 48-49 (Transportation and Warehousing).
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

EmpManufTCUW_2050Est – The amount of employment anticipated in the TAZ in 2050 Planning Horizon Year, in the TDM Category Manufacturing & TCUW, as estimated by the procedures described in the methodology above (Note: For adjustments to specific TAZs for employment values in this category, please refer to the **Employment Growth Apportionment** section, above).

EmpManufTCUW_2050Est_Rounded – The rounded version of the variable EmpManufTCUW_2050Est, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

EmpManufTCUWMarginal_2050 – The difference between the values for EmpManufTCUW_2050Est_Rounded and Emp2015ManufTCUW. This value represents the anticipated growth in the TDM Category Manufacturing & TCUW expected in the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year.

Emp2015Retail – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 44-45 (Retail Trade).
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

EmpRetail_2050Est – The amount of employment anticipated in the TAZ in 2050 Planning Horizon Year, in the TDM Category Retail, as estimated by the procedures described in the methodology above (Note: For adjustments to specific TAZs for employment values in this category, please refer to the **Employment Growth Apportionment** section, above).

EmpRetail_2050Est_Rounded – The rounded version of the variable EmpRetail_2050Est, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

EmpRetailMarginal_2050 – The difference between the values for EmpRetail_2050Est_Rounded and Emp2015Retail. This value represents the anticipated growth in the TDM Category Retail expected in the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year.

Emp2015Service – The total employment in the TAZ in 2015 identified in the NETS 2019 database, summed across NAICS Categories 51 (Information), 52 (Finance and Insurance), 53 (Real Estate and Rental and Leasing), 54 (Professional, Scientific and Technical Services), 55 (Management of Companies and Enterprises), 56 (Administration and Waster Services), 61 (Educational Services), 62 (Health Care and Social Assistance), 71 (Arts, Entertainment and Recreation), 72 (Accommodation and Food Services), 81 (Other Services, except Public Administration), and 92 (Government and Government Enterprises).
This variable carries over from the 2015 Base Year file submitted on 7/6/2021 and finalized on 7/28/2021. For specific details on how it was developed, please see **LRTPBaseYear2015TAZDataDocumentation_20210706**

EmpServ_2050Est – The amount of employment anticipated in the TAZ in 2050 Planning Horizon Year, in the TDM Category Service, as estimated by the procedures described in the methodology above (Note: For adjustments to specific TAZs for employment values in this category, please refer to the **Employment Growth Apportionment** section, above).

EmpServ_2050Est_Rounded – The rounded version of the variable EmpServ_2050Est, described above. This value has been rounded to the nearest integer value.

EmpServMarginal_2050 – The difference between the values for EmpServ_2050Est_Rounded and Emp2015Serv. This value represents the anticipated growth in the TDM Category Service expected in the TAZ between the 2015 Base Year to the 2050 Planning Horizon Year.

Appendix C:

MATS Connect2050/ 2022 Year of the Plan Public Outreach Survey Website Front Page

2022 The Year of the Plan | Trans

maconmpo.com/mats-planning-survey/

Getting Started | MG's Phone Dashb... | Bibb County Zonin... | GARC AGOL | NPMRDS Analytics | Logos | Macon Bibb County... | MyDNB.com Login | Suggested Sites | CMS Builder | My LastPass Vault | Login - Dropbox | Imported From Fire...

LATEST NEWS | SURVEY | PROJECTS | CALENDAR | CONTACT | Search

MATS | Home | About MATS | MATS Committees | Documents & Plans | Maps & Resources

English (US)

P&Z MATS Macon Area Transportation Study

Connect 2050

2022 | THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

2022 - 2050 Transportation Planning Survey

Macon-Bibb Planning Commission's & Macon Area Transportation Study's Connect 2050 needs your input & feedback in the 2022 - 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

This transportation plan sets the vision, and establishes goals & strategies needed for well planned transportation growth in our area for the next 25 years.

Your answers to the following survey questions influence planning decisions for the Macon-Bibb/Middle Georgia Area.

The Macon Metro Planning Organization (MPO) also known as Macon Area



meeting-82169288....ics | tl_2021_us_zcta520.zip | Show all

Appendix D:

MATS 2050 MTP JotForm Survey Freeform Comments Summary November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
1	11/8/2021	5121860969337466822	langstaffpope@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	safety and pedestrian improvements on Eisenhower, Pierce, Gray. Bolinbroke bike loop.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	While MATS staff appreciates the time and effort to leave this comment, it does not contain a specific recommendation or suggestion. Therefore, we cannot provide a focused response to the issues raised.
2	11/8/2021	5121860969337466822	langstaffpope@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	All sectors of the community should be able to get around town by bike or walking in a safe manner, especially to and from downtown but also between other areas.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists. Additionally, Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone.
3	11/22/2021	5134181492423875225	tiffany.davis@jonescountyga.org	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	**Jones County:** 1.Disagree with the immediate need to widen Henderson from Hwy 57 to Hwy 49. Since this has been labeled as a no thru truck route, the amount of traffic has substantially decreased. 2. It would better serve the citizens of Jones County to widen Hwy 49 going into Bibb County. **Other counties:** 1. Agree that the 16/75 construction project needs to be completed in a timely manner to ease the congestion in that area. 2. Bass Road widening-should be a high priority in order to support the amount of traffic and growth within that area. 3. Upkeep of existing roads/bridges. Seems funding for new projects is viewed as a higher importance than maintenance projects. We must be able to maintain the integrity of our current road systems before we continually add more.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	**Jones County:** 1. Classifying these projects as "immediate need" is not entirely accurate. The referenced projects are not anticipated to be open to traffic until 2050 (i.e., planning horizon year of this MTP) 2. Commentor's idea is addressed as part of GDOT PI #332450 (Project Priority #42). This project is included as one potential alternative for MATS Area eastern segment of Interstate 14 **Other Counties:** 1. Commentor's points are well observed. If Commentor proposes to prioritize maintenance over developing additonal capacity, they can bring that proposition before the MATS committees for full consideration.
4	11/24/2021	5136093768718110985	christopher.lawrence@mga.edu	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Incorporate projects associated with I-14/High Priority Corridor 102 as proposed in Public Law 117-58 (Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act).	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	At this time, no specific corridor alternatives have been identified by either GDOT or FHWA (although GDOT PI #332450 is included as part of one proposed I-14 corridor alternative for the eastern portion within the MATS Area).
5	11/24/2021	5136103981126283789	amanda.crowley@cox.net	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Macon needs to be Lee walkable and safer. Especially around all of our schools.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	Bibb County School District has established a Coordinated School Health Program that includes Safe Routes to School. Recommended by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) as a strategy for improving student's health and learning in our schools, the program consist of eight interactive components -- health education, physical education, health service, nutrition services, counseling, healthy school environment, health promotion for staff, and family/community involvement.
6	11/24/2021	5136103981126283789	amanda.crowley@cox.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Leave Forrest Hill alone and do not widen it. Route traffic another way	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Project is not currently under active consideration (i.e., not currently included in the FY 2021 - 2024 TIP). However, project is undergoing preliminary concept review with Macon-Bibb County Engineering and consultants. If Commentor wishes to remove this project from the MTP project list, they may bring this to the MATS committees for consideration.
7	11/24/2021	5136103981126283789	amanda.crowley@cox.net	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Make pedestrian walking safer.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians. Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities.
8	11/27/2021	5138307046013104138	diannebrannen@hotmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Really good public transport could transform Macon-Bibb and make it very desirable to business.	General Comment	Public Transportation	Commentor's points are addressed specifically in Chapter 7 - Public Transportation. In particular, that chapter refers to a forthcoming bus route that will serve the Amazon warehouse in South Bibb County.
9	11/27/2021	5138307046013104138	diannebrannen@hotmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Better, more reliable public transport would give better access to jobs at outlying locations, such as Amazon.	Specific Projects	Public Transportation	See response to Comment #8, above.
10	11/27/2021	5138352890415887286	fellaca@hotmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Macon is not, nor can it feasibly be made walkable or bicycle friendly. The drivers are already dangerous enough without adding more soft targets to the roadway/shoulders. Public transit could work much more efficiently if it was clean, secure, and serviced true centers of culture and population centers.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped & Public Transportation	Macon-Bibb County adopted a Complete Streets policy in 2019 that seeks to improve public safety by reducing the incidence of traffic collision injuries and fatalities for users of all modes of transportation. Public transit is addressed in Chapter 7 of the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan update.
11	11/27/2021	5138352890415887286	fellaca@hotmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Projects seem on autopilot, without any new or original thoughts.	Specific Projects	None	Several of the projects on this list are a continuation from the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan. However, some are new. In particular: Widening Gray Highway from Griswoldville Rd. to State Route 18 (GDOT Project #332450; Project List #42); Phase I of the Bass Rd. expansion (GDOT PI #0017121; Project List #5); Central Georgia Rail to Trail (GDOT PI #TBD; Project List #41) All projects were put forward for public review and comment during the Public Information Open Houses put on by MATS in November and early December 2021
12	11/27/2021	5138352890415887286	fellaca@hotmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Transit police.	Additional Project Type	Public Transportation	While MATS appreciates the observation, police deployments on transit are the responsibility of the Bibb County Sherriff's Office and the Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority. This comment should be directed to those agencies.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
13	11/27/2021	5138361128793239305	yankees958@msn.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	1. As a member on CAC (Dist 4) we need to enhance this comm. by having all the positions filled. 2. I sent this survey to Lake Wildwood association. They need to be part of survey & we need to provide inputs to MATS. Kudos to our P&Z guys on everything else with MATS!	General Comment	None	The chairman and vice-chairman of the MATS CAC are currently leading the efforts to fill all positions.
14	11/27/2021	5138361128793239305	yankees958@msn.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	All seems logical & now is the right time to move forward on project list.	Specific Projects	None	MATS agrees with the comment and appreciates the endorsement and support.
15	11/27/2021	5138361128793239305	yankees958@msn.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	The Middle Georgia Regional Airports runway extension should move forward, as planned by previous county gov't's, & Macon Downtown Airport should continue to be enhanced since it has become a flight school that should be supported by our MATS.	Additional Project Type	Aviation	This runway extension is proceeding as planned, and is reflected in the current MATS FY 2021 - 2024 TIP. If necessary, the FY 2021 - 2024 TIP can be amended to include any changes to project scope and/or budget.
16	11/28/2021	5139116172223229293	aureliusbacon@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	The area bus routes are good. The quality of life is ok.	General Comment	Public Transportation	MATS agrees with the sentiments expressed in this comment. The Macon-Bibb Coounty Transit Authority (MTA) wants to maintain support for the transit service in order to provide increased transit service to the public.
17	11/28/2021	5139116172223229293	aureliusbacon@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I a lot of this work is already being done. From east Macon to West Macon	Specific Projects	None	MATS agrees with the sentiments expressed in this comment. The first 12 projects listed in the 2050 Roads and Bridges projects list (Table 6-2) are already underway.
18	11/28/2021	5139116172223229293	aureliusbacon@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Need a northwest corridor from North-Bibb County to West-Bibb County.	Additional Project Type	Roads and Bridges	This comment is in direct opposition to Comment #4. Previous project concepts for a Northwest Corridor project connecting North to West Bibb County required the expansion of Forest Hill Rd., in addition to expansion of Park St. (West of Vineville Ave./U.S. Hwy 41/GA State Route 19) and taking of several residential properties to connect to Log Cabin Dr. The lastest information on the Northwest Corridor project is that it was approved by GDOT in the MATS FY 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (GDOT PI #351140), with an anticipated Construction start date in FY 2012; the project was not included in the MATS 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan or MATS 2050 MTP
19	11/29/2021	5139954295929197938	dcrowleyjr@cox.net	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Green, sustainable, low-cost are all key but can't happen without safety.	General Comment	Safety	Safety strategies for pedestrians and bicyclists are discussed in detail in Chapters 9 and 10 in the 2050 MTP.
20	11/29/2021	5139954295929197938	dcrowleyjr@cox.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	31. How can pedestrians get from Vineville/Ingleside to Amerson River park on foot or bike? Is there an opportunity to include safe cross walks and sidewalks in this project? Adt'l ideas would be to add sidewalks where missing in Vineville / Ingleside. This should be Macon's most walkable neighborhood but we're missing sidewalks on key locations (i.e., sections of Rogers and Corbin). How can traffic be slowed down on Hines, Rogers, Corbin, etc. They are used as cut through streets. I thinking connecting the neighborhoods of mid-town to Amerson and the Ocmulgee Heritage trail should be a priority.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	A walking audit of the areas mentioned could be done. This would help to identify areas where enforcement is needed, and where infrastructure improvements could be proposed to connect the neighborhood and trail.
21	11/29/2021	5139954295929197938	dcrowleyjr@cox.net	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Assess existing sidewalks for pedestrian safety (i.e., Vineville) and address. Pedestrian friendly is a must. Assess and address the speed on Vineville.	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	See response to Comment #20, above.
22	11/29/2021	5140266830822949743	jim@beallfp.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Design and project decisions should focus on the Pedestrian first. Not only for our health but for our wealth. Road design should focus on keeping the pedestrian safe with narrow lanes to force drivers to go slower.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities.
23	11/29/2021	5140266830822949743	jim@beallfp.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	upgrade the priority on the pedestrian improvements downgrade bass rd phase 2. All bridges should be designed to be beautiful and provide protected pedestrian crossing in addition to vehicles. replacement bridge Tucker at I-75 is ideal to improve pedestrian access. can connect to the Tucker Trail by Wesleyan.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped & Roads and Bridges	The Tucker Road Bridge replacement project is listed in the FY 2021 - 2024 Transportation Improvement Program.
24	11/29/2021	5140266830822949743	jim@beallfp.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	design and planning should focus on the pedestrian first, bike, 2nd, and vehicles last. A network of sidewalks, bike lanes should be installed throughout the region and local train and tram services connecting cities and neighborhoods.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	See response to Comment #22, above.
25	11/30/2021	5140974321213011598		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Improved sidewalks and traffic flow in downtown core	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	The Macon Action Plan seeks to improve multi-modal transportation options in the downtown urban core.
26	11/30/2021	5141000134525292215	fabian_lj@mercer.edu	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Safety improvements and space for pedestrians would be greatly appreciated.	General Comment	Safety	Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities. The policy also seeks to improve public safety by reducing the incidence of traffic collision injuries and fatalities for users of all modes of transportation.
27	11/30/2021	5141037104915201637		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Definitely would like high speed rail access to Atlanta. It would also probably be beneficial to have bus access to south Bibb to help with providing employment opportunities to places such as Amazon, etc.	General Comment	Public Transportation	MATS staff is working with regional partners and GDOT to pursue possibilities for rail connections to Atlanta. With regard to transit access to South Bibb County, Macon Transit Authority is currently planning a new bus route to the major industrial sites in South Bibb (including the Amazon warehouse site). Further details can be found in Chapter 7 of the 2050 MTP.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
28	11/30/2021	514103710491520163 7		Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Stop with the roundabouts. They are ridiculous.	Additional Project Type	Safety & Roads and Bridges	Roundabouts are a proven context sensitive solution that improve the flow of traffic. While they aren't appropriate in all situations, they should be used when and where appropriate. Identifying when and where to use a roundabout is part of an Intersection Control Estimation (ICE) study, which is a componet of any project sponsored by GDOT involving the intersection of one or more roads. ICE studies are conducted by GDOT, County Traffic Engineering, or their selected traffic consultants.
29	11/30/2021	514110771802911525 0	cjgattie@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	1) Increase connectivity between urban and rural areas of Middle Georgia. 2) Transportation improvements that spur and allow redevelopment of underserved Macon neighborhoods (promoting better cohesion between areas of MBC)	General Comment	None	Regional connectivity and addressing the needs of underserved communities are guiding principles in the MATS 2050 MTP. In particualr, the MATS 2050 addresses the intent of the current Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act/Bi-Partisan Infrastructure Law (PL 117-58) to have at least 40% of the benefits for transportation projects covered under this law accrue to traditionally underserved communities. See MATS 2050 MTP Chapter 12 for details.
30	11/30/2021	514110771802911525 0	cjgattie@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	1) The focus on bridge rehab is vitally important for long-term safety of the traveling public. Kudos. 2) The Jones County Highway 18 West bridge project highlights the need for better east to west connectivity across the Ocmulgee River between Monroe and Jones County. This disparity has been previously noted in the MGRC's assessment of our transportation needs. Closing this bridge will cause major traffic detours for cross-county travel and for Jones County residents looking to access I-75 in Monroe County and the important business region of North Macon. While the project is important and must be completed, it demonstrates the lack of options that exist to cross between the two counties (and the lack of a more direct route into North Macon from Jones County). This hampers potential development of affordable single or multi-family housing in southwestern Jones County that would bolster the Bibb and Jones County economies, and segments off rural residents from jobs and commerce in North Macon due to the poor connectivity between Western Jones County and North Macon. The lack of more direct travel options between these two regions also increases emissions. 3) A macro argument of the above example is the need for better, more direct connectivity between all commerce hubs of Macon-Bibb County and surrounding areas. Macon's grid-like infrastructure to keep traffic flowing in many directions is adequate in the downtown corridor, then becomes nighmarish when you get to the North Macon region. Future new roadway projects should better connect the main thouroughfares in the county, increase traffic flow, and eliminate congestion in the poorly urban planned suburban areas of the county. 4) While this plan addresses this in some regard, future projects should look at creating transportation opportunities that shorten travel times and promote more dense growth in the Macon urban core that give residents an option to not have to get in a vehicle to access essential goods and services. This is important for reducing vehicle emissions in the region and allowing the opportunity for a less car-dependent community. As there will be signifigantly more funding for transportation through the recently passed Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act than the FAST act provided, it would be nice to see the Macon MPO add in funding for projects of this type i.e. more sidewalk improvements and new construction of them, increased bike lanes and paths, money spent on multimodal travel promotion and safety, increased pedestrian and motorist safety, etc. 5) The Infrasructure Invesment and Jobs Act provides a historic amount of grant money to localities and community organizations that put forth projects that strike a more "progessive" view of transportation... projects that encompass a lot of the elements I have previously discussed. It is crystal clear by looking at the latest round of RAISE grants that the US Department of Transportation just put out that the Biden administration will award these grants to projects that havea multimodal focus and check a lot of boxes (promote alternate modes of transportation, inccrease equity, connectivity among disadvantaged areas, etc.)... it is incumbent upon the Macon MPO to put forward innovative transportation projects (like complete street projects, projects that increase safety for alternative modes of transportation, more multi-modal focused projectsm etc.) forward to USDOT to capitalize on this historic amount of grant funding completely controlled by USDOT. Projects like a the 7th street truck route, pedestrian and bike improvements through the downtown and vineville corridor, etc. seem to fit this bill 6) The Sardis Church Road to I-16 project is vitally important to the region. If this project can be constructed in an environmentally safe manner that does not harm the ecosystem of the Ocmulgee river it will cross, the Macon region will economically and environmentally benefit from this project. It should be a priority to alleviate truck and vehicle traffic coming through the downtown interstate corridor.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Commentor's points are detailed and well reasoned. MATS response is as follows: 1. The bridge project Commentor is referring to (GDOT PI #0016130; Project Priority #8) is a repair and rehab project for an existing bridge. It does not represent new capacity for the MATS area bordering Jones and Monroe Counties; 2. Commentor is correct in identifying the opportunities available to MATS under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. If Commentor wants to identify specific projects they believe would be eligible for funding (particularly those that have a multi-modal and/or pedestrian emphasis), they can be amended into the MTP project list and the TIP, using the amendment process described in tthe MATS Public Participation Plan.
31	11/30/2021	514110771802911525 0	cjgattie@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	I included my detailed thoughts in the previous answer box	General Comment	None	See response to Comment #30, above.
32	12/1/2021	514205832102903154 7	rmhughes0711@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I-75 and I-16 work needs to get completed.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	According to the GDOT project management website (http://www.dot.ga.gov/BS/Projects/ProjectSearch) Project Phase 1b (Pleasant Hill Neighborhood), Phase 2 (I-75 Northbound from Forsyth St/SR 19 to I-16 Interchange) and Phase 3 (I-75 Southbound from Forsyth St/SR 19 to I-16 Interchange) are completed. Phase 1 (I-16 from I-75 Interchange to GA 87/Colliseum Dr.) began construction in September 2017, and is anticipated to be completed by June 2022 Phase 4 (I-16 from I-75 Interchange to Walnut Creek, Eastbound) began construction in June 2021, and is anticipated to be completed by September 2024 Phase 5 (I-16 from I-75 Interchange to Walnut Creek, Westbound) began construction in June 2021, and is anticipated to be completed by September 2024 Phase 6 (I-75 from I-16 to CR 478/Pierce Ave) is anticipated to begin construction sometime between July 1 2025 and June 30, 2026 (i.e., in Fiscal Year 2026),

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
33	12/1/2021	5142068250226591246	dream04@bellsouth.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	The Bass Road projects should consume every resource after the I-75 - I-16 split area. (I notice that it is your background photo!)	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	In May 2019, GDOT reviewed the Bass Road improvement analysis report and identified the section of Bass Road from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road to propose a funding partnership. In September 2019, Macon-Bibb commissioners approved an agreement that will fund the widening of Bass Road in north Macon. The total amount of federal and state funding for the widening project would be capped at just over $30 million. A total of local SPLOST funds in the currenty FY 2021-2024 TIP is projected at nearly $5.39 million, bringing a total cost for the widening to $35,823,137. Proposed improvements to a 1.1 mile-long section of roadway will widen the existing two lanes to a four-lane roadway with a 20 foot raised median, 5 foot shoulders on the south side, 10 foot shoulders on the north side and replacement of the existing Bass Road bridges over I-75 and Beaver Dam Creek. The proposed funding phase is as follows: Preliminary Engineering phase, $2,092,635 (federal/state) in 2020; Right-of-Way phase, $5,387,700 (local) in 2024; Construction phase, $25,322,802 (federal/state) in 2026; and Utilities, $3,020,000 (federal/state) in 2026. The Bass Road project is also listed in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, project identification number 0017121.
34	12/1/2021	5142072213213393781	t498@bellsouth.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	All look good.	Specific Projects	None	See response to Comment #14, above.
35	12/1/2021	5142080781861224235	kbchandler@att.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Nothing is more important that reducing crime. If you are afraid to walk or drive in our community it doesn't matter about sidewalks and traffic flow.	General Comment	None	While clearly important to transporation, crime control and reduction is the responsibility of the County Sherriff's departments of the various MATS counties. This comment is best addressed by those agencies.
36	12/1/2021	5142107537019490273	tracebutler@yahoo.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I would like to see the bike path to Milledgeville at top of list, not bottom. Our bike and pedestrian rights of way have a long way to go to catch up to more progressive communities where such quality of life/public features attract young professionals. Combined with the rail to Atlanta, and perhaps Savannah, these bike lanes will draw visitors and high income earners to Macon which increases our tax base and helps fuel the growth of our community.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	Specific projects can be re-prioritized and/or selected for inclusion into the MATS TIP through the amendment processes described in the MATS Public Participation Plan. MATS staff recommend that this commentor reach out to their local County Commissioner and/or member of the MATS Citizen Advisor Committee to begin the process.
37	12/1/2021	5142137603201919715	Forrest@forrestwatson.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Most of these projects are designed to increase and speed traffic flow which can be an admirable goal, but Macon is an important historical and cultural center for Middle Georgia and unless these projects allow the Macon business district and adjacent historical districts to become more livable, then we run the risk of having a fast outer circle surrounding an undesirable core.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	Commentor appears to be focusing on the need for context sensitive solutions in the downtown Macon-Bibb area. Historic districts, and the specific Road & Bridge projects that might impact them, are summarized in MATS 2050 MTP Chapter 12.
38	12/1/2021	5142137603201919715	Forrest@forrestwatson.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Eliminate truck traffic from the historic district. Reduce commuter traffic in areas close to downtown (Vineville, College, Forsyth, Washington St)	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Unfortunately, it isn't possible to totally eliminate truck traffic from the historic district areas. Pass through truck traffic cannot be denied on routes recognized by State or Federal DOTs. In the MATS area, many of those routes bisect historic districts (including Vineville neighborhood, and Macon-Bibb downtown). MATS is attempting to identify projects that can provide alternative routes that minimize and/or avoid impacts to historic district areas. For example, the 7th St. truck route over Brosnan Yard (Project Priority #15) is an attempt to provide an alternative to divert truck traffic around the downtown historic district.
39	12/1/2021	5142186916716964182	cchodges@att.net	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Need to fix roads we have now to many in bad shape before we start new ones..	General Comment	Roads and Bridges	Monitoring the condition of existing infrastructure and transit capital is a requirement of the Fixing Americas Surface Transportation Act of 2015. To that end, Performance Measures for Safety, Road & Bridge condition are tracked annually, and reported in the MATS Transportation Improvement Program. In addition to this tracking, County governments receive Local Maintencance Infrastructure Grants from Georgia Dept. of Transportation, for the purpose of maintaining and improving infrastrucutre on Local (i.e., non-State and non-Federal) rights of way. Those funds are separate from any State or Federal funds used to design or build new roads, bridges or pedestrian infrastrucure.
40	12/1/2021	5142186916716964182	cchodges@att.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Fix water problem on 75 north . Anytime it rains to much water stands on the road lots of wreaks here also... After Pierce Road exit	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Commentor's point is well taken. I-75 at Pierce Ave. is part of the project area for Phase 6 of the I-16/I-75 expansion (GDOT Project #311400). MATS will share Commentor's point with GDOT District 3 office to make sure they are aware of this concern as engineering concept plans are developed. Commentor is further encouraged to follow this project on the GDOT Project Tracking website: http://www.dot.ga.gov/BS/Projects/ProjectSearch

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
41	12/1/2021	5142186916716964182	cchodges@att.net	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Make traffic signals longer to move traffic more have lights close together program the same. Also mark roads with larger signs also mark roads with arrows on the pavement for directions better seen	Additional Project Type	Safety	Signage and traffic signalization on local streets are the responsibility of local governments; MATS focuses on State and Federal priorities. That said, LMIG moneies (see comment #37) are eligible to be used for safety and maintenance improvements on local streets. These funds are awarded as a lump sum (i.e., a single funding block), with specific projects being identified and administered by the County government and the GDOT. If Commentor wants to identify specific projects they believe would be eligible for funding (particularly those that have a multi-modal and/or pedestrian emphasis), they can be amended into the MTP project list and the TIP, using the amendment process described in tthe MATS Public Participation Plan.
42	12/2/2021	5142530736948531878	stephen.chanin@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Bus service between Macon and Atlanta.	Additional Project Type	Public Transportation	Currently, Greyhound provides bus service between Macon and Atlanta. There are 3 daily buses from Atlanta to Macon, and 2 from Macon back to Atlanta
43	12/2/2021	5142543015584779029	jmprevette@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Pedestrian safety and design should be top priority and it doesn't seem to be. Not too surprised by this as we seem to ignore those that don't have cars in this county, which is a shame.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists. Additionally, Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone.
44	12/2/2021	5142543015584779029	jmprevette@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Bass rd should only be widened between hwy 87 and Westchester. No need to go beyond that. A light should be added in front of the Marshall's shopping center. With all of the pedestrian accidents we have in this county I am surprised to not see that type of work as a priority.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Bass Road is proposed to be improved from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road. The proposed improvements to a 1.1 mile-long section of roadway will widen the existing two lanes to a four-lane roadway with a 20 foot raised median, 5 foot shoulders on the south side, 10 foot shoulders on the north side and replacement of the existing Bass Road bridges over I-75 and Beaver Dam Creek. The Bass Road project is also listed in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, project identification number 0017121. Work on the Bass Road project is anticipated to occur between 2020 – 2026.
45	12/2/2021	5142571782026046755	jainsworthster@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Some of the long range projects such as improvements at exit ramps need to be given a higher priority. Traffic lights at both the I-75 PioNono and Eisenhower exits have been needed for years.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Project prioritization and selection for inclusion the 4-Year project implementation window (i.e., the Transportation Improvement Program - MATS TIP) happen at the MATS committees. If commentor wishes to lobby for a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
46	12/2/2021	5142571782026046755	jainsworthster@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Increase law enforcement of traffic laws such as speeding and running traffic lights.	Additional Project Type	Safety	While MATS appreciates the observation, police deployments are the responsibility of the County Sherriff's Office and/or municipal Police Departments. This comment should be directed to those agencies.
47	12/2/2021	5142603337519742159		Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Increase safety by lowering speed limits and enforcing them to within 5 MPH!!	General Comment	Safety	While MATS appreciates the observation, police deployments are the responsibility of the County Sherriff's Office and/or municipal Police Departments. This comment should be directed to those agencies.
48	12/2/2021	5142603337519742159		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Lowering speed limits and enforcing them to within 5mph especially in residential areas.	General Comment	Safety	While MATS appreciates the observation, police deployments are the responsibility of the County Sherriff's Office and/or municipal Police Departments. This comment should be directed to those agencies.
49	12/2/2021	5142657801384957541	eloisaborgato@icloud.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Public transportation reduces pollution and road congestion. Creates jobs and enables more tourism.	General Comment	Public Transportation	See response in Comment #14, above.
50	12/2/2021	5142657801384957541	eloisaborgato@icloud.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Paratransit needs to run 7 days per week currently it does not run on Sundays and this eliminates the opportunities for people with disabilities to network with private entities such as Churches that can employe them on Sundays.	Specific Projects	Public Transportation	Transportation for the handicapped is provided by the ADA service that is operated by the Macon Transit Authority and the Jones County Transit Authority. ADA service operating hours are similar to the hours of the regular transit route service as required by the ADA legislation. Therefore, there is no Sunday service available at this time.
51	12/2/2021	5142657801384957541	eloisaborgato@icloud.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	handicap transportation	Additional Project Type	Public Transportation	See response to Comment #50, above
52	12/2/2021	5142722132712826889	phud31032@yahoo.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Train to Atlanta would be fabulous!	Specific Projects	Public Transportation	See response to Comment #27, above.
53	12/2/2021	5142722132712826889	phud31032@yahoo.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Wish more priority was given to pedestrian and bicycle safety, public transportation and air quality.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped & Public Transportation	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists. Additionally, Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone.
54	12/2/2021	5142722132712826889	phud31032@yahoo.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Pedestrian safety on high congestion roads	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	See response to comment #53, above.
55	12/2/2021	5142859703327985783		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Too heavy on adding and expanding roads	General Comment	None	See response to Comment #39, above.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
56	12/2/2021	5142880649016982185		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	All of the pedestrian projects need to be moved up to less than 1-2 years to get finished. The ramp onto I-75 S at Vineville/Forsyth street needs to be widened.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped & Roads and Bridges	Although specific projects can have their priority in the MATS 2050 MTP updated and/or can be amended into the MATS TIP, it is highly unlikely that ***any*** project can be completed in 1 to 2 years. The schedules for preliminary engineering and environmental assessment work, staffing requirements, and construction timeline don't normally allow for such a compressed timeline. For pedestrian and bike projects that already have a preliminary engineering concept ready, there is a special GDOT competitive grant program called Transportation Enhancement (TE). TE Projects have the following adminstrative limits: a.) They are limited to a total budget of $1,250,000; b.) The total award of the TE grant cannot exceed $1,000,000. The rest must be local match, and locals are responsible for all cost overruns ; c.) Projects must be bid within 2 years of award of the funds; d.) Projects must be completed within 18 months of a signed contract With respect to the I-75 Southbound ramp at Vineville/Forsyth, if commentor wishes to lobby for a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
57	12/2/2021	5142880649016982185		Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Macon is horrible for pedestrians, especially those with mobility issues (wheelchairs, motorized scooters). The sidewalks are narrow, when there is a sidewalk, and the ramps to access the sidewalks are sometimes too steep and cause people to tip over. I've seen several people using the streets because construction has blocked the sidewalk they use to travel on safely in their wheelchairs.	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	Pedestrians are encouraged to utilize Macon-Bibb's See Click Fix https://www.maconbibb.us/seeclickfix/ to report any hazards that impedes pedestrian movement, especially those with mobility issues.
58	12/2/2021	5142948784323071083	tim5440@bellsouth.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I think the current infrastructure bill is going to help bring the country to where we should be. it is a good frist step.	General Comment	None	MATS staff agrees with this general assessment, and is looking for specific projects to take advantage of the opportunities presented in the Infrastrucutre Investment and Jobs Act (U.S. PL 117-58). If commentor wishes to lobby for a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP. or both. as needed.
59	12/2/2021	5143063934316036104	bcstyons@msn.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Keep bike lanes maintained with limbs trimmed and lane free of debris	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	Cyclists are encouraged to utilize Macon-Bibb's See Click Fix https://www.maconbibb.us/seeclickfix/ to report any hazards that impedes cycling along Macon-Bibb's roadways.
60	12/2/2021	5143063934316036104	bcstyons@msn.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Like plans	General Comment	None	MATS staff appreciates this endorsement.
61	12/2/2021	5143063934316036104	bcstyons@msn.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Complete roads before new stores / hotels are approved in one location, ie Bass Road. Roads were an after thought.	General Comment	Roads and Bridges	MATS recognizes the value of sequencing and coordinating of roads and other infrastructure development prior to, or at least in concert with, new development. MATS deals primarily with State and Federal infrastructure projects. The type of roads the comment refers to appear to be primarily under local jurisdiction (i.e., outside the scope of the 2050 MTP). If commentor wishes to more directly address this issue, MATS staff recommends looking for opportunities to participate in the comprehensive planning process for their community (since commentor refers specifically to Bass Rd. in Macon-Bibb County, they may want to look for opportunites to contribute to the discussion in the forthcoming Macon-Bibb County Comprehensive Plan update).
62	12/2/2021	5143099923329278901	laurado@cox.net	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Fix roads	General Comment	Roads and Bridges	There are multiple projects in the 2050 MTP, as well as in the current MATS FY 2021-2024 TIP, which address the needs to repair roads and bridges on State and Federal sponsored routes. Repairs on Local streets are supported through Local Maintenance Improvement Grants (LMIG), sponsored by Georgia Dept. of Transportation. LMIG funds are separate from any State or Federal funds used to design or build new roads, bridges or pedestrian infrastrucure.
63	12/3/2021	5143483912324104004		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Would like to see increased vigilance regarding speed and traffic law enforcement....	General Comment	None	While MATS appreciates the observation, police deployments are the responsibility of the County Sherriff's Office and/or municipal Police Departments. This comment should be directed to those agencies.
64	12/3/2021	5143483912324104004		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	How about re-surfacing of roads in dis-repair....Columbus Rd in Bibb	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Repairs on Local streets are supported through Local Maintenance Improvement Grants (LMIG), sponsored by Georgia Dept. of Transportation. LMIG funds are described in the MATS FY 2021-2024 Transportation Improvment Plan, and are separate from any State or Federal funds used to design or build new roads, bridges or pedestrian infrastrucure.
65	12/3/2021	5143483912324104004		Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Surveillance cameras on roads for use by law enforcement	Additional Project Type	Safety	While MATS appreciates the observation, law enforcement matters such as these are the responsibility of the County Sherriff's Office and/or municipal Police Departments. This comment should be directed to those agencies.

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
66	12/3/2021	5143560354529220741	rlabbott9@att.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Bass Rd project has been pushed out several times. It needs to be completed as soon as feasible.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Bass Road is proposed to be improved from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road. The proposed improvements to a 1.1 mile-long section of roadway will widen the existing two lanes to a four-lane roadway with a 20 foot raised median, 5 foot shoulders on the south side, 10 foot shoulders on the north side and replacement of the existing Bass Road bridges over I-75 and Beaver Dam Creek. The Bass Road project is also listed in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, project identification number 0017121. Work on the Bass Road project is anticipated to occur between 2020 – 2026.
67	12/3/2021	5143560354529220741	rlabbott9@att.net	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Resurface damaged road surfaces.	Additional Project Type	Roads and Bridges	See response to Comment #64, above.
68	12/3/2021	5143767181917396034	joeykinard@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Until the number of cars is reduced we should not encourage walkers and biking. Also walking and biking should only be done in residential areas	Specific Projects	Safety & TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities.
69	12/4/2021	5144789369418428114	kendra.castelow@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	There needs to be a traffic light on Bass Road at the entrance to the strip mall entrance (Marshall, Old Navy, etc.). Keep up the good work with the I75/I16 exchange.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Bass Road is proposed to be improved from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road. The proposed improvements to a 1.1 mile-long section of roadway will widen the existing two lanes to a four-lane roadway with a 20 foot raised median, 5 foot shoulders on the south side, 10 foot shoulders on the north side and replacement of the existing Bass Road bridges over I-75 and Beaver Dam Creek. The Bass Road project is also listed in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, project identification number 0017121. Work on the Bass Road project is anticipated to occur between 2020 – 2026.
70	12/4/2021	5144789369418428114	kendra.castelow@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I think the Bass Road work is long overdue, and I look forward to seeing it completed. All the other projects are fabulous.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Bass Road is proposed to be improved from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road. The proposed improvements to a 1.1 mile-long section of roadway will widen the existing two lanes to a four-lane roadway with a 20 foot raised median, 5 foot shoulders on the south side, 10 foot shoulders on the north side and replacement of the existing Bass Road bridges over I-75 and Beaver Dam Creek. The Bass Road project is also listed in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, project identification number 0017121. Work on the Bass Road project is anticipated to occur between 2020 – 2026.
71	12/5/2021	5145460376944781891	scrapburl@att.net	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	OCMULGEE EAST BLVD needs sidewalks	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County can assess the area to obtain feedback from community resident's to assess the walkability of the area. Given that Ocmulgee East Blvd. is part of the US Highway and State Route Systems (US Hwy 23 and GA 87, respectively) any pedestrian work on this section would require consultation with GDOT, and inclusion in the MATS TIP. If commentor wishes to lobby for a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
72	12/5/2021	5145460376944781891	scrapburl@att.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I do not see Ocmulgge East Blvd is in need of sidewalks from Jeffersonville Rd to 4 way stop at Riggins Mill and Ocmulgge east Blvd you have you have YKK and GEICO on 129 HWY surely you can have sidewalks all the way down this highway it sure can use guard rails	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	This comment seems to contradict the previous comment made by the same respondent (See Comment #67, above). It appears the comment contains a typo.
73	12/5/2021	5145460376944781891	scrapburl@att.net	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Make shopping centers repair their entrances and exits	Additional Project Type	Safety & Roads and Bridges	MATS doesn't have the authority to compel a private property owner to maintain their entrance and/or exits to any particular standard. That authority and responsibility lies with the County Engineering office, Building Inspectors, or GDOT District office (if the drive fronts onto a GDOT controlled right of way).
74	12/15/2021	5154183566757803927		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Public transportation needed for poverty residents, however 2 hours to and from work keeps many at home.	General Comment	Public Transportation	The Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority (MTA) considers transit service for residents that live in poverty areas to be very important. MTA provides transit route service to most of the public housing complexes in the Macon-Bibb County area, and is exploring options to provide new service to industrial sites in South Bibb County to connect employers with job seekers. Additional details of this new service to South Bibb County can be found in Chapter 7 of the MATS 2050 MTP.
75	12/15/2021	5154183566757803927		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Stop the growth around Bass Rd until something's done with the traffic.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	A growth moratoria of the type being described is under the authority of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission. If commentor wishes to lobby for this specific policy, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
76	12/27/2021	5164504909912833813	doug.oetter@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Off-road commuter & recreational multi-use pathways, e.g. Central Georgia Rail-Trail	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	MATS staff appreciates the sentiment behind this comment. There are several projects on the road and bridges projects list which address quality of life issues (e.g., Bolingbroke Bike Loop, Central Georgia Rail Trail). In addition, MATS looks for opportunities to incoporate improved pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and safety improvements into any project taking place on a surface street. If commentor wishes to lobby for an idea or a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
77	12/27/2021	5164504909912833813	doug.oetter@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	The Bike/Safety/Pedestrian components should take FIRST priority. Before any funding that will increase vehicular traffic is considered, we need to provide equity to those of us who do not drive a car everywhere we go. Crossing solutions on Gray Hwy., Eisenhower Pkwy., Emery Hwy., and Jeffersonville Rd. should be the first thing to fund because people are dying on those roads way too often. Complete the interstate improvements next. Let's move people through town and get them on & off the highway efficiently. Downlist all of the several Bass Rd. projects. Let the people who elected to move outside of the city suffer some congestion and infrastructure needs. Go ahead and slow down the over-development in that area by making drivers wait their turn. They should have to wait about 20 years for us to address the 'concerns' that were created by their exodus. The Bolingbroke Bike Loop is a good idea, but it will not serve nearly as many deserving low-income citizens as the Central GA Rail-Trail would serve. The CGRT would connect Ocmulgee NP with the Jones County recreation center on Hwy. 49, providing safe off-road pedestrian/biking access for thousands of people who don't have anywhere safe to go today. It would link humans to the places they need to go. Once the CGRT has begun, then we should look to improve the Walnut St. bike route so that North Macon people can bike safely downtown. It's great to see so many bridges under repair. Be sure that each of them has widened pedestrian/bike access, similar to what was done on Hwy. 49 at Mattie Wells school. Every planner & transportation engineer should start a project by walking a half-mile in our shoes. We don't all drive through historic neighborhoods at a high rate of speed. Some of us live here already and the vehicles are the most dangerous things in our immediate vicinity.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	This comment emphasizes the need to develop a coherent pedestrian plan and bike network for MATS generally, and the Macon-Bibb County area in particular. With respect to those efforts: 1. In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists. Additionally, Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone; 2. Both the Bolingbroke Bike Loop and the CGRT projects have been moved into the main Roads and Bridges project list, which makes them eligible for direct movement into the MATS TIP. If Commentor wants to promote specific existing projects or suggest new projects they believe would be eligible for funding (particularly those that have a multi-modal and/or pedestrian emphasis), they can be amended into the MTP project list and the TIP, using the amendment process described in the MATS Public Participation Plan.
78	12/27/2021	5164504909912833813	doug.oetter@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	We let bad ideas go too far in the past, but we can overcome the problem if we demonstrate sound solutions and celebrate success. The downtown bike/pedestrian improvements should be highlighted. Roundabouts are working. Traffic calming solutions like in Ingleside Village are beneficial. Thank you for caring about our community and its people.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	MATS appreciates the sentiments expressed in this comment.
79	12/27/2021	5164751843591696964	wintercreek132@yahoo.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Commit funding to Rail to Trail projects like the Central Georgia Rail Trail between Macon, Gray, Haddock and Milledgeville.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	MATS is exploring options to obtain additional funding for bike/pedestrian projects as well as mass and alternative transportation projects (including the possiblity of seeking direct funding from the Federal government, under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act/B-iPartisan Infrastructure Law (PL 117-58). MATS recognizes that these type of projects decrease traffic congestion and promote environmental preservation.
80	12/27/2021	5164751843591696964	wintercreek132@yahoo.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Needs more emphasis on mass and alternative transportation projects and less on cars and roads.	General Comment	Public Transportation	See response to Comment #7, above.
81	12/28/2021	5165103994027842590	jamie_weatherford@yahoo.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	We have a huge amount of bridges in Macon, partiuclarly along the 75 / 16 corridor. I wish more could be done to beautify the bridges and the exits along the interstates.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	GDOT maintains a special grant for these types of projects; the Transportation Alternatives Program. Grant program details can be found on the GDOT website (http://www.dot.ga.gov/IS/Funding/TAP#tab-3)
82	12/28/2021	5165103994027842590	jamie_weatherford@yahoo.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	The 7th St. truck route is essential. We must get these trucks off of Broadway for the safety of the pedestrians and the health of the businesses.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	MATS staff is working with GDOT to get this project on the GDOT construction schedule. If commentor wishes to lobby for this project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
83	1/6/2022	5173156665316996525		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Road widening tends to induce more usage, not alleviate congestion	General Comment	None	Commentor's point is acknowledged, but not specific enough to be answered in detail.
84	1/6/2022	5173161937203686734	colvinverda860@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Phase 5 is a must. I-16/75; I-16; Forest Hill and Bass Rd are MUST!!!	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Phase 5 I-16/I-75 and Bass Rd are already underway. All phases of I-16/I-75 are anticipated to be completed by 2026; Bass Rd. Phase 1 is anticipated to start construction in 2026. MATS staff is working with GDOT to get Bass Rd. Phase 2 (Providence Blvd. to Zebulon Rd.) and Forest Hill Phase 2 (Wimbish to Vineville Ave.) started as quickly as possible.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
85	1/6/2022	5173172847427215367		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Completing the I-75/I-16 project will improve traffic flow the most	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Commentor's point is acknowledged, but not specific enough to be answered in detail. This comment appears to be directly contrary to Comment #76.
86	1/7/2022	5173713137605598619	greg.boike@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Ensuring a vibrant downtown in Macon is reliant on a strong pedestrian network in the area. I believe there's already been great progress here, so maintaining those connections and encouraging new walkable development should be a key priority at the intersection of transportation and land use. That will also make future inter-city transit connections far more efficient. Finally, the importance of basic maintenance on local streets shouldn't be overlooked. There are always a few too many potholes around and some bumpy streets to travel on--particularly in the downtown core.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	MATS agrees with the premise of encouraging walkable communities in order to promote development in the downtown area. With respect to the observation about basic maintenance, there is funding that has been set aside for Macon-Bibb County road maintenance in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), under the Local Maintenance Infrastructure Grant program.
87	1/7/2022	5173713137605598619	greg.boike@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	The 7th Street truck route is a very important project for keeping streets in the downtown area in better condition by lessening heavy truck traffic. Among the long-term projects, the Sardis Church Rd. Extension is perhaps the most important--particularly due to interest in an I-14 corridor through Macon-Bibb County. Other projects that should be considered include the Central Georgia Rail-Trail, which is a prime pedestrian and recreational opportunity. Also, as pedestrian safety improvements are made along Emery Highway, MATS should consider studying long-term traffic flow along Second Street from I-75 to Gray Hwy, US-129. The road network in that area is set to receive more traffic due to the new Exit 1B interchange, but that stretch of roadway is confusing and difficult to navigate.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	1.) MATS staff is working with GDOT to get the 7th St. Truck Route project on the GDOT construction schedule. This project has been identified in multiple comments as a high local priority; 2.) Sardis Church Rd. extension is identified as a possible component of the proposed Interstate 14 corridor. Exact route alternatives/alignments have not yet been identified. 3.) Central GA Rail-Trail was moved up from the Projects Identified for Further Study and Future Consideration in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan into the formal 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges Projects List. MATS is looking for opportunities to bring this project into the GDOT construction schedule. 4.) MATS is aware of the complications of this intersection. We are exploring opportunities with local and GDOT partners to determine how best to resolve pedestrian conflicts in this area. All modifications to this intersection and surrounding parcels are subject to GDOT review and approval.
88	1/7/2022	5173831245429883511		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Project Description: Improve Bass Road from Providence Blvd to New Forsyth Road (including bridge over I-75 on Bass Rd.) Proposed Schedule Priority: 5 WOW - this is a BIG mess and only getting worse with more development. Surprised it's a 5. Project Description: 7th St. Truck Route – 7th St. @ Walnut & 7th St. @ Eisenhower – Roundabout and Improvements Proposed Schedule Priority: 16 Reflected in GDOT Project Schedule? No This is also a problem - but really the trucks need to be routed out of downtown. At least make them take Riverside off the 2nd street connector instead of Walnut. Also - the pedestrian safety improvements on Gray Highway and Eisenhower should be higher priority. No one is dying because a bridge needs improving, but these are life saving changes that could be incorporated sooner.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	1.) All projects with priority value of 12 or lower are already underway. Priority #5 is the highest value for a locally sponsored project. 2.) Truck traffic on Walnut St. is a local traffic enforcement issue for either the Macon-Bibb County Engineer and/or the Macon-Bibb County Sherriff's Office. This comment will be shared with those organizations. 3.) This comment is a false dichotomy. Bridge improvements/repairs for structures that are functionally obsolete or beyond their design life represent just as much danger to travelers as do unsafe pedestrian environments. MATS staff has been involved in several road safety audits on both Gray Hwy and Eisenhower Pkwy, and we are looking for opportunities to bring those projects into the GDOT construction schedule.
89	1/10/2022	5176507410019574159	obrown@historicmacon.org	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	We are most interested in the final Interstate 75/16 projects, which seem to rival the Big Dig in Boston for the time it's taking to finish. We also are affected by the Forest Hill Road project and the bike improvement lanes from Vineville to Riverside. All in all, the projects seem to address needs in all portions of Bibb and nearby counties geographically. They seem to be distributed fairly.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	The I16/I-75 projects are anticipated to be completed by 2026 (see Comment #30 for additional details). The next phase for the widening project for Forest Hill Rd. (Vineville Ave. to Wimbish Rd.; GDOT PI #0013676) is currently going through concept development and preliminary engineering (including environmental assessment). MATS staff is working with GDOT to get this on the construction schedule as soon as possible.
90	1/10/2022	5176507410019574159	obrown@historicmacon.org	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Incentives or tax credits to boost the sustained use and purchase of electric vehicles.	Additional Project Type	None	The incentives and tax credits Commentor is discussing are the purview of State of Georgia and the Federal government. Although the $5,000 State tax credit for battery-only electric vehicles expired in 2016, Georgia is looking into new incentives for those who purchase vehicles and/or charging equipment. MATS staff is also aware of interest by Southern Company (i.e., the parent company of Georgia Power) looking to establish a statewide network of electric vehicle charging stations. Opportunities to participate in those projects will primarily involve local comprehensive plans. If requested, MATS staff will gladly provide assistance to local jurisdictions in our planning area.
91	1/10/2022	5176529990567224234	gabrielle.e.hale@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	I would love to walk places more in Macon, but the roads are not safe to do so for the most part.	General Comment	Safety	Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities.
92	1/10/2022	5176529990567224234	gabrielle.e.hale@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I believe the most pressing projects are the interstate ones. The construction that has been going on for the last 8+ years makes it difficult to change lanes/follow GPS instructions when lanes are constantly shifting/opening/closing.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Phases 1 through 5 of the I16/I-75 projects are anticipated to be completed by 2026 (see Comment #30 for additional details). Phase 6 (I-75 from I-16 Interchange to Pierce Ave.) is anticipated to be open to traffic somethime between 2026 and 2030

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
93	1/10/2022	5176529990567224234	gabrielle.e.hale@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	I would absolutely love a rail service to Atlanta!!! In addition to improving public transportation, more needs to be done to promote using buses as a safe, normal option.	Additional Project Type	Public Transportation	The new transportation infrastructure bill passed by Congress includes funding for the expansion of passenger rail service which might include the possibility of train service to Atlanta from Macon in the future. The legislation will also expand public transit service across the country and provide new efficient buses as well as improve accessibility for the elderly and disabled.
94	1/10/2022	5176532534918543544		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	I wish it were safe to get around Macon on foot or bicycle, but, for now, I am not willing to take that risk in most places. In addition to the infrastructure issues, I would like to see a public awareness campaign to try to change the attitudes many drivers have toward pedestrians and cyclists.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County adopted a Complete Streets policy in 2019 that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities. The Pedestrian Safety Review Board works with the Governor's Office of Highway Safety and stakeholders in the community to bring public awareness regarding pedestrian safety, and distracted driving.
95	1/10/2022	5176532534918543544		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Is there a phase of the interstate construction that involves turning the street lights back on in the area of the Spring Street bridge? If so, I hope that can be prioritized as the darkness there, combined with people panhandling in the streets, is a major safety concern. I'm glad to see the pedestrian/safety projects on Gray Hwy and Eisenhower Pkwy	Specific Projects	Safety & TE/Bike/Ped	Commentor's question was forwarded to GDOT District 3 Office. The relevant portion of the GDOT response is quoted below: *"Thank you for your inquiry about the I-16 I-75 interchange improvement project. There is new lighting planned to be installed throughout the Spring Street area in the later phases of construction. Unfortunately, it is estimated that this lighting will not be fully installed until the final stages of construction around 2026."*
96	1/10/2022	5176532534918543544		Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	I think there should be an audit of existing roads to determine where problems are (related to signage, lane markers, speed limit, etc.). Many areas seem unsafe for drivers and pedestrians due to poor planning and/or implementation.	Additional Project Type	Safety	Road Safety Audits were conducted on roadways in Macon-Bibb that experience a high rate of pedestrian related incidents. Eisenhower Parkway (from Bloomfield Road to C Street); Gray Highway (from Shurling Drive to Jones County Line); and Emery Highway.
97	1/10/2022	5176558695315605369	sarah.garvey01@yahoo.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Creating an urban trail system (similar to the beltine in Atlanta).	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	The draft Ocmulgee Heritage Trail Master Plan 2.0 is currently exploring areas to connect the trails to neighborhoods outside of the downtown core.
98	1/10/2022	5176574398422876729	jjessopwarren@protonmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Macon does not have the money as Columbus or tourism economy of Savannah, so we must improve quality of life for residents as a focus.	General Comment	None	See response to Comment #76, above
99	1/10/2022	5176574398422876729	jjessopwarren@protonmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Wasn't Eisenhower part of the recently approved plan to create a new interstate. Shouldn't its plan show the upcoming change. Also, to increase value on Vineville place improvements on it.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Eisenhower Pkwy is a potential route for a proposed Interstate 14, which would run from Columbus to Augusta. While MATS supports the proposed interstate, neither GDOT nor U.S. DOT have come forward with a specifically recommended alignment. If and when a final alignment is determined that incorporates Eisenhower Pkwy, or any other road in the MATS jurisdiction, that project will be reflected in the MATS MTP and TIP documents.
100	1/10/2022	5176574398422876729	jjessopwarren@protonmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Protected bike lanes and bike lanes connecting intown commerical hubs, as Ingleside with Mercer	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that seeks to incorporate the inclusion of protected, separated, or share use lanes. The draft Ocmulgee Heritage Trail Plan 2.0 is exploring ways to connect neighborhoods to downtown and the Ocmulgee River Walk.
101	1/10/2022	5176589914527462544	jlbfalk@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I am particularly interested in this project: Project Description: Pierce Ave. (aka State Route 247) – Pedestrian improvements and bike lanes from Vineville Ave. to Riverside Dr.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	This project was listed in the previous 2040 LRTP update for the proposed 2040 newtork year. The project is not currently listed in the 2050 MTP update.
102	1/10/2022	5176681051435989232	demonobrien@yahoo.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Fix/repair all the pot holes on Vineville, Forsyth, Hardeman, College st, Spring st., Georgia ave, Etc!	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	These types of projects are covered under the Local Maintenance Improvement Grants (LMIG), sponsored by Georgia Dept. of Transportation. LMIG funds are separate from any State or Federal funds used to design or build new roads, bridges or pedestrian infrastrucure, and are reflected in the MATS FY 2021 - 2024 TIP.
103	1/10/2022	5176735737024462395	rtrkrswfe@yahoo.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	The I-16 project is a mess. I hope once its done, it will be better but now, I avoid it altogether.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Phases 1 through 5 of the I16/I-75 projects are anticipated to be completed by 2026 (see Comment #30 for additional details). Phase 6 (I-75 from I-16 Interchange to Pierce Ave.) is anticipated to be open to traffic somethime between 2026 and 2030
104	1/10/2022	5176735737024462395	rtrkrswfe@yahoo.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Definitely replace bridges.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	There are multiple bridge projects identified in the MATS 2050 MTP. All projects involving bridge replacement or repair are identified in Table 6-2, under the Project Type "Bridge" or "Bridge Replacement." Projects are also identified for whether or not they are currently in the MATS FY 2021-2024 TIP. If commentor wishes to lobby for an idea or a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
105	1/10/2022	5176735737024462395	rtrkrswfe@yahoo.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Would like to see rail service from terminal station to Atlanta' etc. No bikes lanes; bikes should be ridden in parks and not in the streets. No traffic circle needed at Popular Street. Leave it alone and don't close off Cotton Ave...it's functional and beautuful as it is.	Specific Projects	Public Transportation & TE/Bike/Ped	With respect to rail service to Atlanta, see response to Comment #93, above. Currently, there are bike lanes that exist in parks that exist for the public. The proposed Traffic Circle on Poplar St. and the Cotton Ave. Plaza are part of the Macon Action Plan. This plan is important for the future of Macon-Bibb Co. and contains important downtown development projects.
106	1/10/2022	5176796118712241582	tgoad2004@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Double lanes from New Forsyth Rd. to Zebulon Rd. with turning lanes where needed and added relights at necessary intersections and, businesses. Roundabouts could be possible answers at some intersections.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Bass Road is proposed to be improved from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road. The proposed improvements to a 1.1 mile-long section of roadway will widen the existing two lanes to a four-lane roadway with a 20 foot raised median, 5 foot shoulders on the south side, 10 foot shoulders on the north side and replacement of the existing Bass Road bridges over I-75 and Beaver Dam Creek. The Bass Road project is also listed in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, project identification number 0017121. Work on the Bass Road project is anticipated to occur between 2020 – 2026.
107	1/10/2022	5176796118712241582	tgoad2004@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Improve Bass Road from Providence Blvd to New Forsyth Road (including bridge over I-75 on Bass Rd.) All of Bass rd. needs attention. The roads are tearing our vehicles up. Traffic is highly congested. Needs new, wider and possible double lanes and red lights where needed. New Forsyth Rd. intersection with Bass rd is terrible. The bridge is so narrow, especially when passing beside a bus or other large vehicle and the roads are past being redone. I believe a red-light with turning lanes would be a great help.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	See response to Comment #106, above.
108	1/10/2022	5176806652787909978	tobiaskopp@gatech.edu	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	If Macon wants to be center of Middle Georgia going forward, the pedestrian deaths and bicycle unfriendliness needs to be improved. Additionally, if the project board could use some sort of population projects to see where the additional capacity will be needed, that could help the future transportation projects be better planned now and executed later. This survey should be sent out to more folks in the region/county so there is the opportunity to reach people who may be more affected by these decisions. The Participation Plan is a great start but this survey could be pushed on news channels, placed in the MTA terminal station, or put in the public libraries. I think transportation in Macon could prepare the area for when the region needs more capacity. But this need for new capacity should not come as a car-centric view because Macon could become a place where innovative transportation ideas are implemented outside of the metro area. One great possibility is to lobby for the Amtrack expansion to go through Macon when it most likely expands in Atlanta. The regions that connect to Atlanta and the port in the state will grow while the others will have more trouble attracting young people.	General Comment	None	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians. The MPO followed the requirements of the Public Participation Plan to inform the public about proposed transportation projects.
109	1/10/2022	5176806652787909978	tobiaskopp@gatech.edu	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	The priority should be Bass Road widening with turn bays. If Bass Road will be widened, use the opportunity to replace the bridge over Norfolk Southern bridge to reduce down time. The smaller pedestrian friendly and bike friendly projects like Bolingbroke route and on Eisenhower. For the projects not yet scheduled, how has 2012 LOS been allowed to be passed already? If the transportation is 8 years behind level of service, how will the public be sure the projects projected for 2040 will not have the same thing occur?	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	The project will replace the existing 26 feet wide bridge with a proposed 43 feet wide bridge over Norfolk Southern Railroad and Colonial Pipeline. The proposed bridge will be higher to meet minimum clearance over the railroad, thus there will be approximately 880 feet of roadway approach on either side of the bridge to tie back to the existing roadway grade. The roadway section will include 2-12 feet lanes and 8 feet rural shoulders (4 feet paved). The total project length is approximately 2,000 feet (0.38 miles) long.
110	1/11/2022	5177100870811724754	pjkd@cox.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Bass Road projects should be high on list. Traffic is horrible there and almost every time I use it, there is an accident somewhere along the way	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Bass Road is proposed to be improved from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road. The proposed improvements to a 1.1 mile-long section of roadway will widen the existing two lanes to a four-lane roadway with a 20 foot raised median, 5 foot shoulders on the south side, 10 foot shoulders on the north side and replacement of the existing Bass Road bridges over I-75 and Beaver Dam Creek. The Bass Road project is also listed in the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, project identification number 0017121. Work on the Bass Road project is anticipated to occur between 2020 – 2026.
111	1/11/2022	5177114824009077709		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Please repair hwy 247!!!!	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	There are several projects already underway to fix GA State Route 247 (GDOT PI #0014895 - Bridge at Roff Ave; GDOT PI #009861 - Replacement of 8 bridges from Pio Nono Ave/Broadway split, down to Houston Rd.). In addition, there are three new bridge repair projects (GDOT PI #0017221, 0017230 and 0017231 - Priority Value #9, #10 and #11, respectively) and a roundabout (GDOT PI #0015686) that are in the design/engineering and right of way acquisition phases. If commentor wishes to lobby for an idea or a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
112	1/11/2022	5177114824009077709		Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Repair the old bad roads like Hwy 247 in Macon Bibb and Houston County. It's destroying our vehicles.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	See response to Comment #104, above
113	1/11/2022	5177430345883375740	jessica.anne.plante@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	I would LOVE to ride my bike more often, but don't feel safe! More bike lanes & infrastructure please.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
114	1/11/2022	5177430345883375740	jessica.anne.plante@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Project #22 (Bike/Ped Vineville) most affects me and would be great to see! Bump up in priority!	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	There are no Bike/Ped projects planned for Vineville Avenue.
115	1/17/2022	5182440436012515424	makane24@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Bridges on 247 and 7th st truck route. Would also like a roundabout at 1st st and Oglethorpe.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	With respect to the bridges on GA State Route 247, see response in Comment #111, above. With respect to the 7th St. truck route project, see response in Comment #87, above. With respect to the proposed roundabout for 1st St. and Oglethorpe, if commentor wishes to lobby for an idea or a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
116	1/17/2022	5182440436012515424	makane24@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Bike lanes should be separated from car traffic, especially on higher speed roads.	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County adopted a Complete Streets policy in 2019 that seeks to incorporate the inclusion of protected, separated, or share use lanes. A full discussion of Complete Streets policy with respect to the MATS 2050 MTP can be found in Chapter 10 - Pedesrians and Bicyclists
117	1/18/2022	5183434563217527322	rshipman1@bellsouth.net	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Please consider adding a long-range project of: widening Highway 96 (from two lanes TO a four lane roadway with a grassy median) from Interstate 16 in Twiggs County TO Interstate 75 in Peach County. This expansion would significantly reduce tractor trailer traffic on MLK in downtown Macon.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	Unfortunately, MATS can't help with this request; Highway 96 is not within the MATS planning area jurisdiction. If commentor wishes to pursue this project further, we recommend they reach out to Warner Robins Area Transportation Study MPO (https://www.wrga.gov/295/Warner-Robins-Area-Transportation-Study-), or their County Commissioner/State Representative.
118	1/25/2022	5189392621314595720		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Most of these projects look very important. Bass Rd and Forest Hill Rd widening are certainly important and should be given priority. Especially with the Tucker Road bridge replacements, I think we should consider widening to 4 lanes at least from Peake to Thomaston. Glad to see the Sardis Church to I-16 extension. I wonder if the 7th Street truck route could have a direct connection to the Eisenhower Parkway extension. I wonder if extending Eisenhower to 16 or even Emery Hwy could be more effective and route trucks out of Downtown (particularly the 16/MLK and 16/2nd St interchanges) altogether. Especially if it follows the railroad tracks from Lower Poplar to I-16 and US 23, there shouldn't be much environmental concerns. With I-14 being part of the Infrastructure Bill, that should be part of our long-range plan too.	Specific Projects	Roads and Bridges	This comment touches on several different projects, at various stages of readiness. Each one will be taken in turn: Bass Rd.. - Bass Rd. Phase 1 is already underway (GDOT PI #0017121). This project is expected to be open to traffic in 2026. Phase 2 is out beyond GDOT's 5-year project timeline. Forest Hill Rd - Forest Hill Rd. Phase 1 (Northside to Wimbish) has already been completed. Forest Hill Rd. Phase 2 (Wimbish to Vineville Ave.; GDOT PI #0013676) is currently going through concept development and preliminary engineering (including environmental assessment). MATS staff is working with GDOT to get this on the construction schedule as soon as possible. All other projects described in this comment - These projects are in what GDOT considers their "Long Range" phase (i.e., still under engineering concept, with construction phases out beyond the 5 year project horizon). If Commentor wants to promote specific existing projects or suggest new projects they believe would be eligible for funding (particularly those that have a multi-modal and/or pedestrian emphasis), they can be amended into the MTP project list and the TIP, using the amendment process described in the MATS Public Participation Plan.
119	2/3/2022	5197464165416792311		Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	There are no current programs to improve pedestrian and bike safety while there is a big focus on widening roads/bridges which doesn't fix traffic issues in the long run.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians. Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities. Additionally, Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone.
120	2/6/2022	5199920645711846000	bobharg@yahoo.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Make sure the development of I-14 from Columbus to Augusta jeopardize the establishment of the Ocmulgee National Park & Preserve.	Additional Project Type	Roads and Bridges	MATS staff has been in contact with, and sought comments from, the U.S. National Park Service (NPS) specifically for the purpose of avoiding any conflict with NPS plans for the Ocmulgee Mounds. MATS staff has received no adverse comments.
121	3/9/2022	5226923659512901969	lizzey.riley@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	We are being short sighted if all we focus on is making it easier to drive our cars everywhere. The focus should be on less cars.	General Comment	None	The MTP document is required to reflect plans for all modes of transporation which may be eligible for Federal or State funding support. If commentor wishes to lobby for an idea or a specific project, they should reach out to their County Commissioner and/or MATS Citizen Advisory Committee representative to advocate for that project being included in the MATS TIP, amended into the MATS 2050 MTP, or both, as needed.
122	3/9/2022	5226923659512901969	lizzey.riley@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	It focuses too much on fixing and widening roads and not enough on alternative forms of transportation (bike, ebikes, walking, buses). It also does little to encourage carpooling.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped & Public Transportation	See response to Comment #121, above.

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
123	3/9/2022	5226923659512901969	lizzey.riley@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Bike lanes aren't the answer. Have you ridden a bike next to a car that is going 30 mph? Bike paths are. Create dedicated bike paths that take people from one point to another. How many people go down Vineville Ave. every day? What if a bike path could be created from Wesleyan to downtown? It may have to make use of sidewalks. It may require the addition of some cross walks. Could it make use of any RR land? (I don't know) Publicize bus riding. I don't even know where bus stops are and where the bus could take me. Is there an app that says when the bus would pick me up? Is there an app that allows me to pay? Are there places where I could park my car safely and take a bus downtown for the evening?	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County adopted a Complete Streets policy in 2019 that seeks to incorporate the inclusion of protected, separated, or share use lanes.
124	3/9/2022	5226947527149634234		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Make it safer to travel by bike	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians. Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities. Additionally, Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone.
125	3/9/2022	5226951267026628760	Riley31217@gmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Though my car is currently my primary mode of transportation, if pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in Macon and connecting surrounding communities to Macon was safer and more attractive to use, myself and many others would choose walking or cycling for local travel much more often.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	In 2015, Macon-Bibb County created the Pedestrian Safety Review Board to educate citizens about pedestrian safety, and to advocate for safer roads and improved infrastructure for pedestrians. Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that supports a comprehensive and connected transportation network that is designed, implemented, operated, and maintained in an equitable way to allow for safe use by people of all ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, abilities, and disabilities. Additionally, Bike Walk Macon is leading the movement to make bicycling and walking a safe and convenient option for transportation and recreation for everyone.
126	3/9/2022	5226951267026628760	Riley31217@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Dedicated efficient, attractive & safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure (particularly in East Macon and Jones County) is my top personal priority. Overall, I feel the current mid-century way we have for thinking of and planning transportation infrastructure is outdated, unsafe, unprofitable, and inefficient and needs to be refocused to a more human-scale and human-centric perspective. More focus also needs to be given to smaller scale rail based local transit to increase transportation options and community accessibility for Macon-Bibb residents of all ages, ability, and economic status while simultaneously helping to decongest roadway traffic and improve safety.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County adopted a complete streets policy that seeks to incorporate the inclusion of protected, separated, or share use lanes.
127	3/9/2022	5226951267026628760	Riley31217@gmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Local light rail/tram service network connecting the various dense community pockets around Macon-Bibb making travel to any part of Macon-Bibb from any part of Macon-Bibb easier and more accessible & efficient for residents, changes to the "design speed" of in-town streets with high pedestrian traffic and business to encourage automobile drivers to slow down (textured surfaces/brick, landscaping, etc.), de-coupling bicycle and automobile traffic, de-coupling personal vehicle and large commercial vehicle traffic, the rehabilitation and elimination of "stroads", elimination of "slip lanes" at intersections to increase pedestrian safety, increased use of roundabouts wherever feasible to improve traffic flow, raised pedestrian crossings at driveways/entrances to slow automobile traffic and increase pedestrian safety (the sidewalk serving as a de facto speed bump), pedestrian overpasses and tunnels with design consideration for handicapped individuals, design consideration in pedestrian infrastructure for blind individuals, the construction of "pedestrian plazas" in areas such as downtown Macon to encourage more foot traffic and increase local business, a more flexible and malleable zoning ordinance that allows for increased options in the types of buildings and infrastructure that can be built, complete separation of pedestrian traffic from high speed highway traffic with hard barriers (trees, light posts, railing, etc) to protect pedestrians from wayward high speed vehicles, use of materials by and communication with the group "Strong Towns" (a non-political organization that promotes and advocates for better urban and suburban design and utilization of limited land space), bicycle infrastructure networks separate from roadways that connect residential areas to local schools, construction of a cap over I-75 from Riverside Dr to Fountain Car Wash (and wherever else possible) to reconnect communities long divided by the construction of the Interstate, efforts to reduce noise pollution caused by automobiles, installation and proper maintenance of attractive landscaping on and around interstate on/off ramps	Additional Project Type	Safety	See response to Comment #76, above.
128	3/10/2022	5227358266021913375	tucsonsooner@hotmail.com	Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	The downtown Macon area and the Ocmulgee Heritage Trail are safe and great for bicyclists and pedestrians. We need to tie new pedestrian corridors such as Gray Highway and Vineville/Pio Nono to this so there is a cohesive network.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	The draft Ocmulgee Heritage Trail Master Plan 2.0 is currently exploring areas to connect the trails to neighborhoods outside of the downtown core.
129	3/10/2022	5227358266021913375	tucsonsooner@hotmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	For the Gray Hwy pedestrian/safety upgrades, the focus area needs to be extended south of Shurling Dr down to the Clinton Rd/2nd St Ext intersection. That area has numerous fast food restaurants and convenience stores that attract many pedestrians. There is no stoplight along the entire 0.6 miles between Clinton and Shurling with high speed multi-lane traffic with a center turn lane. I drive this corridor daily and see many pedestrians darting across one direction and then waiting in the center turn lane to dart across the other direction. It is a dangerous game of Frogger. Expecting someone to walk 1/4 mile or more to the nearest stoplight to cross is unreasonable, but having pedestrians darting across 45+mph 6 lane highways is potentially deadly. This needs to be addressed..	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	Gray Highway is a state designated roadway. Macon-Bibb County is aware of the high risk of pedestrian-vehicle incidences and will continue to work with the Georgia Department of Transportation and state lawmakers to improve Gray Highway.
130	3/10/2022	5227358266021913375	tucsonsooner@hotmail.com	Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Yes. Pedestrian crossing lights. Other cities have them on major roads, where there is a crosswalk not at an intersection where pedestrians can push a button to stop traffic and cross safely.	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb County has installed HAWK (High intensity Activated cross WalK) systems in a number of areas throughout Macon-Bibb (Ingleside Avenue, Eisenhower Parkway, Montpelier Avenue, College Street, and Ivey Drive.

Appendix D: MATS 2050 MTP Public Comments Summary, November 8, 2021 through March 17, 2022

Comment #	Date	Submission ID	Email	Question	Comment	Comment Type	Project Type	MATS Response
131	3/10/2022	5227706053124133765		Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Greenway for bikes and walking.	Additional Project Type	TE/Bike/Ped	Macon-Bibb has greenway/multiuse trails in places such as the Ocmulgee Mounds National Historic Parks, and the Ocmulgee Heritage Trail.
132	3/16/2022	5232894683486989702	tanya.sharon@gmail.com	Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	I've love to see the Bolingbroke Bike look funded. Macon is becoming an increasingly attractive setting for young adults; that would be another reason people might like Macon.	Specific Projects	TE/Bike/Ped	See response to Comment #76, above.
133	3/17/2022	5233377652708160270		Do you have any other thoughts on transportation to share	Biking and walking are not just for leisure. Residents living may bicycle or walk to work and need safe streets and bike lanes.	General Comment	TE/Bike/Ped	See response to Comment #43, above.

Appendix E:

Sign In and Public Comment Sheets for 2050 MTP Public Information Open Houses

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Public Information Open House

Rosa Jackson Community Center, 1211 Maynard Street, Macon, Georgia 31217

Monday, November 29, 2021, 5:30PM - 7:30PM

Name	County	Phone	Email	Join MATS E-Newsletter? Yes / No
1. Elizabeth Fabian	Bibb	478-301-2976	fabian_lj@mercer.edu	Yes
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

MATS: Macon Area Transportation Study

Visit www.maconmpo.com to complete the online survey for additional public input.

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Public Information Open House

South Bibb Recreation Center, 7035 Houston Road, Macon, Georgia 31216

Tuesday, November 30, 2021, 5:30PM - 7:30PM

Name	County	Phone	Email	Join MATS E-Newsletter? Yes / No
1. HENRY Black	Bibb		iblack30@yahoo.com	
2. EJ Walker	Bibb		EdWalkerjr@aol	
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

MATS: Macon Area Transportation Study

Visit www.maconmpo.com to complete the online survey for additional public input.

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Public Information Open House

Frank Johnson Recreation Center, 2227 Mercer University Drive, Macon, Georgia 31204

Wednesday, December 1, 2021, 5:30PM - 7:30PM

Name	County	Phone	Email	Join MATS E-Newsletter? Yes / No
1. James Ashley	US	4782138091	Jackalopehome@yahoo.com	Yes
2. Ken North	Jones	4787189268	knorth@mbps-inc	
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

MATS: Macon Area Transportation Study

Visit www.maconmpo.com to complete the online survey for additional public input.

Connect 2050 metropolitan Transportation plan update : Public Information open House

	Name	Email	Representing
1.	John Conn	john@connrealty.com	Conn Realty & Assoc. LLC
2.	Chris Weidner	weidnc-fam@Gmail.com	Jones County Board
3.	Sam Kitchens	Sam.Kitchens@jonescountyga.org	JC Board of Commissioners
4.	M JohnWood	John.Wood@Jonescountyga.org	JC Board of Commissioners
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

Thursday, December 2, 2021 : 5:30pm - 7:30pm

Jones County Government Center

Charlotte C. Wilson Conference Room

166 Industrial Boulevard

Gray, Georgia

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission l 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 l Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12/2/21

(Optional) Name: John Gowen

(Optional) Address: 494 Northminster Dr.

(Optional) City: Macon State: GA Zip: 31204

(Optional) Email: john@gowenrealty.com

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
✓ Yes _____ No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: _____

Comments: I think the Cross County Connector from I-16 across Hy 57 through Jones County over Hy 129 and terminating near Bass Pro should be reviewed and added back to futur MPTS considerations.

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Public Information Open House

Elaine H. Lucas Senior Center, 132 Willie Smokie Glover Drive, Macon, Georgia 3120

Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 2:00PM - 4:00PM

Name	County	Phone	Email	Join MATS E-Newsletter? Yes / No
1. Bob Hargrove	Bibb	478 250 3358	bobharg@yahoo.com	Yes
2. Carolyn Hargrove	Bibb	478 748 5172	hargrovecb@yahoo.com	No
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

MATS: Macon Area Transportation Study

Visit www.maconmpo.com to complete the online survey for additional public input.

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission I 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 I Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12/7/2021

(Optional) Name: Bob Hargrove

(Optional) Address: 1223 Adams St

(Optional) City: Macon State: GA Zip: 31201

(Optional) Email: bob hargrove @ yahoo. com.

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
____ Yes _____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: other

Comments: Vineville Ave from Pio Nono/Pierce to Kenmore Place

The sidewalk on the N.E side of Vineville Ave from Kenmore Place to Pio Nono/Pierce Ave is too narrow. In some places less than 4' wide. Near Pio Nono, north bound trucks have their right wheel in the sidewalk because there is no curb. The sidewalk is TOTALLY unsafe for pedistrians.

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission l 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 l Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12/7/2021

(Optional) Name: Bob Hargrove

(Optional) Address: 1223 Adams St

(Optional) City: Macon State: GA Zip: 31201-1568

(Optional) Email: bobharg@yahoo.com.

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
____ Yes _____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: #32 & 33

Comments:
When I-75 is repaired & resurfaced, please install sound barriers on both sides of I-75 from Forsyth south to at least Eisenhower Parkway.

Residents on both sides would appreciate. Also owners would be able to sell or rent properties adjacent to I-75

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission l 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 l Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12/7/2021

(Optional) Name: Bob Hargrove

(Optional) Address: 1223 Adams St

(Optional) City: Macon State: GA Zip: 31201

(Optional) Email: bobharg@yahoo.com

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
___ Yes ____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: #15

Comments:

I really like the proposal to put round abouts on 7th St. I'd recommend adding one at corner of 7th & Popular St also. The public works trucks & others would prefer it to a stoplight that there now.

I use the round abut at College & Oglethorpe regularly & find drivers are now accustomed to it. Let's replace ALL stoplights with round-abouts

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission I 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 I Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12/7/21

(Optional) Name: Carolyn Hargrove

(Optional) Address: _____

(Optional) City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

(Optional) Email: hargroveb@yahoo.com

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
____ Yes _____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: Const. GA RAIL TRAIL + #21 Red bike Lane improvement

Comments:

#49 YAE for Rails to Trails – DO more

#21 – dedicated bike Lanes on Vineville not "share the Lane."

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission I 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 I Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12-7-21

(Optional) Name: Carolyn Hargrove

(Optional) Address: _____

(Optional) City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

(Optional) Email: hargrovech@yahoo.com

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
____ Yes _____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: not currently on list but needs to be

Comments:

Pio Nono Ave needs side walks on both sides ALL the way from Pierce Ave to Houston/Bellevue TERMINUS. There's a lot of foot traffic & peds. have to walk in the bushes. It's not all about cars. macon pedestrians deserve better. Thank you

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission l 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 l Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12-7-~~22~~-2021

(Optional) Name: Carolyn Hargrove

(Optional) Address: _____

(Optional) City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

(Optional) Email: _____

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
____ Yes _____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: Safety improvement Gray Hwy + Emory Hwy

Comments: #18
#22 Very aggressive efforts needed to make Gray hwy SAFE for peds. to cross
Emory Hwy 1.- wide center pedestrian Refuge. island
2. - Keep crossing places well painted so drivers can see them

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission l 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 l Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12/7/21

(Optional) Name: CAROLYN HARGROVE

(Optional) Address: _____

(Optional) City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

(Optional) Email: hargrovech@yahoo.com

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
____ Yes _____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: Bolingbroke Bike Loop

Comments: we need
#40 A very aggressive effort to widen road for dedicated bike lane.
Share the lane with cars + bikes won't be adequate

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Public Information Open House

Bloomfield – Gilead Community Center, 1931 Rocky Creek Road, Macon, Georgia 31206

Wednesday, December 8, 2021, 2:00PM - 4:00PM

Name	County	Phone	Email	Join MATS E-Newsletter? Yes / No
1. Anthony Crawford		397-7512	acrawford@thesentencingcenterforchoicetheory.com	Yes
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

MATS: Macon Area Transportation Study

Visit www.maconmpo.com to complete the online survey for additional public input.

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Public Information Open House

Lake Tobesofkee (Sandy Beach Pavilion), 6680 Moseley Dixon Road, Lizella, Georgia 31052

Thursday, December 9, 2021, 5:30PM - 7:30PM

Name	County	Phone	Email	Join MATS E-Newsletter? Yes / No
1.				
2.				
3.	No	attendees		
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

MATS: Macon Area Transportation Study

Visit www.maconmpo.com to complete the online survey for additional public input.

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Public Information Open House

Macon Area GDOT Office (Auditorium), 4499 Riverside Drive, Macon, Georgia 31210

Monday, December 13, 2021, 2:00PM - 4:00PM

Name	County	Phone	Email	Join MATS E-Newsletter? Yes / No
1. Bob Komlo CAC #4	Bibb	478 7576592	yankees958@msn.com	On already
2. Forrest Edwards	Bibb		oldgoat1964@yahoo.com	yes
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

MATS: Macon Area Transportation Study

Visit www.maconmpo.com to complete the online survey for additional public input.

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission l 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 l Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: Dec 13 2021

(Optional) Name: Bobby Komlo CAC #4 Rep.

(Optional) Address: 9885 Plantation Pky

(Optional) City: Macon State: _____ Zip: 31220

(Optional) Email: Yankees958@msn.com

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?

____ Yes ____No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

On it already

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: _____

Comments: Peake Rd needs widened + a bike lane added from bridge over I-475 down to Tucker Rd (or at least to Stratford Acad. Many people walk or ride this road up to Exit 19 area, but this section of Peake Rd is not safe to walk or ride a bike.

Thank you for your participation!

Macon Area Transportation Study

CONNECT 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Comment Card

The MATS staff of the Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission appreciates your involvement/input/engagement with the update of the 2050 MATS Transportation Plan (MTP) update. If there are any recommendations regarding the *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list,* please utilize the space below to provide additional comments. Your input will be considered while developing the plan. Return comments in person or mail to: Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission l 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 l Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email to gbrown@mbpz.org by Monday, December 27, 2021. The *goals & objectives* and the *proposed project list* are located at https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Gregory L. Brown @ gbrown@mbpz.org. Input is also obtained through an online survey at www.maconmpo.com.

Date: 12-13-2021

(Optional) Name: Forrest Edwards

(Optional) Address: 4941 Kathryn Dr.

(Optional) City: Macon State: GA Zip: 31210

(Optional) Email: oldgoat1964@yahoo.com

Would you like to be added to MATS MPO E-Newsletter for public engagement purposes?
X Yes ____ No If yes, please provide email address in the space above.

I would like to make the following comment(s) regarding the following: Please write the project name and/or goal & object and use a separate sheet for each project: _____

Comments: Very Good Representation of the proposed Planned Work. Long term plans seem to address local needs. Continue to share plans & Progress with the Citizens of Macon-Bibb.

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix F:

Public Comments on the 2050 MTP Submitted Via E-mail to MATS Staff

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald
Cc: Ken North; Greg Brown
Subject: FW: Comments to MATS plan
Date: Friday, March 4, 2022 11:27:20 AM

Comments received on MATS 2050 MTP. I provided a response to this comment. Not sure if any additional response is needed.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz
Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

-----Original Message-----
From: Greg Brown
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2022 4:22 PM
To: Shannon Fickling <shannon@shannonficklingarchitect.com>
Subject: RE: Comments to MATS plan

Okay great and thanks. When the representative is identified, please share their name and email address so that we can include them for meeting notifications.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463 MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz
Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

-----Original Message-----
From: Shannon Fickling <shannon@shannonficklingarchitect.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2022 4:19 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: Re: Comments to MATS plan

Thanks Greg,
I will try to line up a representative from the neighborhood pedestrian safety committee to get to those meetings.
Shannon

> On Feb 17, 2022, at 2:06 PM, Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org> wrote:
>
> Hello Shannon,
>
> I hope all is well. In terms of pedestrian safety activity, a representative from the Vineville Neighborhood can attend the Pedestrian Safety Review Board meeting on the Third Tuesday of each month at 10:00am at City Hall (Commissioners Board Meeting room). Starting with this board will be a good start.
>
> I've participated in a walking audit of Vineville Avenue with Caitlin Mee and a few others back in October 2021,

regarding the same concerns.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Gregory L. Brown
> assistant planning director
>
> Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission Terminal Station | 200 Cherry
> Street, Suite 300 Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463 MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz
> Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Shannon Fickling <shannon@shannonficklingarchitect.com>
> Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 5:31 PM
> To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
> Cc: Laurie Fickling <lauriefickling@gmail.com>
> Subject: Comments to MATS plan
>
> Hi Greg,
> Our Vineville Neighborhood Association has been working on a plan for pedestrian safety improvements along Vineville Avenue. How can we be more involved in the planning process? In light of the recent pedestrian death at the intersection of Holt and Vineville this past year we think more attention should be given to Vineville.
> Will there be regularly scheduled meetings we could attend?
> Will there be opportunities for us to present our ideas?
> Thanks for your help with understanding the process and how we can be involved.
> Shannon Fickling

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald
Cc: Ken North; Greg Brown
Subject: FW: MATS Transportation Connection Newsletter
Date: Friday, March 4, 2022 11:28:10 AM

Comment received on MATS 2050 MTP.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: joseph ralph clark <jrclark08@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 3:52 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: Re: MATS Transportation Connection Newsletter

What happen to the " Northwest Packway " thru Log Cabin Dr., thru " Eminent Domain " and Park St., across Vineville Ave., and Forest Hill Road in '06 ??
I live at 137 Parkwood Ave., here in Macon, Ga., and the DOT have miss That Idea Up ...!!
Bass Road is a 2 - lane road all the way from Zebulon Road to Hwy. 87 ....! It's a Big Mesh ....!!
Ralph Clark

jrclark08

On Tuesday, February 15, 2022, 03:25:27 PM EST, Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) <gbrown@mbpz.org> wrote:

MATS Transportation Connection Newsletter

(Covering transportation improvement projects in Macon - Bibb County and the southern portions of Jones & Monroe Counties)

February 2022

View this email in your browser

MATS Transportation Connection Newsletter is a public outreach tool designed to keep the public engaged and aware of transportation improvement projects within the MATS area.

Public Comment Period Opening for Future Transportation Plans for the MATS (Macon Area Transportation Study) Area

The MATS staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is opening the public comment period for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP) and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report Update. These plans are consistent with the existing MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, and therefore do not require additional adjustments to, or re-adoption of, that document. Links to the draft plans are available on the MATS website (www.MaconMPO.com) for public review & comment from February 15 through March 17, 2022.

The *2050 MTP* includes approximately a billion dollars of transportation projects over the next 30 years and public input is vitally important to help set priorities. This plan guides future transportation improvements in Macon-Bibb County & a portion of Jones and Monroe Counties and includes *new roadways, new pedestrian and bike facilities, new transit opportunities, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure*. The MTP is updated every four years and its impact can be seen around the Macon area in road projects that are currently underway like the Bass Rd. widening, and planned projects like the I-75/I-16 interchange expansion, new roundabouts, and new bridges over rail lines and waterways. The MTP also feeds into the Macon-Bibb and Jones County *Comprehensive Plans,* which are state mandated plans required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. The Comprehensive Plan is a 20-Year plan which, in addition to transportation, outlines the vision of a community in areas of community development, land use, recreation, and housing which is updated every 10 years.

The update of both the 2050 MTP and the Comprehensive Plan process relies heavily on input from the public. In November and early December 2021, MATS staff conducted public listening sessions at various locations in Macon-Bibb & Jones Counties. The 2050 MTP incorporates the results of those listening sessions. Your opinions helped shape the future of Macon – Bibb County; determine the character, scale and quality of development and redevelopment of our area; formulate the goals and objectives of our future transportation systems; prioritize a list of currently proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area. Your involvement will impact planning policies for Macon – Bibb County and together we will create a blueprint for the future of our community.

Everyone is encouraged to share ideas and provide comments on the 2050 MTP draft. For more information regarding MATS, the MTP process, the list of current transportation projects in the area, and a summary of the listening sessions completed in November/December 2021, please visit our website regularly for any changes / updates at www.maconmpo.com. Submit comments to Gregory L. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, 200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email at gbrown@mbpz.org.





Copyright © 2022 MATS (Macon Area Transportation Study)
MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization, All rights reserved).

Our mailing address is:
Macon Terminal Station (3rd Floor)
200 Cherry Street, Suite 300, Macon, Georgia 31201
Website: www.maconmpo.com

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list

This email was sent to jrclark08@att.net
why did I get this? unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences
Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission · Macon Terminal Station · 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 · Macon, Georgia 31201 · USA

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald
Cc: Ken North; Greg Brown
Subject: FW: Gondola project
Date: Friday, March 4, 2022 11:31:06 AM

Comment received on MATS 2050 MTP. I provided a response, but additional response may be needed.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz
Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: Re: Gondola project

Thanks a lot. I should be part of the 2050 plan, I think.

Bob

> On Feb 16, 2022, at 8:28 AM, Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org> wrote:
>
> Good morning. Okay thanks. Yes, I remember reading about that proposed project. The name escaped me.
>
> I'll reach out to see if I can get more clarity about the Gondola project.
>
> Thanks,
>
>
> Gregory L. Brown
> assistant planning director
>
> Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission Terminal Station | 200 Cherry
> Street, Suite 300 Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463 MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz
> Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
> Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 6:31 PM
> To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
> Subject: Re: Gondola project
>
> What was in the paper is that it's a solar Pilates system going from downtown, pass Navicent, pass Mercer to the Macon Mall. It will run continuously also.
>
> No small footprint. Better call the Mayor's office for more info.
>

> Thanks, Bob
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Feb 15, 2022, at 16:01, Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org> wrote:
>>
>> Hello Mr. Hargrove,
>>
>> I hope all is well. I'm not familiar with the Gondola project. Do you know where it can be located?
>>
>>
>>
>> Gregory L. Brown
>> assistant planning director
>>
>> Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission Terminal Station | 200 Cherry
>> Street, Suite 300 Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463 MBPZ.org |
>> @mcnbibbpz
>> Note: Please update my work contact number from 478.751.7463 to the
>> new number 478.338.9463
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
>> Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 4:00 PM
>> To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
>> Subject: Gondola project
>>
>> Mr Brown,
>>
>> Is the Mayor & Council Gondola project going to be inserted in the 2050 plan?
>>
>> Will the CAC be able to review it?
>>
>> Thanks,
>>
>> Bob Hargrove
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>

From: Jotform
To: Greg Brown; Michael Greenwald; Ken North; James Thomas
Subject: Re: 2022 Year of the Plan | Transportation
Date: Monday, January 17, 2022 10:54:10 AM

2022 Year of the Plan | Transportation

	1: Bicycle & Walking 2: Better Traffic Flow 3: Road Maintenance 4: Public Transportation 5: Travel Safety 6: Add & Widen Roads 7: Technologically Smarter Roads
	8
Implement programs to promote ride sharing & carpooling	7
Improve air quality through fees & regulations	5
Fix roads & bridges faster	5
Add more sidewalks & bike lanes	9
Add bus routes, extend service hours & days	7
Are there other items that you think we should add to the list?	Bike lanes should be separated from car traffic, especially on higher speed roads.
Your thoughts regarding the MATS Project List	Bridges on 247 and 7th st truck route. Would also like a roundabout at 1st st and Oglethorpe.
What is your home zip code?	31201
What is your age?	35 to 59 years old

	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Personal	X			

vehicle			
Ridesharing apps like Groome, Uber or Lyft		X	
Public transportation (bus, para-transit)			X
Bicycle			X
Walking		X	

If makane24@gmail.com

You can edit this submission and view all your submissions easily.

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald
Cc: Ken North; Greg Brown
Subject: FW: MATS -Question & Comment
Date: Friday, March 4, 2022 11:29:36 AM

Comment received on MATS 2050 MTP.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: Adah Roberts <adahrob2@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2022 12:38 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Cc: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
Subject: MATS -Question & Comment

Mr. Brown,
I would like to know exactly how you are advertising the proposed plan for the next thirty years to the citizens at large? I think more people do not comment, because they are not aware of the upcoming changes. How does it get disseminated to the general public? Can more be done to make sure it reaches every community? How can civic organizations be of help?

Would an overhead cross-walk be possible for Gray highway? I am concerned about the number of incidents and want to see more done to ensure the safety of pedestrians.

Thank you for your consideration,
Sent from Mail for Windows

From:	Greg Brown
To:	Michael Greenwald
Cc:	Ken North; Greg Brown
Subject:	FW: Comments on MTP
Date:	Friday, March 4, 2022 11:25:15 AM

Comment Received on MATS 2050 MTP.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: Hetty Jardine <hetty.jardine@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2022 12:12 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: Comments on MTP

Hello Mr. Brown,I have some concerns about the proposed master plan.

Gray Highway is indeed a grave concern here in Macon. Far too many pedestrians are struck each year. We need to install speed deterrents - lower the speed limit, install more stop lights, crosswalks, etc.
Perhaps even an "island" could be built in the middle of the highway from downtown to Sherling Drive; this would create a safe haven for walkers.
Curbed, painted, raised, minimum of 6 feet wide.

I-14 is that going to be the Fall Line Freeway?? How is this possible while avoiding the Native American historic home lands - i.e., Ocmulgee Park and Preserve.. Also, if it has streets and current highways included, how can it be an "interstate'?

The bicycle initiatives lack specifics, such as commuter lanes on thoroughfares. There are currently many people who cycle both for exercise and as a mode of transportation. They are not frivolous riders - and their safety needs to be better protected. What are the exact proposals? The same logic applies to pedestrians. In the downtown area or neighboring, we need better protections for folks who are working for transportation, not just leisure.

Macon needs more sde walks. When streets are r-paved they just pile on the asphalt and eventually the curbs disappear...

AND, last but not least, such street planning should also have some green space between sidewalk and street for safety (and of course, beauty and some semblance of fresh air...). Do we need to say global warming mitigation??!

Thanks in advance for your attention to my comments AND for seeking public input.
Harriet Jardine, pedestrian

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc: Greg Brown
Subject: FW: 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan - Comments
Date: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 12:05:38 PM

Additional comment received 3/8/22

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: C M Kirk <claudiakirkwood@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 12:03 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan - Comments

Gregory L. Brown, Asst. Planning Director, Macon Area Transportation Study

Good afternoon, Mr. Brown,

In response to the MATS invitation for public comments on the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, I offer the following:

I live on Gray Highway. The rate of accidents and deaths on this road, for victims on foot and in vehicles, is unthinkable. Frequently the vehicles at risk are wheelchairs!! Some of our residents have no other way to get around; surely we can do better for their safety. And of course there are many brave bicyclers; where is the bike lane?

Indeed, well-planned and well-marked bike lanes throughout the catchment area are needed. Many of our residents commute regularly by bicycle!

Many others commute regularly on foot to work or school. Major sidewalk renovations are needed, to provide curbed walking areas safe from vehicle traffic. Surely the final plan will better address this enormous issue?

Since I travel Gray Highway routinely, I would not enjoy more traffic lights – but would appreciate fewer deaths. So I am hoping the Plan will provide for

lights and crosswalks at strategic places. **I am very grateful that the existing traffic lights are apparently being synced** to allow much smoother travel at an appropriate rate of speed! I assume that synchronization (complex though it is) would include any new lights.

And **please**, an island down the middle of the road to provide safe haven for pedestrians! A raised island with curbs and wheelchair access, from Riverside and Spring to the light at the Walmart shopping area.

I live a few yards from that latter intersection. Visibility for a left turn there, heading out from town, is about zero if there is a vehicle turning left into that shopping area. There often appears to be no oncoming traffic (and thus a safe left turn) when in fact a vehicle coming toward town is rocketing in for a collision. I learned that the hard way when I first moved here, while being – I thought – entirely cautious! Keeping the left-turn arrow operational from early morning until after dark – rather than only occasionally – would increase safety at that intersection enormously!

I cannot discern how I-14 (the Fall Line Freeway?) is to be routed so that it does not run afoul of Native American sacred lands and the proposed Ocmulgee National Park and Preserve or try to merge onto existing surface roads. May this please receive the most careful attention!

And of course, all over Macon are the ever-present potholes ready to cause vehicle damage if we hit them, or accidents if we swerve suddenly since we could not see them for the cars just ahead of us.

Thank you, Mr. Brown and All, for your arduous work on this monumental task! May your finished product be wise and workable, and showcase Macon as a place where people want to live, visit, and do business – and are safe in doing so.

In gratitude,

Claudia Kirkwood
1420 Gray Hwy., #101
Macon 31211
478.714.2392

From:	Greg Brown
To:	Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc:	Greg Brown
Subject:	FW: 2050 MPO public comment
Date:	Wednesday, March 9, 2022 11:22:59 AM

Comment received on draft 2050 MTP Update.

From: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 11:05 AM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: 2050 MPO public comment

Mr, Brown,

I have read the 2050 MPO in detail & have a comment to make on its contents.

The news has reported the high rate of pedestrian accidents occurring along Gray Highway in East Macon. Its design is causing the accidents and many deaths. It is over six lanes wide in most places. There are no crosswalks except in a very few places and even they are difficult to navigate. The traffic travels at high rate of speed. The speed limit is 45 MPH, but most cars travel in excess of 50 MPH.

I think this highway needs to be physically modified to provide safer crossing. There should be several stoplights & crosswalks installed. There needs to be an "island" built in the middle of the highway from downtown to at least Shurling Drive, as a safe refuge for walkers. This island should be a minimum of six feet wide, raised, curbed, & painted.

I would also recommend a lower speed limit and increased enforcement of the speed limit. I regularly get passed on Gray highway while traveling 5 MPH over the posted speed limit.

The 2050 MPO should emphasize safer streets and roads.

Thank you,

Robert Hargrove
1223 Adams Street
Macon, GA 31201

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc: Greg Brown
Subject: FW: 20050 MPO Comment
Date: Thursday, March 10, 2022 1:36:32 PM

Please see additional comments.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 10:53 AM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: 20050 MPO Comment

Mr. Brown,

I am really concerned about the lack of detail in the 2050 MPO concerning the plan to create an interstate highway from Dallas, Texas to Augusta, GA, which is said to go THROUGH Macon. This sounds like the Fall Line freeway to me, which exists in west Georgia. It has been designed as I-14. I-14 is mentioned in the 2050 MTP. It says it will follow various street & state highways. It sure doesn't read like an interstate highway to me. Furthermore, there are no specifics as to how it will cross Bibb County avoiding the native American historic lands which is our proposed Ocmulgee National Park & Preserve, which is in its final stages of development & approval.
This proposed new interstate highway MUST AVOID the Native American lands in Bibb County and the Ocmulgee River basin to the south towards Hawkinsville.
I would recommend it connect with I-475 on the west and continue northeast crossing I-75 in Bolingbroke and continue east from there into Jones County. Going north of Macon would be the best route for this proposed highway.
The 2050 MPO plan must contain details for this proposed major highway system.
Thank you for receiving my comment.
Robert Hargrove
1223 Adams Street
Macon, GA 31021

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc: Greg Brown
Subject: FW: Macon Area Transportation Study Comments
Date: Friday, March 11, 2022 4:57:28 PM

Another comment.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: Info@_Shared <info@mbpz.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 12:45 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>; Ken North <knorth@mbpz.org>; Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Cc: Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; John Langstaff <jlangstaff@mbpz.org>; Randi Doveton <rdoveton@mbpz.org>
Subject: Fw: Macon Area Transportation Study Comments

Planning Dept. see below

From: Grimm, Julie <JGrimm@maconbibb.us>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 3:55 PM
To: Info@_Shared <info@mbpz.org>
Subject: Macon Area Transportation Study Comments

[CAUTION] This email originated from inside Macon-Bibb County Government. Do NOT click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing to comment on the MATS public opinion as I've not been able to attend a meeting. What I'd like to see as a fairly new transplant is safer or more crosswalks and sidewalks as most of Macon does not embrace walking nor biking. It seems the speed, wreak less driving, and general safety curbs people from just walking or biking from A to B. I'd suggest patrolling to add to the safety, submit tickets to speeders and take a portion of the fees to give officers a bonus while placing another portion into developing safe areas to walk and bike. With gas prices going through the roof, I'd really like to see Amtrak come back to connect Atlanta to Savannah. Mercer could directly connect its campuses while allowing Maconites a more convenient way to travel to Atlanta

airport, aquarium, football game or spend a day in Savannah's riverwalk. More people are moving out of Atlanta and it would be a great way to travel to work without gridlock. Macon could reemerge as the popular hub again.

Julie Grimm
Bibb County Superior Court Clerk's Office
Real Estate Clerk
601 Mulberry Street, Suite 216
Post Office Box 1015
Macon, Georgia 31202

478-621-6527 Office Ext 4828
478-309-2627 Direct
478-621-6033 Fax

You can now E-File Plats and Liens in Bibb County Superior Court Clerk's Office with https://efile.gsccca.org, as well as your civil cases and pleadings with www.eFileGA.com!! Save time with efiling!

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc: Greg Brown
Subject: FW: 2050 MPO Public Comment
Date: Friday, March 11, 2022 1:16:01 PM

Another comment received from Mr. Hargrove. A similar comment was made earlier and I attempted to address it. We can look at this comment and compare it to the other comment we received previously.

Thanks,

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz
Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 11:04 AM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: 2050 MPO Public Comment

Mr. Brown,

Recently, it has been reported in the Macon Telegraph and on the Macon-Bibb website that Mayor Lester Miller has proposed to build a solar-powered gondola from somewhere downtown to the new Macon Mall amphitheater. He says it will connect downtown, Navicent Medical Center, Mercer University and the Mall and possibly run 24 hrs a day.

Its route has not been described, but a proposed route should be included in the 2050 MPO report. It has to follow or cross one or more state or federal highways.

I would hope it would follow Second Street to the Richard Perry Parkway & then Mercer University Blvd to the Mall area.

Please contact the Mayor's office and get their plans into yours, please.

Thank you,

Robert Hargrove
1223 Adams Street
Macon, GA 31201

From:	Greg Brown
To:	Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc:	Greg Brown
Subject:	Fw: 2050 MPO Public comment
Date:	Monday, March 14, 2022 9:09:03 AM

Another Comment received.

Gregory L. Brown
senior planner

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | **@mcnbibbpz**

Note: Please update my work contact number from 478.751.7463 to the new number 478.338.9463

From: Bob Hargrove <bobharg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 12, 2022 8:55 AM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: 2050 MPO Public comment

Mr. Brown,

The 2050 MPO plan contains some bicycle initiatives but no specifics, like commuter lanes on major thoroughfares, for example. It assumes all bicyclists are recreational riders, only. Where I live, I see many folks riding into downtown Macon every day commuting to work or shopping.
Thank you,

Robert J. Hargrove
1223 Adams Street
Macon, GA 31201

From: Greg Brown
To: Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc: Greg Brown
Subject: FW: Draft 2050 MTP comments
Date: Monday, March 14, 2022 2:34:15 PM

Additional Comment.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: Christopher N. Lawrence <c.n.lawrence@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 2:00 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: Draft 2050 MTP comments

Dear Mr. Brown - I am writing to comment on the draft 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the Macon urbanized area. My primary concern is that the 2050 MTP does not appear to incorporate developments from the latest surface transportation reauthorization bill, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (aka the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill), which was passed by Congress and signed into law in November 2021.

In particular, the IIJA includes a congressional designation for the Interstate 14 corridor (as discussed on MTP draft pages 216 and 217) that appears to indicate that the route should follow the Fall Line Freeway corridor; I am uncertain whether this language would preclude a more direct route along SR 49 between Macon and Milledgeville rather than one following the SR 57/SR 540 corridor via Gordon. Consideration should also be given to the (lack of) feasibility of connecting a route following SR 49 to Interstate 16 or 75; the presence of the Ocmulgee National Historical Park and the level of development between the boundaries of the park and downtown Macon would seem to preclude any direct routing of an interstate-standard route through this area and necessitates a more easterly route to provide a logical connection, especially given that the plans for a new-build Fall Line Freeway segment through East Macon had to be cancelled for similar reasons.

I would also suggest that consideration be given to pursuing the Sardis Church/Sgoda Road extension as part of the I-14 proposal, as it would provide for an additional high capacity crossing of the Ocmulgee River between I-16 and SR 96, and logically could be connected to the Fall Line Freeway corridor in the Byron area. Regardless, the I-14 designation would seem to require more thorough

study to identify how the route should traverse the Macon and Warner Robins areas, and such a study probably should be provided for in the MTP and future TIPs.

My other concern is the low level of service for the I-75/I-475 interchange near Hartley Bridge Road. In particular, there seem to be operational issues with the southbound merge between the two interstates, likely due to the upward grade from the Tobesofkee Creek to the Hartley Bridge overpass. It would be helpful to investigate if there are relatively low-cost options to resolve this problem, such as better signage and enforcement of the truck lane restrictions—a large number of trucks appear to try to merge into the leftmost lane on I-475, which eventually becomes the rightmost lane of I-75 south of Sardis Church Road, even though they have several miles to merge left, and are unable to maintain speed due to the upward grade. Another option may be to shift the actual merge point south of the Hartley Bridge overpass, which may be achievable at relatively low cost as this area of I-75 already has pavement for 6 southbound lanes while only 5 are in use (the extra shoulder space is currently often used by trucks for illegal non-emergency stopping or parking); there would be space for a concrete barrier to be added to limit merging with some restriping of the existing lanes, and coupled with the lane restriction noted above it could substantially improve operations.

Thank you for your attention to my comments and I look forward to seeing the final 2050 MTP in the coming months.

Best regards,

Christopher N. Lawrence

From:	Greg Brown
To:	Michael Greenwald; Ken North
Cc:	Greg Brown
Subject:	FW: Macon Area Transportation Study 2050
Date:	Thursday, March 10, 2022 1:41:45 PM

Additional Comment.

Gregory L. Brown
assistant planning director

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9463
MBPZ.org | @mcnbibbpz

Subscribe to MATS eNewsletter: http://eepurl.com/gUEtcb

From: Patricia Walker <patriciaeasonwalker@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 4:59 PM
To: Greg Brown <gbrown@mbpz.org>
Subject: Macon Area Transportation Study 2050

Please recognize and remedy those transportation issues which contribute to the disproportionate number of fatalities we have had in Macon. Many of these involve low-income people who have to walk to access essential services and do not have other highways, streets, or roads to access these critical services.

Many are in the neighborhood of residential motels used for long-term living. Of particular note is the pedestrian access on Gray Highway, Emery Highway, Pio Nono Avenue, Broadway, and Eisenhower Hwy. We need better lighting, safe crosswalks, pedestrian islands, alternate traffic routing, and better speed regulation.

There is much development in Macon right now, particularly apartments and other housing developments, and this development does not appear to consider pedestrian movement. Many people do not have transportation. Any plan developed should consider mass transportation and how to stress that for all economic levels. The safety of pedestrian access should be considered in all approved new developments.

Thankyou.

Patricia E. Walker

(478) 747-5578

Appendix G:

Public Notices for MATS Public Open Houses and Opportunities to Comment on MATS 2050 MTP

PRESS RELEASE

Connect 2050

2022 | THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

For Immediate Release
For more information contact:
Gregory L. Brown, Senior Planner
gbrown@mbpz.org
478-751-7460

November 24, 2021

MATS to Hold Public Information Open House meetings on 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is seeking public input during the update of the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) that will include over half a billion dollars of transportation projects.

The study will assess the existing transportation network, gather community feedback, update goals, objectives, & transportation priorities for Macon-Bibb County and parts of Jones & Monroe Counties.

The update will produce a report that includes a prioritized, cost-constrained list of projects that will be implemented over the next 25 to 30 years.

The **Connect 2050 Plan** guides future transportation improvements in the area, including transit opportunities, pedestrian & bike facilities, bridge replacement, safety & operational, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure.

The update of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan process relies heavily on public participation and input. This is your opportunity to voice your opinions to help formulate the goals & objectives of our future transportation systems; help prioritize a list of proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area.

Public Information Open House Schedule

11/29 Monday, November 29, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Rosa Jackson Community Center
1211 Maynard Street

11/30 Tuesday, November 30, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
South Bibb Recreation Center
7035 Houston Road

12/01 Wednesday, December 1, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Frank Johnson Community Center
2227 Mercer University Drive

12/02 Thursday, December 2, 2021 | 5:30pm – 7:30pm
Jones County Government Center
Charlotte C. Wilson Conference Room
166 Industrial Boulevard, Gray

12/06 Monday, December 6, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Theron Ussery Recreation Center
815 N. Macon Park Drive

12/07 Tuesday, December 7, 2021 | 2:00pm - 4:00pm
Elaine H. Lucas Senior Center
132 Willie Smokie Glover Drive

12/08 Wednesday, December 8, 2021 | 2:00pm - 4:00pm
Bloomfield - Gilead Community Center
1931 Rocky Creek Road

12/09 Thursday, December 9, 2021 | 5:30pm - 7:30pm
Lake Tobesofkee (Sandy Beach Pavilion)
6680 Moseley Dixon Road

12/13 Monday, December 13, 2021 | 2:00pm - 4:00pm
Macon Area GDOT Office (Auditorium)
4499 Riverside Drive

MACON-BIBB COUNTY Planning & Zoning

Macon Area Transportation Study Survey

CHAMBER NEWS, MEMBER NEWS

Macon-Bibb Planning Commission's & Macon Area Transportation Study's *Year of the Plan* needs your input & feedback in the 2022 – 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

This transportation plan sets the vision, and establishes goals & strategies needed for well planned transportation growth in our area for the next 25 years.

Your answers to the following survey questions influence planning decisions for the Macon-Bibb/Middle Georgia Area.

Tags In

ACCELERATE SURVEY TRANSPORTATION

SHARE

← 90 / 107 →

Recent Posts

Macon-Bibb International Summit



Connect 2050



2022 | THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

Public Comment Period Opening for Future Transportation Plans for the MATS (Macon Area Transportation Study) Area

The MATS staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is opening the public comment period for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP). The draft plan will be available on the MATS website (www.maconmpo.com) for public review and comment from February 15 through March 17, 2022.

The *2050 MTP* includes approximately a billion dollars of transportation projects over the next 30 years and public input is vitally important to help set priorities. This plan guides future transportation improvements in Macon-Bibb County and a portion of Jones and Monroe Counties and includes *new roadways, new pedestrian and bike facilities, new transit opportunities, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure.* The MTP is updated every four years and its impact can be seen around the Macon area in road projects that are currently underway like the Bass Rd. widening, and planned projects like the I-75/I-16 interchange expansion, new roundabouts, and new bridges over rail lines and waterways. The MTP also feeds into the Macon-Bibb and Jones County *Comprehensive Plans,* which are state mandated plans required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. The Comprehensive Plan is a 20-Year plan which, in addition to transportation, outlines the vision of a community in areas of community development, land use, recreation, and housing which is updated every 10 years.

The update of both the 2050 MTP and the Comprehensive Plan process relies heavily on input from the public. In November and early December 2021, MATS staff conducted public listening sessions at various locations in Macon-Bibb and Jones Counties. The 2050 MTP incorporates the results of those listening sessions. Your opinions helped shape the future of Macon – Bibb County; determine the character, scale and quality of development and redevelopment of our area; formulate the goals and objectives of our future transportation systems; prioritize a list of currently proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area. Your involvement will impact planning policies for Macon – Bibb County and together we will create a blueprint for the future of our community.

Everyone is encouraged to share ideas and provide comments on the 2050 MTP draft. For more information regarding MATS, the MTP process, the list of current transportation projects in the area, and a summary of the listening sessions completed in November/December 2021, please visit our website regularly for any changes / updates at www.maconmpo.com. Submit comments to Gregory L. Brown, Asst. Planning Director, 200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email at gbrown@mbpz.org.

GRATIS
FEBRERO 2022

Beautiful Smiles
ental Care Center
Se Habla Español
Dr. DENISE P. NOEL
Dr. WALDO E. BLANCHET, JR.
478-953-6554

¡QP! ASA
EL PERIÓDICO INFORMATIVO

El informe estara disponible en linea desde el 15 de febrero hasta el 17 de marzo

P&Z

MATS
Macon Area Transportation Study

Connect 2050

2022 | THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

El personal del Estudio de Transporte del Área de Macon (MATS) de la Comisión de Planificación y Zonificación del Condado de Macon-Bibb busca la opinión del público durante la actualización del Plan de Transporte Metropolitano (MTP) de 2050 que incluirá más de 500 millones de dólares en proyectos de transporte.

El proceso de actualización del Plan de Transporte Metropolitano depende en gran medida de la participación y los aportes del público. Esta es su oportunidad de expresar sus opiniones para ayudar a formular las metas y objetivos de nuestros futuros sistemas de transporte; ayudar a priorizar una lista de proyectos de transporte propuestos; y proponer proyectos de transporte que le gustaría ver en el área de estudio MATS.

Participe Connect 2050 *en la encuesta o visite www.maconmpo.com*

in the win over

KING
Pre-Order
NOW!
303-776-4923
Call to find your nearest pick-up location.
ad Fisheries

Connect 2050

2022 | THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

Public Comment Period Opening for Future Transportation Plans for the MATS (Macon Area Transportation Study) Area

The MATS staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is opening the public comment period for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP). The draft plan will be available on the MATS website (www.maconmpo.com) for public review and comment from February 15 through March 17, 2022.

The 2050 MTP includes approximately a billion dollars of transportation projects over the next 30 years and public input is vitally important to help set priorities. This plan guides future transportation improvements in Macon-Bibb County and a portion of Jones and Monroe Counties and includes new roadways, new pedestrian and bike facilities, new transit opportunities, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure. The MTP is updated every four years and its impact can be seen around the Macon area in road projects that are currently underway like the Bass Rd. widening, and planned projects like the I-75/I-16 interchange expansion, new roundabouts, and new bridges over rail lines and waterways. The MTP also feeds into the Macon-Bibb and Jones County Comprehensive Plans, which are state mandated plans required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. The Comprehensive Plan is a 20-Year plan which, in addition to transportation, outlines the vision of a community in areas of community development, land use, recreation, and housing which is updated every 10 years.

The update of both the 2050 MTP and the Comprehensive Plan process relies heavily on input from the public. In November and early December 2021, MATS staff conducted public listening sessions at various locations in Macon-Bibb and Jones Counties. The 2050 MTP incorporates the results of those listening sessions. Your opinions helped shape the future of Macon - Bibb County; determine the character, scale and quality of development and redevelopment of our area; formulate the goals and objectives of our future transportation systems; prioritize a list of currently proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area. Your involvement will impact planning policies for Macon - Bibb County and together we will create a blueprint for the future of our community.

Everyone is encouraged to share ideas and provide comments on the 2050 MTP draft. For more information regarding MATS, the MTP process, the list of current transportation projects in the area, and a summary of the listening sessions completed in November/December 2021, please visit our website regularly for any changes / updates at www.maconmpo.com. Submit comments to Gregory L. Brown, Asst. Planning Director, 200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email at gbrown@mbpz.org.

Legals

Connect 2050
2022 THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

NOTICE

Public Comment Period Opening for Future Transportation Plans for the MATS (Macon Area Transportation Study) Area

The MATS staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is opening the public comment period for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP) and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report Update. These plans are consistent with the existing MATS FY 2021 - 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, and therefore do not require additional adjustments to, or re-adoption of, that document. The draft plans will be available on the MATS website (www.MaconMPO.com) for public review & comment from February 15 through March 17, 2022.

The 2050 MTP includes approximately a billion dollars of transportation projects over the next 30 years and public input is vitally important to help set priorities. This plan guides future transportation improvements in Macon-Bibb County & a portion of Jones and Monroe Counties and includes new roadways, new pedestrian and bike facilities, new transit opportunities, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure. The MTP is updated every four years and its impact can be seen around the Macon area in road projects that are currently underway like the Bass Rd. widening, and planned projects like the I-75/I-16 interchange expansion, new roundabouts, and new bridges over rail lines and waterways. The MTP also feeds into the Macon-Bibb and Jones County Comprehensive Plans, which are state mandated plans required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. The Comprehensive Plan is a 20- Year plan which, in addition to transportation, outlines the vision of a community in areas of community development, land use, recreation, and housing which is updated every 10 years.

The update of both the 2050 MTP and the Comprehensive Plan process relies heavily on input from the public. In November and early December 2021, MATS staff conducted public listening sessions at various locations in Macon-Bibb & Jones Counties. The 2050 MTP incorporates the results of those listening sessions. Your opinions helped shape the future of Macon – Bibb County; determine the character, scale and quality of development and redevelopment of our area; formulate the goals and objectives of our future transportation systems; prioritize a list of currently proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area. Your involvement will impact planning policies for Macon – Bibb County and together we will create a blueprint for the future of our community.

Everyone is encouraged to share ideas and provide comments on the 2050 MTP draft. For more information regarding MATS, the MTP process, the list of current transportation projects in the area, and a summary of the listening sessions completed in November/December 2021, please visit our website regularly for any changes / updates at www.maconmpo.com. Submit comments to Gregory L. Brown, Asst. Planning Director, 200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email at gbrown@mbpz.org.

IPL0059862
Feb 15 2022

The Jones County News

Connect 2050

2022 | THE YEAR OF THE PLAN

Public Comment Period Opening for Future Transportation Plans for the MATS (Macon Area Transportation Study) Area

The MATS staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is opening the public comment period for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP). The draft plan will be available on the MATS website (www.maconmpo.com) for public review and comment from February 15 through March 17, 2022.

The *2050 MTP* includes approximately a billion dollars of transportation projects over the next 30 years and public input is vitally important to help set priorities. This plan guides future transportation improvements in Macon-Bibb County and a portion of Jones and Monroe Counties and includes *new roadways, new pedestrian and bike facilities, new transit opportunities, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure.* The MTP is updated every four years and its impact can be seen around the Macon area in road projects that are currently underway like the Bass Rd. widening, and planned projects like the I-75/I-16 interchange expansion, new roundabouts, and new bridges over rail lines and waterways. The MTP also feeds into the Macon-Bibb and Jones County *Comprehensive Plans,* which are state mandated plans required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. The Comprehensive Plan is a 20-Year plan which, in addition to transportation, outlines the vision of a community in areas of community development, land use, recreation, and housing which is updated every 10 years.

The update of both the 2050 MTP and the Comprehensive Plan process relies heavily on input from the public. In November and early December 2021, MATS staff conducted public listening sessions at various locations in Macon-Bibb and Jones Counties. The 2050 MTP incorporates the results of those listening sessions. Your opinions helped shape the future of Macon - Bibb County; determine the character, scale and quality of development and redevelopment of our area; formulate the goals and objectives of our future transportation systems; prioritize a list of currently proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area. Your involvement will impact planning policies for Macon - Bibb County and together we will create a blueprint for the future of our community.

Everyone is encouraged to share ideas and provide comments on the 2050 MTP draft. For more information regarding MATS, the MTP process, the list of current transportation projects in the area, and a summary of the listening sessions completed in November/December 2021, please visit our website regularly for any changes / updates at www.maconmpo.com. Submit comments to Gregory L. Brown, Asst. Planning Director, 200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email at gbrown@mbpz.org.

Appendix H:

Print Articles and Media Postings Related to MATS 2050 MTP Outreach Efforts

$763 million in transportation projects invites public scrutiny

Macon Area Transportation Study staff are holding public meetings seeking input on GDOT projects in the 2050 plan

Liz Fabian (https://macon-newsroom.com/staff_name/liz-fabian/), Civic Reporting Senior Fellow | November 30, 2021



Liz Fabian (https://macon-newsroom.com/staff_name/liz-fabian/)

Macon-Bibb Planning & Zoning Commission senior planner Gregory Brown points out pending road projects Monday night at Rosa Jackson Community Center during the first of nine public meetings on local transportation projects.

If you spend a lot of time in traffic, hold highway frustrations or want a better way to get around, a unique opportunity awaits.

The Macon Area Transportation Study (https://www.maconmpo.com) is formulating the Connect 2050 plan to guide future infrastructure updates, transportation access and improvements of roads and bridges in Macon-Bibb County, southwestern Jones County and south Monroe County.

The study encompasses transit routes and opportunities, pedestrian and bike enhancements and safety improvements.

MATS scheduled nine public meetings through mid-December to inform the public about the nearly 50 projects listed and collect thoughts through an online survey. (https://www.maconmpo.com/mats-planning-survey/)

Information gathered at the meetings and through the survey will be used to determine local priorities for Georgia Department of Transportation projects.

The survey is designed to take about 10 minutes, but there is additional information available for those who seek greater knowledge about the projects (https://www.maconmpo.com/year-of-the-plan-transportation-project-list/) that could extend the survey time.

The projects list is broken down in three categories: projects that will be completed in 10 years, short-range projects and long-range work.

The first meeting Monday night at Rosa Jackson Community Center only drew a couple of curious onlookers who appeared to be already at the center.

"These are always a struggle to get the public out," Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning senior planner Gregory Brown said.

He remembered a different scenario when he started working in Macon a couple of decades ago. Many people showed up with concerns over the pending interstate interchange construction that is now underway.

"Nothing too hot on the press (this time)," Brown said.

The nearly $150 million bridge reconstruction project from Interstate 16 East to Walnut Creek tops the project list on the survey, but is about $5 million away from completion.

Nearly $36 million in improvements to Bass Road from Providence Boulevard to New Forsyth Road comes in at No. 5 on the list.

The first dozen projects are underway and have been partially funded, but the remaining items could be accelerated and funded based on public input.

"It's always easier to amend the budget of an existing project than to add a brand-new project," said Mike Greenwald, the Metropolitan Planning Organization's technical coordinator.

If there is enough public support for a new project, it could be added to the evolving list.

Greenwald has outlined the current projects on a sprawling spreadsheet he props on an easel beside a map during the meetings.

The spreadsheet tracks whether a project meets planning goals, notes the cost estimate, shows money committed to date and remaining balance.

"Believe me, when you work with public money you… better be able to track it," Greenwald said.

Every five years, staff goes through the list and makes changes to the plan.

This map highlights projects listed in the Macon Area Transportation Study survey. (Liz Fabian (https://macon-newsroom.com/staff_profile/liz-fabian/))

The lower a project is on the list does not necessarily mean it's a lower priority, but it is not as far along in the planning and funding process, Greenwald said.

No. 49 – the Central Georgia Rail Trail from Macon to Milledgeville – has an estimated cost of $7 million, but No. 48 – pedestrian improvements to Log Cabin Drive – doesn't even have a cost estimate yet.

Once feedback is gathered, the resulting update will provide a "prioritized, cost-constrained list of projects that will be implemented over the next 25 to 30 years," according to a news release about the meetings.

The survey (https://www.maconmpo.com/mats-planning-survey/) can be taken online anywhere, but those attending the meetings can question staff about the process and use a QR code to access the survey while in attendance.

MATS public meetings:

Tues., Nov. 30, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm: South Bibb Recreation Center, 7035 Houston Road, Macon, 31216

Wed., Dec. 1, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm: Frank Johnson Community Center, 2227 Mercer University Drive, Macon, 31201

Thurs, Dec. 2, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm: Jones County Government Center – Charlotte C. Wilson Conference Room, 166 Industrial Boulevard, Gray, 31032

Mon., Dec. 6, 5:30pm – 7:30pm: Online meeting accessed through **www.mbpz.org/streaming (https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fmbpz.us13.list-manage.com%2Ftrack%2Fclick%3Fu%3Df1ad1714306707e434ee17c93%26id%3D0e060a8638%26e%3D5f0fecc885&data=04%7C01%7Cfabian_lj%40mercer.edu%7C78c50f119f894567f30e08d9b679b5c8%7C4fb34d2889b247109bcc30824d17fc30%7C0%7C1%7C637741456131351665%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=mdArNJIBQB6bIT%2Fv0iAqZZoH5HETHyQL4Idy9czVKzY%3D&reserved=0)**. Organizers will need the name and email addresses of participants wishing to speak.

Tues., Dec. 7, 2 pm – 4 pm: Elaine H. Lucas Senior Center, 132 Willie Smokie Glover Drive, Macon, 31201

Wed., Dec. 8, 2 pm – 4 pm: Bloomfield – Gilead Community Center, 1931 Rocky Creek Road, Macon, 31206

Thurs. Dec. 9, 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm: Lake Tobesofkee (Sandy Beach Pavilion), 6680 Moseley Dixon Road, Macon, 31220

Mon., Dec. 13, 2 pm – 4 pm: Macon Area GDOT Office (Auditorium), 4499 Riverside Drive, Macon, 31210

– Civic Journalism Senior Fellow Liz Fabian covers Macon-Bibb County government entities and can be reached at fabian_lj@mercer.edu or 478-301-2976.

Public input requested at forum to update 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

by Haley Garrett
Monday, November 29th 2021

Source: WGXA

MACON, Ga. -- A public forum was held to give the public a voice and answer any questions on the update of the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

This forum was held by the Macon Area Transportation Study staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commissions.

The Connect 2050 Plan is updated every four years and looks at transportation improvements that will be implemented over the next 25 to 30 years including transit opportunities, pedestrian and bike facilities, bridge replacement, safety and operational, and more.

Over half a billion dollars is used on transportation projects outlined in this plan.

Examples of projects that have been in this plan include improvements along State Route 247, the I-16/I-75 interchange expansion, Jeffersonville Road widening, the extension of Sardis Church Rd., new roundabouts, and new bridges over rail lines and waterways.

This plan impacts all of Macon-Bibb County, the southwestern portion of Jones County, and South Monroe County.

"The transportation element plan of Macon Bibb's Comprehension plan that will be updated in October of 2022 is part of this, so we would love for the public to keep that plan update in mind and please get involved," said Mike Greenwald Planning Director at Macon-Bibb County Office of Planning & Zoning.

Greenwald says if you didn't make it tonight, there are several more public forums this week and next.

He also encourages the public to complete a questionnaire on the plan by heading to: www.maconmpo.com.

To view the list of remaining public forums look below:

- Tuesday, November 30, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: South Bibb Recreation Center, 7035 Houston Road, Macon, Georgia 31216
- Wednesday, December 1, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: Frank Johnson Community Center, 2227 Mercer University Drive, Macon, Georgia 31201
- Thursday, December 2, 2021, 5:30pm – 7:30pm: Jones County Government Center – Charlotte C. Wilson Conference Room, 166 Industrial Boulevard, Gray, Georgia 31032
- Monday, December 6, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: Theron Ussery Recreation Center, 815 N. Macon Park Drive, Macon, Georgia 31210
- Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm: Elaine H. Lucas Senior Center, 132 Willie Smokie Glover Drive, Macon, Georgia 31201
- Wednesday, December 8, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm: Bloomfield - Gilead Community Center, 1931 Rocky Creek Road, Macon, Georgia 31206
- Thursday, December 9, 2021, 5:30pm - 7:30pm: Lake Tobesofkee (Sandy Beach Pavilion), 6680 Moseley Dixon Road, Macon, Georgia 31220
- Monday, December 13, 2021, 2:00pm - 4:00pm: Macon Area GDOT Office (Auditorium), 4499 Riverside Drive, Macon, Georgia 31210

News from Around the State – District 5



Middle Georgia-Robins Air Force Base Sustainability Plan

The Middle Georgia Regional Commission and Robins Air Force Base, along with local and federal officials and the surrounding community, have teamed together to develop a sustainability plan for the future of Middle Georgia's military base and surrounding area. The effort aims to identify compatible land uses and growth management guidelines on and near the military base. The study team and the community adjacent to the military base are working collaboratively to minimize impact to the surrounding area and to the base considering future growth both on and off the military installation.

Study elements include encroachment, transportation, infrastructure, operations, economic and community development, and environmental and cultural resources. Robins Air Force Base has been operating in Houston County since 1941 and employs over 23,000 civilians, members, and contractors, creating an annual impact of over $3.5 billion to its surrounding community. The sustainability planning process kicked off in May 2021 and is anticipated to be complete in June of this year. To follow the planning process, visit this website.

Bike Walk Macon Made a Big Impact in 2021

Despite the challenges of the pandemic, Bike Walk Macon continued to advance their mission to create a more bikeable, walkable Macon-Bibb County. The organization, founded in 2015, recently released an informative *2021 Impact Report* highlighting the accomplishments within the community. The year 2021 saw remarkable accomplishments and changes, including the adoption of a Complete Streets Policy ordinance, installation of painted crosswalks and murals on City streets, green sharrows, bumpouts, and a sensory sidewalk pathway throughout the Beall's Hill, Downtown, Greenwood Bottom, and Napier Heights neighborhoods. The "Open Streets Macon" program was also expanded to include two additional neighborhoods. Bike Walk Macon hosted several first-time events like Rolling Town Hall, the My Bike Photo Series gallery, and the Macon Mobility Maker Awards. Also, new staff joined the organization to expand educational programs in 2022. Follow the exciting work underway at Bike Walk Macon.

Connect 2050 – Macon MPO Updates Transportation Plan

The Macon Metropolitan Planning Organization is currently updating its Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), known as *Connect 2050*. The *Connect 2050* plan update guides future transportation improvements in the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) area. The update will assess the existing transportation network, gather community feedback, and update goals, objectives, and transportation priorities for Macon-Bibb County and parts of Jones and Monroe Counties.

Based on feedback received from survey participants at this current stage of the MTP development, the following transportation priorities (and percentage of respondents indicating each priority) were regarded as "High Importance":

- Improve Travel Flows (26%)
- Enhance Public Transportation (20%)
- Enhance Travel Safety (20%)
- Add & Widen Roads (19%)
- Enhance Bicycling & Walking (19%)
- Incorporate Smart Technology into Road Infrastructure (18%)
- Improve and Maintain Road Surfaces (17%)

Please visit the Macon MPO's website to stay informed about the *Connect 2050* MTP update!

Planning for Progress in Perry

The City of Perry has seen rapid growth over the past few years. There has been an influx of new residents and commercial development as the City has been identified as a desirable place to live, due to its high quality of life, amenities, and reliable services. The City of Perry recently completed several community planning initiatives, including a 5-Year Strategic Plan, Perry Pathways Connectivity Plan, Sewer Master Plan, and an update to the Joint Comprehensive Plan for Houston County and the Cities of Centerville, Perry, and Warner Robins.

For the Joint Comprehensive Plan, Perry began by implementing a robust public engagement process through surveys and community meetings for four specific topics – housing, economic development, land use and growth, and city services. With the surveys' 700 Perry-specific responses and the topic-driven community meetings, respondents and attendees generated input that directly informed the final plan. The planning process also led to an extensive update of Perry's land use character area map to direct the City's growth and development for the next five years.

The City of Perry Sewer Master Plan is a proactive planning effort that has been initiated in direct response to recent significant growth and changing development patterns. Using a consulting engineer, the City of Perry is finalizing the plan, which will detail and prioritize sewer projects for the next 20 years. The plan takes into consideration desirable growth areas and the sewer capacity required to serve new residents, commercial development, and new industries. The plan details the process for constructing and bringing online a new wastewater treatment facility which will spur additional growth in the eastern portion of Perry and alleviate sewer capacity concerns city-wide. Visit the City of Perry's website to follow ongoing planning initiatives in Perry!

GPA wants to hear from you and feature news from around the state. This month, we are showcasing GPA District 5. Thank you to Mary Hufstetler, AICP, GPA District 5 Director for this update!

Public Comment Period Opening for Future Transportation Plans for the Macon Area Transportation Study Area

Monday, February 14th, 2022

The MATS staff of the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission is opening the public comment period for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP) and the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report Update. These plans are consistent with the existing MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, and therefore do not require additional adjustments to, or re-adoption of, that document. The draft plans will be available on the MATS website (www.MaconMPO.com) for public review & comment from February 15 through March 17, 2022.

The *2050 MTP* includes approximately a billion dollars of transportation projects over the next 30 years and public input is vitally important to help set priorities. This plan guides future transportation improvements in Macon-Bibb County & a portion of Jones and Monroe Counties and includes *new roadways, new pedestrian and bike facilities, new transit opportunities, as well as upgrades of existing transportation infrastructure*. The MTP is updated every four years and its impact can be seen around the Macon area in road projects that are currently underway like the Bass Rd. widening, and planned projects like the I-75/I-16 interchange expansion, new roundabouts, and new bridges over rail lines and waterways. The MTP also feeds into the Macon-Bibb and Jones County *Comprehensive Plans,* which are state mandated plans required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. The Comprehensive Plan is a 20-Year plan which, in addition to transportation, outlines the vision of a community in areas of community development, land use, recreation, and housing which is updated every 10 years.

The update of both the 2050 MTP and the Comprehensive Plan process relies heavily on input from the public. In November and early December 2021, MATS staff conducted public listening sessions at various locations in Macon-Bibb & Jones Counties. The 2050 MTP incorporates the results of those listening sessions. Your opinions helped shape the future of Macon – Bibb County; determine the character, scale and quality of development and redevelopment of our area; formulate the goals and objectives of our future transportation systems; prioritize a list of currently proposed transportation projects; and propose transportation projects that you would like to see in the MATS study area. Your involvement will impact planning policies for Macon – Bibb County and together we will create a blueprint for the future of our community.

Everyone is encouraged to share ideas and provide comments on the 2050 MTP draft. For more information regarding MATS, the MTP process, the list of current transportation projects in the area, and a summary of the listening sessions completed in November/December 2021, please visit our website regularly for any changes / updates at www.maconmpo.com. Submit comments to Gregory L. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, 200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, Georgia 31201 or via email atgbrown@mbpz.org.

Appendix I:

Public Notice for Final MATS 2050 MTP and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report

Public Notice - Final Adoption of MATS 2050 MTP and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report
Macon Telegraph, Pg. 6B, Col. 3 - April 1, 2022



Notice Of Final Adoption for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report

Notice is hereby given that the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) intends to adopt both the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the amended Air Quality Conformity Determination Report (AQ-CDR) at the meeting of their Policy Committee on May 3, 2022. These documents are consistent with the existing MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Therefore, adoption of the MATS 2050 MTP and AQ-CDR do not require re-adoption of the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP.

In accordance with the public involvement requirements specified under 23 CFR 450.316 and the MATS Public Participation Plan, a public comment period on the initial draft plans was conducted February 15 through March 17, 2022. The comments received during that period did not identify any material errors or omissions with respect to the required elements of the MTP, as described in 23 CFR 450.324.

The MATS 2050 MTP and AQ-CDR can be viewed on the MATS website at www.MaconMPO.com. Copies of the amendment can also be obtained at the Macon-Bibb Co. Planning & Zoning Commission (200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, GA).
IPL0067043
Apr 1 2022

The Telegraph MACON.COM | The Telegraph jobs.macon.com

Public Notice - Final Adoption of MATS 2050 MTP and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report
MATS Website Front Page (www.maconmpo.com) - April 1, 2022



Notice Of Final Adoption for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report

Notice is hereby given that the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) intends to adopt both the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the amended Air Quality Conformity Determination Report (AQ-CDR) at the meeting of their Policy Committee on May 3, 2022. These documents are consistent with the existing MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Therefore, adoption of the MATS 2050 MTP and AQ-CDR do not require re-adoption of the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP.

In accordance with the public involvement requirements specified under 23 CFR 450.316 and the MATS Public Participation Plan, a public comment period on the initial draft plans was conducted February 15 through March 17, 2022. The comments received during that period did not identify any material errors or omissions with respect to the required elements of the MTP, as described in 23 CFR 450.324.

Hard copies of these documents can be obtained at the Macon-Bibb Co. Planning & Zoning Commission (200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, GA). You can also download these documents at the links below

Click here to download the Final Draft of the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Public Comment Advertisement for 2050 MTP Amendments Adopted June 13, 2022

Notice Of Comment Period For Amendments To The 2050 MetropolitanTransportation Plan For The Macon Area Transportation Study

Notice is hereby given that the public comment period has begun for amendments to the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) region, covering all of Macon-Bibb County, and portions of Jones and Monroe counties. Specifically, the following project changes are anticipated in the MATS 2050 MTP:

Chapter 6: Roads and Bridges Projects – GDOT Project #0019107 Truck Parking Expansion – Region 2
Project added at the request of Georgia Dept. of Transportation - $100,000

Chapter 8: Fiscal Assessment

- Add $26,055,442 to the revenue estimate for new highway projects, to reflect funds received by State of Georgia under the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act of 2021 – PROTECT Grant program, and assigned to the MATS MPO Area.
- Update the MATS Transit Program fiscal balancing calculations to reflect a new balance of $7,733,143.36, after processing amendments to the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program

In accordance with the public involvement requirements in the MATS Public Participation Plan, a public comment period on the initial draft plans will be open from April 25, 2022 through June 8, 2022. Comments can be e-mailed to Mr. Greg Brown (gbrown@mbpz.org)

The proposed amended MATS 2050 MTP can be viewed on the MATS website at www.MaconMPO.com. Copies can also be obtained at the Macon-Bibb Co. Planning & Zoning Commission (200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, GA).

IPL0074678
May 25 2022

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ADOPTED MAY 3, 2023

A fifteen day public comment period was held for amendments to the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as required by the MATS Public Participation Plan. The public comment period began on April 15, 2023 and concluded on May 1, 2023. A legal ad was placed in the Macon Telegraph newspaper to announce the public review period. In addition, a public notice was also put on the MATS website along with the draft TIP document.

Macon Telegraph, 14 April 2023, Pg. 7B., col. 2 - 3

NOTICE

Notice Of Proposed Amendments to the MATS System Performance Report and MATS FY 2021 – 2024 Transportation Improvement Program, To Reflect Updated Performance Measures for Pavement & Bridge Conditions (PM2) and System Performance & Freight Movement (PM3) for Calendar Year 2023

Notice is hereby given that the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) intends to amend the System Performance Report, and the FY 2021 - 2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), at the meeting of their Policy Committee on May 3, 2023. The proposed amended MATS System Performance Report and MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP can be viewed on the MATS website at www.MaconMPO.com. Copies can also be obtained at the Macon-Bibb Co. Planning & Zoning Commission (200 Cherry St., Suite 300, Macon, GA).

On December 21, 2023, Georgia Dept. of Transportation (GDOT) informed the Georgia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations of updated performance measure targets for categories specified under 23 CFR 490.105. Specifically, those updated Statewide targets are:

Pavement and Bridge Condition Targets (PM2) – Calendar Year 2023

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	2-YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE	4-YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE
PERCENTAGE OF INTERSTATE PAVEMENTS IN "GOOD" CONDITION	≥50%	≥50%
PERCENTAGE OF INTERSTATE PAVEMENTS IN "POOR" CONDITION	≤5%	≤5%
PERCENTAGE OF NON-INTERSTATE PAVEMENTS IN "GOOD" CONDITION	≤40%	≤40%
PERCENTAGE OF NON-INTERSTATE PAVEMENTS IN "POOR" CONDITION	≤12%	≤12%
PERCENTAGE OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM BRIDGES (BY DECK AREA) IN "GOOD" CONDITION	≤60%	≤60%
PERCENTAGE OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM BRIDGES (BY DECK AREA) IN "POOR" CONDITION	≤10%	≤10%

System Performance/Freight Movement (PM3) – Calendar Year 2023

Performance Measure	2-Year Rolling Average	4-Year Rolling Average
Percentage of PERSON-MILES ON Interstate SYSTEM THAT ARE "RELIABLE"	≥73.9	≥68.4%
Percentage of PERSON-MILES ON NON-Interstate SYSTEM THAT ARE "RELIABLE"	≥87.3%	≥85.3%
TRUCK TRAVEL TIME RELIABILITY INDEX	≥1.62%	≥1.65%

Under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(l), within 180 days after the adoption of a specific performance target by GDOT, MATS is required to establish their own targets. The MATS MPO may either develop their own individual targets for the MATS planning area, or choose to simply adopt the targets established by GDOT (23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(ii))

In accordance with the public involvement requirements in the MATS Public Participation Plan, a public comment period on these amendments will be open from April 15, 2023 through May 1, 2023. Comments can be e-mailed to Dr. Michael Greenwald (mgreenwald@mbpz.org)

IPL0118340
Apr 14 2023

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE MATS 2050 MTP ADOPTED MAY 1, 2024

A fifteen day public comment period was held for amendments to the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required by the MATS Public Participation Plan. The public comment period began on April 12, 2024 and concluded on April 29, 2024

The following legal ad was placed in the Macon Telegraph newspaper to announce the public review period. In addition, a public notice was also put on the MATS website along with the proposed amendments.

Macon Telegraph, 12 April 2024, Pg. 6B., col. 5 – 6



Legals

NOTICE OF COMMENT PERIOD FOR PROPSOED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2050 METROPOLITANT TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR THE MACON AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Notice is hereby given that the public comment period has begun for amendments to the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) region, covering all of Macon-Bibb County, and portions of Jones and Monroe counties. Specifically, the following changes are proposed for the MATS 2050 MTP:

Chapter 6: Roads and Bridges Projects – Update the MATS 2050 MTP approved Roads & Bridges Projects List to reflect the project costs in the current FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, including adding the following projects to the list, at the request of Georgia Dept. of Transportation

Project ID	Description	Type	Cost
PI #0019933	I-75 @ Rocky Creek	Bridge Replacement	$19,400,000
PI #0019934	I-475 Southbound & Northbound @ Tobesofkee Creek 3 Miles South of Macon.	Bridge Replacement	$23,000,000
PI #0019935	I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ CSX #636057K & Boggy Branch, 1.5 miles East of Macon	Bridge Replacement	$29,000,000
PI #0019936	I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow	Bridge Replacement	$13,000,000
PI #0019945	SR 19/SR 87 Southbound & Northbound @ Walnut Creek	Bridge Replacement	$13,600,000
PI #0020056	Bondsview Rd. from West of Stone Creek to SR 87. Road base improvement and grading, shoulder reconditioning, drainage headwall improvements along a 1.06 mile stretch of Bondsview Road with access to 800 acres of Wildlife refuge land.	Roadway Project	$490,000
PI #0019088 PROJECT CANCELLATION	SR 11/US 129 NB @ Sand Creek	Bridge Replacement	($5,375,000)

- **Chapter 8: Fiscal Assessment** – Add **$11,363,312.74** to FY 2024 and **$90,500,000** to FY 2029 revenue estimates for new highway projects, to reflect funds received by State of Georgia to support the new projects identified in the previous list
- **Chapter 13: Performance Based Transportation Planning and Programming** – In accordance with 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i), amend the chapter to reflect adoption of the Statewide PM 1 – Safety Performance Measure targets for CY 2024, as transmitted by Georgia Dept. of Transportation to FHWA on August 31, 2023, as the current targets for the MATS 2050 MTP, pursuant to. Those GDOT Statewide targets for CY 2024 are:

Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1) – Calendar Year 2024

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	GA 5-YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE (2020 – 2024)
Number of Fatalities	1,680.0
Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)	1.36
Number of Serious Injuries	8,966.0
Serious Injury Rate (per 100 million VMT)	7.679
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	802

In accordance with the public involvement requirements in the MATS Public Participation Plan, a public comment period on the initial draft plans will be open from April 12, 2024 through April 29, 2024. Comments can be e-mailed to Dr. Michael J. (Mike) Greenwald (mgreenwald@mbpz.org)

The proposed chapter amendments to the MATS 2050 MTP can be viewed on the MATS website at www.MaconMPO.com. Copies can also be obtained at the Macon-Bibb Co. Planning & Zoning Commission (3661 Eisenhower Parkway Suite MB104, Macon, GA 31206).

IPL0168574
Apr 12 2024

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE MATS 2050 MTP ADOPTED AUGUST 7, 2024

A fifteen day public comment period was held for amendments to the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required by the MATS Public Participation Plan. The public comment period began on July 15, 2024 and concluded on July 30, 2024.

The following legal ad was placed in the Macon Telegraph newspaper to announce the public review period. In addition, a public notice was also put on the MATS website along with the proposed amendments.

Macon Telegraph, 15 July 2024, Pg. 3B., col. 3

NOTICE OF COMMENT PERIOD FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM and MATS 2050 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Notice is hereby given that the Macon Area Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization (MATS MPO) intends to amend the FY 2024 - 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, at the meeting of their Policy Committee on August 7, 2024.

Between May 10, 2024 and May 21, 2024, Georgia Dept. of Transportation – Office of Planning Division advised MATS that there were amendments required to the MATS MPO FY 2024 – 2027 TIP and 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan in order to reflect the following:

- **ADD NEW GDOT PROJECT #0020213** (SR 247/US 129 Southbound & Northbound at Norfolk Southern Bridge #729382R), in the amount of **$22,650,000** ($18,120 Federal; 4,530,000 State) to the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Ch. 6, Table 6-2, Item #20), including **$2,150,000** ($1,720,000 Federal; $430,000 State) added to the FY 2024 – 2027 MATS TIP, for Preliminary Engineering phase in FY 2025 and anticipated Right Of Way Acquisition phase in FY 2027. This project replaces the bridge located on SR 247/US 129 (aka Hawkinsville Rd.) between Liberty Church Rd. and Griffin Rd.
- **ADD NEW GDOT PROJECT #0020345** (I-16 from SR 22 in Bibb County to SR 96 in Twiggs County), in the amount of **$425,000** ($340,000 Federal; $85,000 State) to both the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Ch. 6, Table 6-2, Item #21) and the FY 2024 – 2027 MATS TIP for Construction Phase in FY 2025 related to electric vehicle charging stations, under the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure program
- **ADD MACON-BIBB COUNTY PLEASANT HILL RECONNECTING COMMUNITIES PLANNING GRANT**, in the amount of $600,000 ($500,000 Federal; $100,000 State) to the FY 2024 – 2027 MATS TIP in a new Appendix, entitled "Supplemental Grants Not Subject to Fiscal Balancing" pursuant to requirements under 23 CFR 450.326
- **ADD FEDERAL LANDS PROJECT LIST FOR STATE OF GEORGIA** to the FY 2024 – 2027 MATS TIP in a new Appendix, entitled "Supplemental Grants Not Subject to Fiscal Balancing" pursuant to requirements under 23 USC § 204

In accordance with the public involvement requirements in the MATS MPO Public Participation Plan, a public comment period on the initial draft plans will be open from July 15, 2024 through July 30, 2024. Comments can be e-mailed to Dr. Michael J. (Mike) Greenwald (mgreenwald@mbpz.org)

The proposed amended MATS MPO FY 2024 – 2027 TIP can be viewed on the MATS website at www.MaconMPO.com. Copies can also be obtained at the Macon-Bibb Co. Planning & Zoning Commission (3661 Eisenhower Parkway Suite MB104, Macon, GA 31206).
IPL0183621
Jul 15 2024

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES FROM MATS MPO

MATS MPO received the following comments from the general public during the amendments to the 2050 MTP. The comments received and responses provided are summarized below:

- **Amendments: May 25, 2022 through June 8, 2022**
  MATS received no comments or inquiries from the general public.

- **Amendments: April 14, 2023 through May 1, 2023**
  MATS received no comments or inquiries from the general public.

- **Amendments: April 12, 2024 through April 29, 2024**
  MATS received no comments or inquiries from the general public.

- **Amendments: July 15, 2024 through July 30, 2024**
  MATS received, and responded to, one comment from the general public. See e-mail communication thread starting on pg. 432.

Re: Comment Period for proposed amendments to the MATS FY 2024 - 2027 Transportation Improvement Program and MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>

Wed 7/31/2024 9:12 AM

To:Jackson Hurst <ghostlightmater@yahoo.com>

Good morning Mr. Hurst,

Thank you for your comments. They will be included in the amended MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP and MATS 2050 MTP document.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald

Michael J. Greenwald, Ph.D., AICP
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
3661 Eisenhower Pkwy, Suite MB 104
Macon, GA 31206 | **478-241-2566**
MaconMPO.com

From: Jackson Hurst <ghostlightmater@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2024 11:20 AM
To: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Subject: Comment Period for proposed amendments to the MATS FY 2024 - 2027 Transportation Improvement Program and MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

[WARNING - EXTERNAL EMAIL] This email originated from outside Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning. Do NOT click links or open attachments from this email unless you know the sender and trust the content. If you suspect this email to be a phishing attempt, please forward this email to MBIT-Admin@mbpz.org.

Name - Jackson Hurst

Address - 4216 Cornell Crossing, Kennesaw, Georgia 30144

Comment - I have reviewed the documents for MATS and I support the documents.

sent from ghostlightmater@yahoo.com

Appendix J:

Completed Freight Surveys

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

RECEIVED
OCT 14 2016
MBCPZC

October 5, 2016

Re: Request for input into the 2040 LRTP Update: Freight & Goods Movement
Macon Area Transportation Study

Greetings:

As part of its Freight and Goods Movement Study, the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission (MPO) is currently updating the freight and goods movement component of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS). The MPO has previously undertaken goods movement studies and research in previous LRTP updates and the completion of the *"Goods Movement Study, June 1995"*. The completion of the Freight and Goods Movement Study by the MPO represents a continued effort in developing an integrated freight-planning program for the Macon Area Transportation Study.

Therefore, we respectfully request your assistance in completing the enclosed survey that will assist transportation planners with prioritizing future roadway improvements. Your assistance in providing information on activities and needs regarding freight and goods movement in Macon-Bibb County is greatly appreciated. Please feel free to use additional sheets for your responses, if needed.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463. Please find enclosed a stamped return envelope for your convenience, or you may fax your completed survey to 478.751.7467 or by email to gbrown@mbpz.org. We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016.

Thank you for being a part of this study!

Sincerely,

Gregory L. Brown, Senior Planner
Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission

Macon Area Transportation Study

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

1. Please provide the following demographic information. The name of your organization will not be listed in the results of the survey. However, it will be used solely for informational purposes of future Macon's MPO Long Range Transportation Plan updates:

- Name: Casey Smock
- Company Name: Fedex Freight
- Address: 2750 Roff Avenue
- City: Macon State: GA Zip: 31204
- Country: USA
- Email Address: Casey.Smock@Fedex.com
- Phone Number: 478-464-1014

2. How would you describe the primary type of facilities / industries of your company? (Check all that apply)

- ☑ Truck Terminal
- ☐ Manufacture
- ☐ Warehouse
- ☑ Freight / Logistics Provider
- ☐ Distribution Center
- ☐ Retail / Wholesale Trade
- ☐ Liquid or Dry Bulk
- ☐ Other: (please specify)

3. What are the primary types of shipments handled at this site? (Check all that apply)

- ☑ Less than truckload
- ☐ Truckload
- ☐ Parcels
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Bulk commodity shipments in rail cars
- ☐ Shipping containers
- ☐ Waste materials
- ☐ Hazardous materials
- ☐ Other: (please specify)

4. During what hours do you usually receive/ship deliveries of your major inbound and outbound products? (Check all that apply)

- ☒ 6AM – 12 Noon
- ☒ 12 Noon – 4PM
- ☒ 4PM – 8PM
- ☒ 8PM – ~~12 Midnight~~ 2200
- ☒ 12 Midnight – 6AM
- ☐ 24 hours a day

5. How many trucks on average does your company use on a daily basis for freight and goods movement in Macon – Bibb County?

- ☐ Less than 5
- ☐ 6 – 10
- ☑ 11 – 25
- ☐ 25 or More

Macon Area Transportation Study

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

6. What roadways are used most by your company's vehicle in the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County? This information will assist transportation planners with prioritizing future roadway improvements. (Check all that apply)
   - ☒ I-75
   - ☒ I-16
   - ☐ I-475
   - ☒ SR 247 (Pio Nono Avenue)
   - ☒ SR 49 (Shurling Drive; Industrial Highway)
   - ☒ SR 74 (Mercer University; Thomaston road)
   - ☒ US 41 (Forsyth Road; Vineville Avenue; Hardeman Avenue)
   - ☒ US 80 (Eisenhower Parkway; Jeffersonville Road)
   - ☒ US 129 (Gray Highway)
   - ☐ Other (please specify)_____

7. What other routes would be more preferable to use that are not identified as truck routes?
   - Highway Names: [redacted] Unknown

8. Which, if any, of the following movement problems does your truck(s) encounter on the local roadway? (Check all that apply)
   - ☒ Narrow Roads
   - ☐ Rail Crossings
   - ☐ Difficult Turn Movements
   - ☐ Width of Bridges
   - ☒ Other (please specify) Trees/Bushes

9. Where are the specific locations / areas where truck or rail traffic causes recurring congestion in Macon – Bibb County?
   - Please Name: 7th Street

10. What improvements could be easily made to the roadway system to improve the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County?
    - Please List: Trees/Bushes Roff Ave. Updated Intersections update lane width

Thank You!

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

October 5, 2016

Re: Request for input into the 2040 LRTP Update: Freight & Goods Movement
Macon Area Transportation Study

Greetings:

As part of its Freight and Goods Movement Study, the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission (MPO) is currently updating the freight and goods movement component of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS). The MPO has previously undertaken goods movement studies and research in previous LRTP updates and the completion of the *"Goods Movement Study, June 1995"*. The completion of the Freight and Goods Movement Study by the MPO represents a continued effort in developing an integrated freight-planning program for the Macon Area Transportation Study.

Therefore, we respectfully request your assistance in completing the enclosed survey that will assist transportation planners with prioritizing future roadway improvements. Your assistance in providing information on activities and needs regarding freight and goods movement in Macon-Bibb County is greatly appreciated. Please feel free to use additional sheets for your responses, if needed.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463. Please find enclosed a stamped return envelope for your convenience, or you may fax your completed survey to 478.751.7467 or by email to gbrown@mbpz.org. We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016.

Thank you for being a part of this study!

Sincerely,

Gregory L. Brown, Senior Planner
Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission

Macon Area Transportation Study

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

1. Please provide the following demographic information. The name of your organization will not be listed in the results of the survey. However, it will be used solely for informational purposes of future Macon's MPO Long Range Transportation Plan updates:

- Name: WILL BUTTS
- Company Name: ABF
- Address: 711 GUY PAINE ROAD
- City: MACON State: GA Zip: 31206
- Country: USA
- Email Address: WButts@freight.abf.com
- Phone Number: 478-788-6424

2. How would you describe the primary type of facilities / industries of your company? (Check all that apply)

- ☒ Truck Terminal
- ☐ Manufacture
- ☐ Warehouse
- ☒ Freight / Logistics Provider
- ☐ Distribution Center
- ☐ Retail / Wholesale Trade
- ☐ Liquid or Dry Bulk
- ☐ Other: (please specify)

3. What are the primary types of shipments handled at this site? (Check all that apply)

- ☒ Less than truckload
- ☐ Truckload
- ☐ Parcels
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Bulk commodity shipments in rail cars
- ☐ Shipping containers
- ☐ Waste materials
- ☒ Hazardous materials
- ☐ Other: (please specify)

4. During what hours do you usually receive/ship deliveries of your major inbound and outbound products? (Check all that apply)

- ☒ 6AM – 12 Noon
- ☐ 12 Noon – 4PM
- ☒ 4PM – 8PM
- ☐ 8PM – 12 Midnight
- ☐ 12 Midnight – 6AM
- ☐ 24 hours a day

5. How many trucks on average does your company use on a daily basis for freight and goods movement in Macon – Bibb County?

- ☐ Less than 5
- ☒ 6 – 10
- ☐ 11 – 25
- ☐ 25 or More

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

6. What roadways are used most by your company's vehicle in the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County? This information will assist transportation planners with prioritizing future roadway improvements. (Check all that apply)
   - ☒ I-75
   - ☒ I-16
   - ☒ I-475
   - ☒ SR 247 (Pio Nono Avenue)
   - ☒ SR 49 (Shurling Drive; Industrial Highway)
   - ☒ SR 74 (Mercer University; Thomaston road)
   - ☒ US 41 (Forsyth Road; Vineville Avenue; Hardeman Avenue)
   - ☒ US 80 (Eisenhower Parkway; Jeffersonville Road)
   - ☒ US 129 (Gray Highway)
   - ☐ Other (please specify)_____

7. What other routes would be more preferable to use that are not identified as truck routes?
   - Highway Names: NONE

8. Which, if any, of the following movement problems does your truck(s) encounter on the local roadway? (Check all that apply)
   - ☐ Narrow Roads
   - ☐ Rail Crossings
   - ☒ Difficult Turn Movements → LOWER POPLAR STREET
   - ☐ Width of Bridges
   - ☐ Other (please specify) _____

9. Where are the specific locations / areas where truck or rail traffic causes recurring congestion in Macon – Bibb County? RIVERSIDE DRIVE
   - Please Name: ALLEN ROAD, 7TH STREET, 5TH STREET

10. What improvements could be easily made to the roadway system to improve the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County?
    - Please List: NONE

Thank You!

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

October 5, 2016

Re: Request for input into the 2040 LRTP Update: Freight & Goods Movement
Macon Area Transportation Study

Greetings:

As part of its Freight and Goods Movement Study, the Macon-Bibb County Planning & Zoning Commission (MPO) is currently updating the freight and goods movement component of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update for the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS). The MPO has previously undertaken goods movement studies and research in previous LRTP updates and the completion of the *"Goods Movement Study, June 1995"*. The completion of the Freight and Goods Movement Study by the MPO represents a continued effort in developing an integrated freight-planning program for the Macon Area Transportation Study.

Therefore, we respectfully request your assistance in completing the enclosed survey that will assist transportation planners with prioritizing future roadway improvements. Your assistance in providing information on activities and needs regarding freight and goods movement in Macon-Bibb County is greatly appreciated. Please feel free to use additional sheets for your responses, if needed.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463. Please find enclosed a stamped return envelope for your convenience, or you may fax your completed survey to 478.751.7467 or by email to gbrown@mbpz.org. We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016.

Thank you for being a part of this study!

Sincerely,

Gregory L. Brown, Senior Planner
Macon – Bibb County Planning and Zoning Commission

Macon Area Transportation Study

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

1. Please provide the following demographic information. The name of your organization will not be listed in the results of the survey. However, it will be used solely for informational purposes of future Macon's MPO Long Range Transportation Plan updates:

- Name: Rico Ferguson
- Company Name: SAVE-A-LOT
- Address: 7595 Industrial Hwy
- City: Macon State: GA Zip: 31216
- Country: USA
- Email Address: Rico.D.Ferguson@SaveALot.com
- Phone Number: 478-788-6811

2. How would you describe the primary type of facilities / industries of your company? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Truck Terminal
- ☐ Manufacture
- ☐ Warehouse
- ☐ Freight / Logistics Provider
- ☑ Distribution Center
- ☐ Retail / Wholesale Trade
- ☐ Liquid or Dry Bulk
- ☐ Other: (please specify)

3. What are the primary types of shipments handled at this site? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Less than truckload
- ☑ Truckload
- ☐ Parcels
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Bulk commodity shipments in rail cars
- ☐ Shipping containers
- ☐ Waste materials
- ☐ Hazardous materials
- ☐ Other: (please specify)

4. During what hours do you usually receive/ship deliveries of your major inbound and outbound products? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ 6AM – 12 Noon
- ☐ 12 Noon – 4PM
- ☐ 4PM – 8PM
- ☐ 8PM – 12 Midnight
- ☐ 12 Midnight – 6AM
- ☑ 24 hours a day

5. How many trucks on average does your company use on a daily basis for freight and goods movement in Macon – Bibb County?

- ☐ Less than 5
- ☐ 6 – 10
- ☑ 11 – 25
- ☐ 25 or More

Macon Area Transportation Study

Macon – Bibb County MPO Freight & Goods Movement Survey
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Gregory L. Brown @ 478.751.7463 or gbrown@mbpz.org. Please use additional sheets as needed! We genuinely desire your input by Friday, November 4, 2016. This survey can also be found online @ http://www.mats2040.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Website-Freight-Movement-Cover-Letter-and-Survey-2040-LRTP-Update.pdf

6. What roadways are used most by your company's vehicle in the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County? This information will assist transportation planners with prioritizing future roadway improvements. (Check all that apply)
   - ☑ I-75
   - ☑ I-16
   - ☑ I-475
   - ☐ SR 247 (Pio Nono Avenue)
   - ☐ SR 49 (Shurling Drive; Industrial Highway)
   - ☐ SR 74 (Mercer University; Thomaston road)
   - ☐ US 41 (Forsyth Road; Vineville Avenue; Hardeman Avenue)
   - ☐ US 80 (Eisenhower Parkway; Jeffersonville Road)
   - ☐ US 129 (Gray Highway)
   - ☐ Other (please specify)_____

7. What other routes would be more preferable to use that are not identified as truck routes?
   - Highway Names:_____

8. Which, if any, of the following movement problems does your truck(s) encounter on the local roadway? (Check all that apply)
   - ☑ Narrow Roads
   - ☐ Rail Crossings
   - ☐ Difficult Turn Movements
   - ☐ Width of Bridges
   - ☐ Other (please specify) _____

9. Where are the specific locations / areas where truck or rail traffic causes recurring congestion in Macon – Bibb County?
   - Please Name:_____

10. What improvements could be easily made to the roadway system to improve the movement of freight and goods in Macon – Bibb County?
    - Please List:_____

Thank You!

Appendix K:

Solicitation for Comments from Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee Members (and Other Partner Agencies), Log of Received Comments, and MATS Responses

IAC Correspondence E-Mail Log for
MATS 2050 MTP Amendments
Adopted - May 1, 2024

Michael Greenwald

From: Hicks, Edward P <EHicks@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 9:31 AM
To: Michael Greenwald; Olivia Lewis; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V.; Grodzinsky, Gil; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Freund, Weston (he/him/his); Jarvis, Simone (she/her/hers); Peevy, Phillip M.; Craig Ross; McLoyd, Johnathan G; Myers, Dianna (Myers.Dianna@epa.gov); Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA); Williams, Jacqueline R
Subject: RE: MEETING MINUTES--IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP and MATS 2050 MTP

[WARNING - EXTERNAL EMAIL] This email originated from outside Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning. Do NOT click links or open attachments from this email unless you know the sender and trust the content. If you suspect this email to be a phishing attempt, please forward this email to MBIT-Admin@mbpz.org.

Mike
Thank you for compiling the minutes and carefully detailing our discussion with the IAC team. GDOT concurs with FHWA's best practices on numbering amendments and looking forward to the amendments adoption and the Air Quality Conformity SOP.
Thanks again!

Ted Hicks, AICP
Urban Branch Chief

Georgia Department of Transportation

Office of Planning
One Georgia Center
600 West Peachtree Street 5th Floor
Atlanta, GA, 30308
404.631.1750 office
404.807.9843 cell

From: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 5:36 PM
To: Olivia Lewis <olivia.lewis@dot.gov>; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. <mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>; Grodzinsky, Gil <gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov>; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Freund, Weston (he/him/his) <Freund.Weston@epa.gov>; Jarvis, Simone (she/her/hers) <Jarvis.Simone@epa.gov>; Peevy, Phillip M. <PPeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Craig Ross <craigross@mta-mac.com>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Myers, Dianna (Myers.Dianna@epa.gov) <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Hicks, Edward P <EHicks@dot.ga.gov>; Williams, Jacqueline R <JWilliams@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: MEETING MINUTES--IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP and MATS 2050 MTP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From:	Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA)
To:	Michael Greenwald; Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA); mcanizares@dot.ga.gov; Grodzinsky, Gil; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Freund, Weston (he/him/his); Jarvis, Simone (she/her/hers); Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov); Craig Ross; McLoyd, Johnathan G; Myers, Dianna (Myers.Dianna@epa.gov); Ted Kicks; Williams, Jacqueline R
Subject:	RE: MEETING MINUTES--IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP and MATS 2050 MTP
Date:	Thursday, April 4, 2024 8:24:25 AM

[WARNING - EXTERNAL EMAIL] This email originated from outside Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning. Do NOT click links or open attachments from this email unless you know the sender and trust the content. If you suspect this email to be a phishing attempt, please forward this email to MBIT-Admin@mbpz.org.

Good morning Michael;

Thank you for the detailed and timely minutes.

My only other comment is to ensure that this amendment to the TIP and MTP indicates a number. For instance, Amendment #1 to the FY 2024 – 2027 TIP. I don't know how many amendments have been done on the current MTP, but that should be indicated as well. Going forward, all amendments must show the corresponding amendment # as well. Please incorporate these details into the AQ Conformity SOP.

Thank you,

Ann-Marie Day
Planning Team Leader
FHWA Georgia Division
75 Ted Turner Drive, Suite 1000
Atlanta, GA 30303
Voice: 404-562-3639
Cell: 470-925-0563
Fax: 404-562-3703
Email: ann-marie.day@dot.gov

From: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 5:36 PM
To: Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA) <Olivia.Lewis@dot.gov>; mcanizares@dot.ga.gov; Grodzinsky, Gil <gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov>; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Freund, Weston (he/him/his) <Freund.Weston@epa.gov>; Jarvis, Simone (she/her/hers) <Jarvis.Simone@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Craig Ross <craigross@mta-mac.com>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Myers, Dianna (Myers.Dianna@epa.gov) <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Ted Kicks

<EHicks@dot.ga.gov>; Williams, Jacqueline R <JWilliams@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: MEETING MINUTES--IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP and MATS 2050 MTP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

[CAUTION] This email originated from inside Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning. Do NOT click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon IAC Members,

Following up on yesterday's Zoom Call, I am submitting the following meeting summary. Per EPA's comments during the meeting (Time Index +24:55), these meeting minutes serve as documentation that the assembled members agreed to categorize the list of projects proposed for Amendment (GDOT PI #0013712, #0014072, #0019088, #0019933, #0019934, #0019935, #0019936, #0019945, and #0020056) and Administrative Modification (GDOT PI #0017231) at the MATS Policy Committee meeting on 5/1/2024 are considered Exempt from Air Quality Conformity Determination review. See highlighted portion below.

As described in the minutes of the call below, GDOT and FHWA have decided that the original comment clock started on March 21, 2024 is still in effect. Therefore, for anyone who did not attend the call, in accordance with the procedures specified under Section 5.3 of the MATS 2050 AQCD currently in place, if MATS does not receive comments by **April 8, 2024**, MATS will presume there is concurrence/are no objections with the findings described below, and proceed through the remainder of the TIP and MTP amendment adoption process.

If you have any questions or corrections for the record, please let me know as soon as possible.

Yours truly,

Michael J. Greenwald, Ph.D., AICP
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | **NEW NUMBER: 478-241-2566**
MaconMPO.com

IAC Meeting Minutes for Consultation on Proposed Project Amendments and Administrative Modifications for Scheduled for Approval at MATS Policy Committee Meeting on 5/1/2024

Date: 4/2/2024 @ 1:33 p.m.
Location: On-Line Zoom Call

Attendance:

- Dr. Mike Greenwald, MATS MPO
- Ann-Marie Day, FHWA Division Office
- Dianna Myers, U.S. EPA Region 4 Office
- Vivian Canizares, GDOT Office of Planning
- Dr. Gil Grodzinsky, GA Environmental Protection Division—Air Protection Branch
- Ted Hicks, GDOT Office of Planning
- Jackie Williams, GDOT Office of Planning

Mike Greenwald led off the discussion by stating MATS MPO considered this call a start over of the IAC process originally begun with e-mail notification on 3/21/2024. Vivian Canizares stated that GDOT has stated twice that they would like to continue the existing process. GDOT's intent was to continue with FHWA as the lead agency, and move on. Ms. Canizares asked for FHWA to provide additional approval.

Mike Greenwald said that he was fine either with starting the process over from 4/2/2024, or continuing the existing process started on 3/21/2024; the final determination is at the discretion of FHWA.

Ann-Marie Day stated that she did not receive any information from Olivia (i.e., Olivia Lewis, FHWA planner assigned to the MATS MPO) in terms of re-starting, that FHWA just wanted to re-start the conversation now that they were receiving documentation in an acceptable format. Ms. Day observed that Dianna Myers (U.S. EPA) received the information late, so FHWA was unsure if EPA had an opportunity to fully review the updates. Ms. Day specifically stated that FHWA had only seen the project summary, and not the details for the full amendment process and what that would look like.

Mike Greenwald responded that the only change between this call and what was sent on 3/21/2024 was the addition of the Excel project summary spreadsheet. He asked GDOT staff to speak to any other materials that IAC may want to see. Dr. Greenwald stated that while he didn't send the entire 2050 MTP document (several hundred pages) in the 3/21/2024 e-mail, if FHWA feels that is necessary, that document could be compiled for review. The documents that were shared with the IAC included the updated drafts of the two chapters showing

consistency in projects listed in the TIP and MTP, and the update to demonstration fiscal balancing. There was also an additional chapter that had nothing to do with IAC i.e., the updating of Performance Measures to reflect the PM1 Safety Target updates adopted by GDOT on 8/31/2024, which should have gone on the February 2024 MATS agenda; that PM update will be on the May 1, 2024 MATS Policy Committee meeting agenda.

In response, Vivian Canizares stated that while the information previously provided by Dr. Greenwald was extensive, in order for other agencies to review, the group needs to see the package of what is being proposed for amendment, rather than full documents.

Mike Greenwald responded that when the original materials were sent out on 3/12/2024, the proposed amendment sections were highlighted in the attached documents. Is GDOT asking that the preference is to have a side by side comparison with the existing draft? Ms. Canizares responded that all she wanted was the material be presented in same way that it was to be presented to the MATS Technical Coordinating Committee (MATS TCC). Mike Greenwald responded that the only thing he provides to the MATS committees is the proposed updated sheets, because that's all they want to see, and the existing sheets are already included in the current MATS TIP and MTP documents.

Ann-Marie stated concurrence with Ms. Canizares' point that all FHWA wants to see is the existing sheet and the proposed amended worksheet, in order to facilitate IAC review. Vivian followed up that while Dr. Greenwald did highlight the proposed changes, providing a link to the current versions of the MTP and TIP for comparison purposes would facilitate meeting the goal of comparing the current documents with the proposed changes.

Dr. Gil Grodzinsky said he reviewed the documents both times (i.e., the attachments in both the 3/21/2024 e-mail, and the 4/2/2024 IAC meeting call invitation) and was able to discern both times which ones were new from the documentation provided, and, while not being completely familiar with the fiscal constraint requirements, it appears that there was enough information to determine that the projects proposed for amendment do, in fact, meet the requirements for being classified as Air Quality Exempt. Dr. Grodzinsky reiterated that he would defer to GDOT and FHWA on the determination of fiscal constraint (which he thought had been met).

Dianna Myers stated that she appreciated the project pages being included in the Excel spreadsheet, that it made it easier to follow/trace the proposed changes. The only suggestion was that in Column H, the full citation for the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section should be cited (i.e., "40 CFR 93.126 – Table 2" instead of simply "40 CFR 93").

Ann-Marie Day asked for clarification on GDOT PI #0017231: Is this project replacing GDOT PI #0019088? Mike Greenwald responded that GDOT PI #0019088 was being consolidated into GDOT PI #0017231, since these were bridge projects at the same location, the only difference being that one was Northbound and the other Southbound. GDOT requested of MATS staff

that GDOT PI #0019088 be cancelled due to the consolidation. Ted Hicks from GDOT Office of Planning confirmed that the projects were, in fact, being consolidated. Ms. Day asked if this would be handled as an Administrative Modification, or an Amendment? Mr. Hicks responded that it would require an Amendment, since a project was being removed entirely from the TIP and the MTP. Mike Greenwald provided further context, stating that while GDOT PI #0019088 being removed is an amendment, there is also a separate Administrative Modification to increase the budget for GDOT PI 0017231 from $350,000 to $357,000. A $7,000 increase is allowed to be processed as an Administrative Modification because it is below the dollar amount requiring a formal amendment.
Ms. Day followed up with the question for the group: Does IAC want to include Administrative Modifications with Amendments as part of the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for IAC review? Administrative Modifications are capable of proceeding more quickly, since they don't require going out for public comment or for a Policy Committee vote. Vivian Canizares stated she concurred with FHWA's assessment of not overcomplicating the process.

Mike Greenwald summarized that the consensus of the participants on the call is that the projects were going to be considered Air Quality Exempt. Dr. Greenwald asked that if the individual members of the call, or at least the individual agencies, could send a response e-mail stating concurrence with the Air Quality Exempt status, so that there would be documentation for the IAC communications log in the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP. MATS staff would continue to develop the SOPs, as requested. Ann-Marie Day stated that since the call was being recorded, why is there a need for an additional e-mail follow up? Gil Grodzinsky expressed concurrence with Ms. Day's point. Dr. Greenwald re-iterated that he was only asking for a written communication so that he had something for the IAC communication logs in the TIP, and that he was fine with sending a follow up e-mail saying the group concurred with the finding of Air Quality Exempt status for the listed projects. Dianna Myer said that the meeting minutes would serve as the needed documentation.

Gil Grodzinsky asked a follow up question about what was required for demonstrating fiscal constraint? Will concurrence on fiscal constraint require additional e-mails, or can that concurrence be handled on this call as well?

Mike Greenwald responded that IAC concurrence on this call for fiscal constraint would count. The conclusion would be the group recognizes that the projects are Exempt for Air Quality Conformity review, and that fiscal constraint has been demonstrated. Dr. Greenwald asked for concurrence by FHWA. Ann Marie Day said that the Excel spreadsheet was what ARC used to not overly complicate the discussions with concerns about fiscal constraint, and that Olivia Lewis had not expressed any concerns regarding fiscal constraint for the set of Amendments or Administrative Modifications proposed here.

Ann Marie followed up that for future amendments there is the possibility of two different process flows that would need to be followed. For projects that are determined to be Exempt from Air Quality Conformity review, the process is for the projects proceed to public comment,

review by the MATS Committees, with final adoption by the MATS Policy Committee if there are no significant comments received for the proposed project Amendments and/or Administrative Modifications. If there is at least one project on the list that is Non-Exempt, MATS would have to return to FHWA and receive a Short Form Conformity Determination from FHWA after adoption by the MATS Policy Committee.

Mike Greenwald said this was good to know, because he anticipated there would be a Non-Exempt project coming up for Amendment consideration in late 2024: GDOT PI #0017121 (Bass Rd. Phase 1). Vivian Canizares asked for clarification on what was being anticipated. Dr. Greenwald responded that, based on participation on the monthly project calls with the Atlas Consulting team (i.e., the designated GDOT consultant for the project), the budget line in the MTP and TIP will substantially increase. A number can't be nailed down until Atlas is through their Public Information Open House. Ms. Canizares reminded the group that the specific project will have to go through its own fiscal constraint analysis. Mike Greenwald said he understood, and was only speaking to the issue of whether or not GDOT PI #0017121 was Non-Exempt or Exempt for Air Quality Conformity Determination analysis.

Vivian Canizares followed up with the observation that GDOT relies on MPO staff to make the initial determination of whether or not a project is Exempt or Non-Exempt for Air Quality Conformity Review, using 40 CFR 93.126 and 40 CFR 93.127, and examples from the Atlanta. She said it was not appropriate for GDOT to tell the MPO which projects were Exempt or Non-Exempt. Ann-Marie Day interjected, summarizing that the MPO staff would take responsibility for the initial classification of a project, and then ask IAC if they concurred in the determination. IAC has final determination of whether or not a project is Exempt or Non-Exempt from Air Quality Conformity Review.

Mike Greenwald closed the meeting with a re-statement that it appears the group agrees with the finding of Exempt from Air Quality Conformity review for the list of proposed project Amendments and Administrative Modification. Ann-Marie Day emphasized the focus on the specific projects on the list, not the list itself.

Call Ends at 2:01 p.m. on 4/2/2024

From:	Michael Greenwald
To:	Olivia Lewis; mcanizares@dot.ga.gov; Grodzinsky, Gil; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Freund, Weston (he/him/his); Jarvis, Simone (she/her/hers); Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov); Craig Ross; McLoyd, Johnathan G; Myers, Dianna (Myers.Dianna@epa.gov); Ann-Marie Day (ann-marie.day@dot.gov); Ted Kicks
Subject:	IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP and MATS 2050 MTP
Start:	Tuesday, April 2, 2024 1:30:00 PM
End:	Tuesday, April 2, 2024 2:00:00 PM
Location:	Zoom Meeting (see link below)
Attachments:	MATSMPO_IACReviewTable_FY2024_2027.xlsx TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240329_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf Chapter06_Roads_and_Bridges_Projects_20240501_UPDATE_20240329_REDUCED_SIZE.pdf MATS 2050 MTP_Chapter08_Fiscal_Assessment_20240501_UPDATE_IACCommentDraft.pdf image001.jpg

Good afternoon IAC members,

Pursuant to the requirements of the 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination for the MATS MPO area (MATS 2050 AQCD; adopted by MATS 5/3/2022; amended 9/28/2023 https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/MATS_AirQualityConformityDeterminationReport_2050MTP_20230928_AMENDED.pdf), MATS MPO is submitting the attached documentation for review for proposed amendments to the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP and MATS 2050 MTP. For your convenience, the proposed amendments are summarized in the attached Excel spreadsheet, and in the draft versions of the MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, and Chapters 6 and 8 of the MATS 2050 MTP. Update pages in the draft MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, and Chapters 6 and 8 of the MATS 2050 MTP are highlighted in yellow, and these drafts are identical to what will be presented to the MATS CAC, TCC and Policy Committees on April 10, April 17 and May 1, 2024, respectively. These Amendments and Administrative Modifications are anticipated to be released for a 15 day public comment period (pursuant to the requirements set forth in the MATS Public Participation Plan: https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/MATS_PublicParticipationPlan_20211013-FINAL.pdf, pg. 13) after presentation to the MATS Citizens' Advisory Committee on April 10, 2024

MATS MPO staff is requesting a video call on 4/2/2024 to review and discuss these amendments. The meeting link is here:

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89813944151?pwd=VVI3bUYvSHZDeS96YjZBcWdEUkprUT09

If you cannot make the proposed meeting, please send any comments or questions to the entire recipient list for this message by April 17, 2024. In accordance with the procedures specified under Section 5.3 of the MATS 2050 AQCD currently in place, if MATS does not receive comments by April 17, 2024, MATS will presume there is concurrence/are no objections and proceed through the remainder of the TIP and MTP amendment adoption process.

In accordance with requirements under Federal regulations and the most recent guidance related to the designation of the MATS area as Maintenance area for the 1997 8-hour Ozone air quality standard, MATS hereby states:

* The proposed projects are Exempt for air quality analysis for Ozone. MATS was found to be conforming with the 1997 NAAQS for Ozone during the original model run (dated 4/26/2016; .065 ppm); The latest design value (i.e., model run result) maintains and improves upon that original conformity finding (as per e-mail communication with Georgia Dept. of Environmental Protection - Air Protection Branch on or about 5/22/2023; .058 ppm). This design value is well below both the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS (.084 ppm) and the 2015 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS (0.075 ppm).
As summarized in the attached Excel spreadsheet, the proposed amendments meet the requirements for designation as Exempt under 40 CFR 93 (specifically falling under the list of Air Quality Conformity Review Exempt projects described in 40 CFR 93.126 – Table 2).
* The proposed plan update meets fiscal constraint requirements of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required under 23 CFR 450.324(11);
* The proposed plan update has been evaluated against the most recent planning assumptions, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.110. Because the latest applicable conformity determination for the MATS region does not identify any required Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), none have been applied in the evaluation of the proposed project update;
* Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.109(c), the proposed plan update does not create the requirement for a regional emissions analysis. MATS latest conformity review with a regional emissions analysis was determined on 4/27/2016 by U.S. EPA Region IV, wherein the MPO region was found to be in conformity with applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards."

Thank you very much for your attention in this matter.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald

Michael J. Greenwald, Ph.D., AICP
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | NEW NUMBER: 478-241-2566
MaconMPO.com <http://www.maconmpo.com/>

From:	Grodzinsky, Gil
To:	Michael Greenwald
Subject:	RE: IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP, Associated Amendments for the MATS 2050 MTP, and Adoption of CY 2024 PM 1 Safety Targets
Date:	Thursday, March 21, 2024 9:58:22 AM

[WARNING - EXTERNAL EMAIL] This email originated from outside Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning. Do NOT click links or open attachments from this email unless you know the sender and trust the content. If you suspect this email to be a phishing attempt, please forward this email to MBIT-Admin@mbpz.org<mailto:MBIT-Admin@mbpz.org>.

Hi Mike:
I received your email this morning. My only comments are that the projects that are highlighted seem to be exempt but of course will need to be confirmed by the IAC. As for the design value for ozone, based on 2021-2023 years, it is now 62 ppb.

Thanks!

Gil

Gil Grodzinsky, Ph.D.
Supervisory Modeler (MOVES)
Emissions and Control Strategies Unit
Air Protection Branch
GA Environmental Protection Division (EPD)
470-524-0604
gil.grodzinsky@dnr.state.ga.us

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2024 9:13 AM
To: Grodzinsky, Gil <Gil.Grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov>
Subject: RE: IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP, Associated Amendments for the MATS 2050 MTP, and Adoption of CY 2024 PM 1 Safety Targets

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

[CAUTION] This email originated from inside Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning. Do NOT click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Gil,

Thanks for the help/confirmation.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300 Macon, GA 31201 | NEW NUMBER: 478-241-2566

-----Original Message-----
From: Grodzinsky, Gil <Gil.Grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2024 9:07 AM
To: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Subject: Read: IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP, Associated Amendments for the MATS 2050 MTP, and Adoption of CY 2024 PM 1 Safety Targets

[WARNING - EXTERNAL EMAIL] This email originated from outside Macon-Bibb Planning and Zoning. Do NOT click links or open attachments from this email unless you know the sender and trust the content. If you suspect this email to be a phishing attempt, please forward this email to MBIT-Admin@mbpz.org<mailto:MBIT-Admin@mbpz.org>.

From: Michael Greenwald
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2024 8:27 AM
To: Olivia Lewis <olivia.lewis@dot.gov>; mcanizares@dot.ga.gov; Grodzinsky, Gil <gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov>; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Freund, Weston (he/him/his) <Freund.Weston@epa.gov>; Jarvis, Simone (she/her/hers) <Jarvis.Simone@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Craig Ross <craigross@mta-mac.com>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>
Cc: Ann-Marie Day (ann-marie.day@dot.gov) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Ted Kicks <EHicks@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: IAC Consultation--Proposed Project Amendments to MATS FY 2024 - 2027 TIP, Associated Amendments for the MATS 2050 MTP, and Adoption of CY 2024 PM 1 Safety Targets

Good morning IAC members,

Pursuant to the requirements of the 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination for the MATS MPO area (MATS 2050 AQCD; adopted by MATS 5/3/2022; amended 9/28/2023 https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/MATS_AirQualityConformityDeterminationReport_2050MTP_20230928_AMENDED.pdf), MATS MPO is submitting the attached documentation for review and comments on the amendments listed below the signature bloc at the end of this e-mail. For

your convenience, all amendments in the attached documents have been **highlighted in yellow.**

These Amendments and Administrative Modifications are anticipated to be released for a 15 day public comment period (pursuant to the requirements set forth in the MATS Public Participation Plan: https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/MATS_PublicParticipationPlan_20211013-FINAL.pdf, pg. 13) **after presentation to the MATS Citizens' Advisory Committee on April 10, 2024**.

In accordance with requirements under Federal regulations and the most recent guidance related to the designation of the MATS area as Maintenance area for the 1997 8-hour Ozone air quality standard, MATS hereby states:

- **The proposed projects are Exempt for air quality analysis for Ozone.** MATS was found to be conforming with the 1997 NAAQS for Ozone during the original model run (dated 4/26/2016; .065 ppm); The latest design value (i.e., model run result) maintains and improves upon that original conformity finding (as per e-mail communication with Georgia Dept. of Environmental Protection - Air Protection Branch on or about 5/22/2023; .058 ppm). This design value is well below both the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS (.084 ppm) and the 2015 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS (0.075 ppm).
  All but one of the proposed project amendments are for bridge repair/replacement projects, and none of the proposed projects involve expansion of road capacity.
  The adoption of the Statewide PM1 Safety Targets for CY 2024 is an administrative step not related to air quality analysis.
- **The proposed plan update meets fiscal constraint requirements of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required under 23 CFR 450.324(11);**
- **The proposed plan update has been evaluated against the most recent planning assumptions, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.110. Because the latest applicable conformity determination for the MATS region does not identify any required Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), none have been applied in the evaluation of the proposed project update;**
- **Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.109(c), the proposed plan update does not create the requirement for a regional emissions analysis.** MATS latest conformity review with a regional emissions analysis was determined on 4/27/2016 by U.S. EPA Region IV, wherein the MPO region was found to be in conformity with applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards."

Please send any comments or questions to the entire recipient list for this message by **April 8, 2024**. In accordance with the procedures specified under Section 5.3 of the MATS 2050 AQCD currently in place, if MATS does not receive comments by the close of this comment period, MATS will presume there are no objections and proceed through the remainder of the TIP and MTP amendment process.

Thank you very much for your attention in this matter.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald

Michael J. Greenwald, Ph.D., AICP
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | **NEW NUMBER: 478-241-2566**
MaconMPO.com

- **Amendments to MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP.** Specifically, the following projects are being added at the request of the identified partner agencies:
  - **Add PM 1 Safety Targets for CY 2024 to Introduction, and System Performance Report (appendix).** – See pgs. 9, 65, 75 and 94 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
    - Targets provided by GDOT on September 28, 2023
    - Targets were to be added to TIP and MTP by February 27, 2024, but were missed in January/February 2024 meeting cycle.
  - **Augment GDOT PI 0013712** – SR 11/SR 49/US 41 @ Norfolk Southern #734080Y (1.4 miles South of Macon; Bridge Replacement Project) – See pgs. 26 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
    - Increase FY 2024 budget from $15,158,410 to $19,021,722.74 (+$3,863,312.74; 20.79%)
    - Adjust funding categories for Construction and Utilities activities from GDOT Funding Code Y001 (STBG funding) to Y114 (Highway Improvement Program bridge formula funding)
    - Amendment initiated pursuant to GDOT Office of Planning e-mail request of 3/14/2024
  - **NEW PROJECTS FOR FY 2024 – 2027 TIP:**
    - **Add GDOT PI 0014072** – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound at Walnut Creek (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 28 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
      - Reinstatement of existing project from FY 2021 – 2024 TIP, pursuant to GDOT Office of Planning e-mail request of 2/22/2024

- Total Cost: $21,565,645.00; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $19,636,645.00

- **Add GDOT PI 0019933** – I-75 @ Rocky Creek (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 36 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
  - New project, added at the request of GDOT Office of Planning, pursuant to e-mail request of 3/14/2024
  - Total Cost: $19,400,000; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $1,100,000
- **Add GDOT PI 0019934** – I-475 Southbound & Northbound @ Tobesofkee Creek 3 miles South of Macon (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 37 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
  - New project, added at the request of GDOT Office of Planning, pursuant to e-mail request of 3/14/2024
  - Total Cost: $23,000,000; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $1,700,000
- **Add GDOT PI 0019935** – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ CSX #636057K & Boggy Branch 1.5 Miles East of Macon (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 38 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
  - New project, added at the request of GDOT Office of Planning, pursuant to e-mail request of 3/14/2024
  - Total Cost: $29,000,000; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $1,700,000
- **Add GDOT PI 0019936** – I-16 Eastbound & Westbound @ Ocmulgee River Overflow 2 Miles East of Macon (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 39 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
  - New project, added at the request of GDOT Office of Planning, pursuant to e-mail request of 3/14/2024
  - Total Cost: $13,000,000; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $1,700,000
- **Add GDOT PI 0019945** – SR 19/SR87 Southbound & Northbound @ Walnut Creek (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 40 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
  - New project, added at the request of GDOT Office of Planning, pursuant to e-mail request of 3/14/2024
  - Total Cost: $13,600,000; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $1,700,000
- **Add GDOT PI 0020056** – Bondsview Rd. from West of Stone Creek to SR 87 (Roadway Improvement Project) – See pg. 41 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
  - New project, added at the request of Macon-Bibb County Engineering Dept.
  - Project road base improvement and grading (no capacity expansion), shoulder reconditioning, drainage headwall improvements along a 1.06 mile stretch of Bondsview Road with

access to 800 acres of Wildlife refuge land.
        - Project is funded through Federal Land Access Program (FLAP) at 100% Federal funding
        - Total Cost: $490,000; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $490,000
    - **Remove GDOT PI 0019088** (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 35 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
        - Project removed pursuant to GDOT request of 3/18/2024. This project was included in the original FY 2024 – 2027 TIP, but has been **cancelled and consolidated** into existing project GDOT PI #0017231
  - **Adjust funding calculations in Chapter 3 to reflect additional revenues anticipated by GDOT to pay for the a NEW PROJECTS described immediately above.** – See pgs. 43 through 46 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
- **Administrative Modifications to MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP**
  - **Increase funding for GDOT PI 0017231** - SR 19/SR22/US 129 @ Sand Creek (Bridge Replacement Project) – See pg. 33 in **TIP2024_2027_UPDATE_20240318_DRAFT_ReducedSize.pdf**
    - Add $7,000 to ROW funding in FY 2025
    - Total Cost: $9,883,170.03; Cost in FY 2024 – 2027 TIP: $357,000
- **Amendments to MATS 2050 MTP**
  - **Amend Chapter 6 – Roads & Bridges Projects to reflect the following:**
    - Adoption of MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP;
    - Individual project amendments described in MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP to master Roads & Bridges projects list;
    - Continued demonstration of fiscal balancing, as required per 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), 23 CFR 450.326(i) and MATS 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report
  - **Amend Chapter 8 – Fiscal Balance, to demonstrate overall continued fiscal constraint for MATS 2050 MTP subsequent to MATS FY 2024 – 2027 TIP adoption.** This amendment is being processed to maintain consistency with requirements in 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11), 23 CFR 450.326(i) and MATS 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report.
  - **Amend Chapter 13 - Performance-Based Transportation Planning and Programming.** This amendment incorporates the Statewide CY 2024 PM 1 Safety Performance Measure targets transmitted by GDOT on September 28, 2023, in accordance with the requirements described in the e-mails from FHWA on 1/11/2023 and 2/23/2024.

IAC Correspondence E-Mail Log for
MATS 2050 MTP Amendments
Adopted - June 13, 2022

From:	Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA)
To:	Michael Greenwald; Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA)
Cc:	Myers, Dianna; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; LaRocca, Sarah; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov); rsimpson dot.ga.gov; Tom Caiafa; Kaniz Sathi; McLoyd, Johnathan G; Walker, Robin; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri; Jalen Ford
Subject:	RE: STATUS UPDATE: IAC Consultation For Upcoming MATS 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021-2024 TIP Amendments
Date:	Wednesday, May 18, 2022 8:57:13 AM

Good morning Mike;

Macon MPO question - Just to close the loop on all the amendment items; can I also conclude that the TIP amendments related to the Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority are also Exempt, and therefore conformity determination will not be needed for those either?

FHWA's response – yes, those transit projects are exempt from conformity.

Thank you,

Ann-Marie Day
Planning Team Leader
FHWA Georgia Division
61 Forsyth Street, SW Suite 17T100
Atlanta, GA 30303
Voice: 404-562-3639
Fax: 404-562-3703
Email: ann-marie.day@dot.gov

From: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 8:39 AM
To: Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA) <Olivia.Lewis@dot.gov>
Cc: Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Myers, Dianna <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; LaRocca, Sarah <Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; rsimpson dot.ga.gov <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford <JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: RE: STATUS UPDATE: IAC Consultation For Upcoming MATS 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021-2024 TIP Amendments
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Olivia,

Thanks very much for the confirmation. Just to close the loop on all the amendment items; can I also conclude that the TIP amendments related to the Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority are also Exempt, and therefore conformity determination will not be needed for those either?

Thanks again for your help with this.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9472
MaconMPO.com

From: Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA) <Olivia.Lewis@dot.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 5:45 PM
To: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Cc: Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Myers, Dianna <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; LaRocca, Sarah <Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; rsimpson dot.ga.gov <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford <JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: RE: STATUS UPDATE: IAC Consultation For Upcoming MATS 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021-2024 TIP Amendments

Michael,
It has been verified that the Road diet project, PI# 0018327, is exempt as well. Therefore, a conformity determination will not be needed.

Thank you
Olivia Lewis
FHWA GA Division
Transportation Planner
Olivia.lewis@dot.gov

From: Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA)
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 4:42 PM
To: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Cc: Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Myers, Dianna <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; LaRocca, Sarah <Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; rsimpson dot.ga.gov <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford <JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: RE: STATUS UPDATE: IAC Consultation For Upcoming MATS 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021-2024 TIP Amendments

Hello Michael,
In reviewing the listed projects, only one of the listed projects requires a CDR for the FY 2021 – 2024 TIP amendment and possibly an amendment to the 2050 MTP (if this project is not in the recently adopted MTP). GDOT PI #0018327 – SR 22/US 80 from CR 5503/Canterbury Rd. to I-75 Southbound Ramp. Preliminary Engineering phase for a Road Diet project on the referenced right of way, to include lane reductions and improved sidewalk, will need a conformity determination to be amended into the MTP and TIP because the project is non-exempt.

The remaining projects are exempt from air quality conformity. However, an amendment to the TIP and if these three projects are not already in the 2050 MTP, an amendment to the MTP must be done as well. Please follow the planning requirements (Public Involvement, must demonstrate fiscal constraint on the TIP and if applicable the MTP, since the below write-up does not demonstrate fiscal constraint, and endorsement by the PC.)

There is only one amendment, not three. There are three projects being amended into the required planning documents TIP and/or MTP. This amendment should be identified as Amendment #1.

Lastly, the TIP must be consistent w/the MTP (these NEW projects must also be in the MTP) and the MPO must demonstrate fiscal constraint in the MTP and TIP.

Thank you
Olivia Lewis
FHWA

From: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2022 4:08 PM
To: Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Myers, Dianna <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA) <Olivia.Lewis@dot.gov>; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; LaRocca, Sarah <Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; rsimpson dot.ga.gov <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford

<JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: STATUS UPDATE: IAC Consultation For Upcoming MATS 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021-2024 TIP Amendments
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon IAC Members,

Following up on the thread below, I wanted to let you know that MATS has not yet started the amendments listed below for the 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021 – 2024 TIP. Judging by the comments received below, there is confusion on what is being proposed, and how it is anticipated to proceed. In the most recent e-mail in this thread (5/11/2022), FHWA asked that the amendments be listed sequentially, and for clarification as to whether or not the proposed amendments were for the MTP, the TIP, or both, demonstration of fiscal constraint, and that both IAC consultation and public involvement procedures have been followed. To address those concerns, this message has three goals:

- Define the exact nature of the proposed amendments;
- Classify each amendment w/r/t the conformity requirements described in the MATS 2050 CDR;
- Explain the status of each amendment

Given that these amendments are all classified as Exempt from air quality analysis for Ozone, it is the intent of MATS to do concurrent IAC Consultation and Public Involvement processes, in accordance with the procedures set for in the 2050 CDR, Sec. 5.2 (https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/MATS_AirQualityConformityDeterminationReport_2050MTP_ADOPTED_20220503.pdf). The IAC Review and Public Involvement processes will begin as soon as the documents are ready for public review. As described in the Status section for each amendment below, we are still waiting for certain steps/documents to be completed.

Here is a description of each amendment:

- **Amendment #1** – Amend the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP as follows:
    - Add line items to FY 2022 and FY 2023 Section 5307 Transit **Capital** Budget to reflect covered activities (see pg. 52, 58, 101 and 102).
        - Additional Cost:
            - FY 2022: $1,220,000 ($976,000 Federal; $122,000 State; $122,000 Local)
            - FY 2023: $2,214,000 ($1,771,200 Federal; $221,400 State; $221,400 Local)
        - Revenues Source: 5307 Grant funding (per communications from Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority and GDOT Office of Intermodal)
    - Add itemized description of anticipated expenses in FY 2022 and FY 2023 for Section 5307 funding (see pg. 52, 58, 101 and 102);
    - Add line item in FY 2022 for Section 5339(a) Transit Capital Budget, to reflect new

monies dedicated from GDOT to assist Macon Transit Authority with purchase of new electric bus, to be used as replacement for an existing diesel bus scheduled for retirement (see pg. 52, 58, 101 and 102);

- Additional Cost: $$750,000 ($600,000 Federal; $0 State; $150,000 Local)
- Revenues Source: 5307 Grant funding (per communications from Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority and GDOT Office of Intermodal)

- Update of Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority Replacement schedule, to reflect fleet expansion from 29 to 32 regular service vehicles, and from 10 to 13 para-transit vehicles (see pg. 60).
- Increase FY 2023 and FY 2024 Section 5307 Operations Budget to reflect full availability of funds to cover MTA operating expenses
  - FY 2023: Increase 5307 Operations budget from $4,267, 630 (Federal: $2,133,815 State: $0; Local: $2,133,815) to $6,400,000 (Federal: $3,200,000 State: $0; Local: $3,200,000)
  - FY 2024: Increase 5307 Operations budget from $4,267, 630 (Federal: $2,133,815 State: $0; Local: $2,133,815) to $6,592,000 (Federal: $3,296,000 State: $0; Local: $3,296,000)
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination Status:**
  - **This proposed MATS AQCD amendment is Exempt for air quality analysis for Ozone.** MATS was found to be conforming with the 1997 NAAQS for Ozone during the original model run (dated 4/26/2016; .065 ppm); The latest model run maintains and improves upon that original conformity finding (as per e-mail communication with Georgia Dept. of Environmental Protection - Air Protection Branch on or about 10/6/2020; .064 ppm).
    The proposed amendments are administrative, in support of purchases and activities by Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority already authorized by GDOT Office of Intermodal, supported by the Sec. 5307 and 5339(a) sub-recipient contracts. With respect to the purchase of the electric bus to replace the retiring diesel bus, this will help to improve all air quality emissions in the MATS planning area.
  - **The proposed plan update meets fiscal constraint requirements of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required under 23 CFR 450.324(11).** All spending described in Amendment #1 is either a detailed statement of existing expenditures, or has been accounted for with new grant funding. See individual items for specific details.
  - **The proposed plan update has been evaluated against the most recent planning assumptions, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.110.** Because the latest applicable conformity determination for the MATS region does not identify any required Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), none have been applied in the evaluation of the proposed project update;
  - **Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.109(c), the proposed plan update does not create the requirement for a regional emissions analysis.** MATS latest conformity review with a regional emissions analysis was determined on 4/26/2016 by U.S. EPA Region IV, wherein the MPO region was found to be in conformity with applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Amendment #1 Status – Awaiting final confirmation of specific budget items from GDOT Office of Intermodal and MTA. Once these are confirmed, MTP, TIP and CDR documents can be fully updated and sent out for IAC and Public Comment

- **Amendment #2** – Amend the MATS 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR, and FY 2021 – 2024 TIP to include a new project: GDOT PI #0018327 – SR 22/US 80 from CR 5503/Canterbury Rd. to I-75 Southbound Ramp. Preliminary Engineering phase for a Road Diet project on the referenced right of way, to include lane reductions and improved sidewalks.
    - GDOT Project Website: https://www.dot.ga.gov/applications/geopi/Pages/Dashboard.aspx?ProjectId=0018327
    - Total Estimated Project Cost: $2,463,000
    - Cost in FY 2021 – 2024: $620,000 (Federal: $558,000; State $62,000)
    - GDOT Funding Source: Y600 (IIJA – Carbon Reduction Program funding)
    - **Air Quality Conformity Determination Status:**
        - **This proposed MATS AQCD amendment is Exempt for air quality analysis for Ozone.** MATS was found to be conforming with the 1997 NAAQS for Ozone during the original model run (dated 4/26/2016; .065 ppm); The latest model run maintains and improves upon that original conformity finding (as per e-mail communication with Georgia Dept. of Environmental Protection - Air Protection Branch on or about 10/6/2020; .064 ppm).
          The proposed amendment involves improvement of pedestrian infrastructure, and removal of lane capacity. These changes are anticipated to result in a net reduction of vehicle movement on this corridor, resulting in lower total emissions for all NAAQS Criteria Pollutants.
        - **The proposed plan update meets fiscal constraint requirements of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required under 23 CFR 450.324(11).** All spending described in Amendment #2 has been accounted for with new grant funding under the IIJA Carbon Reduction Program
        - **The proposed plan update has been evaluated against the most recent planning assumptions, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.110.** Because the latest applicable conformity determination for the MATS region does not identify any required Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), none have been applied in the evaluation of the proposed project update;
        - **Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.109(c), the proposed plan update does not create the requirement for a regional emissions analysis.** MATS latest conformity review with a regional emissions analysis was determined on 4/26/2016 by U.S. EPA Region IV, wherein the MPO region was found to be in conformity with applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards.
    - **Amendment #2 Status** – TIP project sheet has been completed. 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021 – 2024 TIP need to be updated to reflect new fiscal balancing requirements
- **Amendment #3** – Amend the MATS 2050 CDR and FY 2021 – 2024 TIP to include a new project: GDOT PI #0019107 – Truck Parking Expansion (Region 2) Scoping Study
    - GDOT Project Website: https://www.dot.ga.gov/applications/geopi/Pages/Dashboard.aspx?ProjectId=0019107
    - Total Estimated Project Cost: $100,000

Cost in FY 2021 – 2024: $100,000 (Lump Sum Program)

- GDOT Funding Source: Y240 (Surface Transportation Program: Lump Sum Funding – IIJA analogy to GDOT Funding Code Z240)
- **Air Quality Conformity Determination Status:**
  - **This proposed MATS AQCD amendment is Exempt for air quality analysis for Ozone.** MATS was found to be conforming with the 1997 NAAQS for Ozone during the original model run (dated 4/26/2016; .065 ppm); The latest model run maintains and improves upon that original conformity finding (as per e-mail communication with Georgia Dept. of Environmental Protection - Air Protection Branch on or about 10/6/2020; .064 ppm).
    This project is classified under the Lump Sum category, which is a set aside of STIP funding for groups of projects that do not affect the capacity of the roadway. The proposed amendment involves a scoping study for a proposed project, not actual infrastructure construction or utilization.
  - **The proposed plan update meets fiscal constraint requirements of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required under 23 CFR 450.324(11).** All spending described in Amendment #3 has been accounted for with new grant funding under the IIJA
  - **The proposed plan update has been evaluated against the most recent planning assumptions, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.110.** Because the latest applicable conformity determination for the MATS region does not identify any required Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), none have been applied in the evaluation of the proposed project update;
  - **Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.109(c), the proposed plan update does not create the requirement for a regional emissions analysis.** MATS latest conformity review with a regional emissions analysis was determined on 4/26/2016 by U.S. EPA Region IV, wherein the MPO region was found to be in conformity with applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards.
- **Amendment #3 Status** – TIP project sheet has been completed. 2050 MTP, 2050 CDR and FY 2021 – 2024 TIP need to be updated to reflect new fiscal balancing requirements

If you have any questions, please let me know as soon as possible. Thanks in advance for your assistance.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9472
MaconMPO.com

From: Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 1:34 PM
To: Myers, Dianna <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>; Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA) <Olivia.Lewis@dot.gov>; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; LaRocca, Sarah <Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; rsimpson dot.ga.gov <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford <JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: RE: IAC Consultation Request--Permission to being a Concurrent Review for MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 TIP

Good day Mike;

Following up on what Dianna asked:

- MTP amendment – Are these projects going into the MTP or are they are already in the 2050 MTP?
- TIP amendment – Please ensure that this first amendment request is identified as Amendment #1 and subsequent Amendments listed as such.
- Conformity - Please ensure that the CDR is reflective of an amendment to the 2021 – 2024 TIP, fiscal constraint is demonstrated, IAC involvement, and public involvement.

Thank you,

From: Myers, Dianna <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 11:24 AM
To: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>; Day, Ann-Marie (FHWA) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Lewis, Olivia D. (FHWA) <Olivia.Lewis@dot.gov>; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; LaRocca, Sarah <Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; rsimpson dot.ga.gov <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford <JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: RE: IAC Consultation Request--Permission to being a Concurrent Review for MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 TIP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning Michael,

You will need to provide have the Draft Conformity Determination Report for the MTP/TIP Amendment ready for the IAC and the public.

Based on what you are asking, it sounds like the draft CDR will be sent by Friday, May 13th. Is that correct? Also, is it correct that the funding and/or the fact that you are moving the projects from the out year of the MTP is making this an amendment?

Dianna B. Myers
Regional Transportation Conformity Contact
Air Regulatory Management Section-ARD
US Environmental Protection Agency
Phone-(404) 562-9207 Fax-(404) 562-9019
Email-myers.dianna@epa.gov

From: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 9:23 AM
To: ann-marie.day@dot.gov; Olivia Lewis <olivia.lewis@dot.gov>; gil.grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov; Myers, Dianna <Myers.Dianna@epa.gov>; LaRocca, Sarah <Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov>; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Radney Simpson <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford <JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: RE: IAC Consultation Request--Permission to being a Concurrent Review for MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 TIP

Thanks Gil!

Anyone else?

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9472
MaconMPO.com

From: Grodzinsky, Gil <Gil.Grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 8:28 AM
To: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Subject: RE: IAC Consultation Request--Permission to being a Concurrent Review for MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 TIP

Hi Mike:
I concur about the concurrent review (IAC/public review) as long as EPA and FHWA are okay with it. I am off on vacation for 3 days starting now but wanted to respond before your deadline and was waiting on others. Have a good week!

Thanks!

Gil

From: Michael Greenwald <mgreenwald@mbpz.org>
Sent: Friday, May 6, 2022 11:46 AM
To: Ann-Marie Day (ann-marie.day@dot.gov) <ann-marie.day@dot.gov>; Olivia Lewis <olivia.lewis@dot.gov>; Grodzinsky, Gil <Gil.Grodzinsky@dnr.ga.gov>; Myers, Dianna <Myers.dianna@epa.gov>; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Phil M. Peevy (ppeevy@dot.ga.gov) <ppeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Radney Simpson <rsimpson@dot.ga.gov>; Tom Caiafa <tcaiafa@dot.ga.gov>; Kaniz Sathi <KSathi@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Walker, Robin <RWalker@dot.ga.gov>; craigross@mta-mac.com; Jeff Ruggieri <jruggieri@mbpz.org>; Jalen Ford <JFord@dot.ga.gov>
Subject: IAC Consultation Request--Permission to being a Concurrent Review for MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 TIP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning IAC Members,

Following up on conversations during yesterday's staff call with GDOT Office of Planning and FHWA, MATS is requesting that we be allowed to start a concurrent IAC review/public notice for the following TIP and MTP Amendments (see below). If IAC accepts a concurrent review process, MATS

would like to get that started ***sometime between May 9 and May 13***, and finish up 15 days later (sometime around Memorial Day).

Please let MATS staff know by **12:00 noon on Wednesday, 5/11/2022** if anyone has any objections to this concurrent review. A "no response" will hold up the entire process; MATS can't proceed with a concurrent review without the approval of all IAC member agencies (i.e., GDOT Planning, GDOT Intermodal, Macon-Bibb County Transit Authority, FHWA, U.S. EPA Region 4 and Georgia EPD)

The proposed amendments are as follows:

- Amendments to the MATS TIP related to Macon-Transit Authority for FY 2022 and FY 2023 (see attached e-mail thread from 4/20/2022).
- Amend MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 – 2024 to add the following projects
    - GDOT PI #0018327 - SR 22/US 80 From CR 5503/Canterbury Rd TO I-75 SB Ramp. Bibb County. Full Project details at: https://www.dot.ga.gov/applications/geopi/Pages/Dashboard.aspx?ProjectId=0018327
    - GDOT PI #0019088 - SR 11/US 129 NB @ Sand Creek. Jones County - Bridge replacement; PE work in FY 2023 and FY 2024. Full details at: https://www.dot.ga.gov/applications/geopi/Pages/Dashboard.aspx?ProjectId=0019088
    - GDOT PI #0019107 - Truck Parking Expansion – Region 2 – Bibb, Monroe and Dooley Counties. Project is Scoping Only. Full details at: https://www.dot.ga.gov/applications/geopi/Pages/Dashboard.aspx?ProjectId=0019107

The proposed projects contained in the amendment are anticipated to be Exempt for air quality analysis for Ozone, and will meet fiscal constraint. Concurrent IAC/public review is consistent with the approved procedures set forth in Sec. 5.2 of the MATS 2050 Air Quality Conformity Determination Report, found at: https://www.maconmpo.com/air-quality-conformity/

Please let me know if anyone has any questions.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9472
MaconMPO.com

IAC Correspondence E-Mail Log for Original MATS 2050 MTP Adoption - May 3, 2022

From:	Michael Greenwald
To:	Radney Simpson; Tom Caiafa; Kaniz Sathi; craigross@mta-mac.com; Larocca.Sarah@epa.gov; Grodzinsky, Gil; Finch, Ashley M; Myers, Dianna; Olivia Lewis; Ann-Marie Day (ann-marie.day@dot.gov)
Cc:	James Thomas
Subject:	DRAFT FOR REVIEW--MATS Update to CDR for 2050 MTP Update
Date:	Monday, December 13, 2021 6:24:37 PM
Attachments:	MATS_CDR_DRAFT_For_IAC_Review_20211213.pdf
Importance:	High

Good evening IAC members,

Following up on conversations from our last discussion in November, and subsequent consultation with GDOT and Georgia EPD Air Protection Branch, MATS is submitting for your review the proposed update language to the Conformity Determination Report for the 2050 MTP Update. The attached document contains the following elements:

- The draft language of the CDR (based on the template language provided for the current MATS CDR for the 2040 LRTP, which was developed in consultation with the IAC after the South Coast II decision);
- The MATS MTP Roads & Bridges Project List for the 2050 MTP Update (approved by MATS Policy Committee on 12/9/2021)
- pursuant to the requirements of both the CDR and 23 CFR 450.324(11), a statement of projected revenue (provided by GDOT Office of Planning in June 2021), and a related demonstration of revenue balancing.

As listed in the watermark for each page, THIS DOCUMENT IS A DRAFT. It is NOT intended for circulation outside the IAC group at this point. It is being sent out for early review by the IAC members for the convenience of the members of this group, so that they might have an extended look at the document and have additional time to ask any questions or request edits.

The official review period for the CDR and the MTP documents will begin on or around February 2, 2022. If anyone has any questions or concerns they would like MATS to address before the document goes out for that formal review period, please let us know as soon as you can.

Thank you for your continued support in this process.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9472
MaconMPO.com

Michael Greenwald

From: Michael Greenwald
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 3:23 PM
To: CScott@georgia.org; Gil.Grodzinsky@dnr.state.ga.us; CEidson@georgia.org; region6@dca.ga.gov; ppeevy@dot.ga.gov; Doug.Faour@tbiam.aero; WJackson@maconbibb.us; shawkins@maconbibb.us; jason.rizner@jonescountyga.org; Tim@jonescountyga.org; Tiffany.Davis@jonescountyga.org; kfortner@monroecoga.org; mjackson@monroecoga.org; ann-marie.day@dot.gov; olivia.lewis@dot.gov; Keith.Melton@dot.gov; Myers.dianna@epa.gov; gboike@mg-rc.org; carla_beasley@nps.gov; craigross@mta-mac.com; Conner.Poe@nscorp.com
Cc: Greg Brown
Subject: FOLLOW UP--REQUEST FOR COMMENTS: MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report Update

Importance: High

Good Afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen,

Apologies for multiple emails on this topic. Some of the recipients on this list have indicated that the watermarks in the original files may make it difficult to read the underlying documents. To clarify the situation, we have removed the watermarks and placed the word "Draft" at the top of the main manuscript pages. The links to the updated documents drafts can be found at the following links:

- Draft 2050 MTP (Watermark Removed): https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/DRAFT_MATS2050MTP_22020202_RemoveWatermark.pdf
- Draft CDR Update (Watermark Removed): https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/MATS_CDR_DRAFT_For_IAC_Review_20211213_RemoveWatermark.pdf

The links from the MATS homepage (www.maconmpo.com) will point to the drafts without the watermarks. For those of you who prefer the drafts with the watermarks intact, the original links below are still active.

Should anyone have any other questions or need any additional assistance in accessing these drafts, please feel free to reach out to us. Thanks again for your assistance, and we look forward to receiving your comments.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald

Michael J. Greenwald, Ph.D., AICP
MPO Technical Coordinator

Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9472
MaconMPO.com

From: Michael Greenwald
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 2:38 PM
To: CScott@georgia.org; Gil.Grodzinsky@dnr.state.ga.us; CEidson@georgia.org; region6@dca.ga.gov; ppeevy@dot.ga.gov; Doug.Faour@tbiam.aero; WJackson@maconbibb.us; shawkins@maconbibb.us; jason.rizner@jonescountyga.org; Tim@jonescountyga.org; Tiffany.Davis@jonescountyga.org; kfortner@monroecoga.org; mjackson@monroecoga.org; ann-marie.day@dot.gov; olivia.lewis@dot.gov; Keith.Melton@dot.gov; Myers.dianna@epa.gov; gboike@mg-rc.org; carla_beasley@nps.gov; craigross@mta-mac.com; Conner.Poe@nscorp.com
Subject: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS: MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination Report Update

Good Afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen,

You are receiving this message because the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) is seeking your agency's comments on our draft 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP) and our draft Air Quality Conformity Determination Report (CDR) Update.

Links to both documents can be found on the MATS homepage (www.maconmpo.com), or through the following direct links:

- Draft 2050 MTP: https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/DRAFT_MATS2050MTP_22020202.pdf
- Draft CDR Update: https://www.maconmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/MATS_CDR_DRAFT_For_IAC_Review_20211213.pdf

Comments may be submitted in a standard written correspondence, or via e-mail. Comments should be submitted to both Mike Greenwald (mgreenwald@mbpz.org) and Greg Brown (gbrown@mbpz.org). Please submit all comments by 5:00 p.m. on March 17, 2022.

MATS is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) covering all of Bibb County, and portions of Jones and Monroe Counties. The MPO is the organization responsible for local coordination of federally supported transportation projects in our Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA).



Pursuant to 23 CFR 450.316(b), MPOs must implement a consultation process with State and local resource agencies in developing Metropolitan Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs. Specifically, "…*the MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by*

transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, tourism, natural disaster risk reduction, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities." MATS recognizes your agency as one such entity which has an interest in the topic areas described.

Please review the information provided at the links above and make appropriate comments regarding any concerns your agency may have related to your agency's area of responsibility. Thank you in advance for your time in this matter, and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours truly,

Mike Greenwald

Michael J. Greenwald, Ph.D., AICP
MPO Technical Coordinator



Macon Area Transportation Study
Terminal Station | 200 Cherry Street, Suite 300
Macon, GA 31201 | 478-338-9472
MaconMPO.com

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
December 13, 2021	Georgia Environmental Protection Division- Air Protection Branch	Dr. Gil Grodzinsky	**1. Typo: Page 6 of 17, second to last paragraph:** "Figure 1 below shows the boundaries of the Macon air quality monitoring area. Macon was initially designated Non-Attainment for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS, effective 15 June 2004 (69 FR 23857). The area was redesignated as Maintenance for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS)), effective on 19 October 2007 (72 FR 53432)." Remove double parentheses after "Maintenance for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS" so it reads "Figure 1 below shows the boundaries of the Macon air quality monitoring area. Macon was initially designated Non-Attainment for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS, effective 15 June 2004 (69 FR 23857). The area was redesignated as Maintenance for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS, effective on 19 October 2007 (72 FR 53432)."	This typo has been corrected.
			2. Typo, Page 7 of 17, first paragraph: "The MATS Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is the lists of specific transportation projects for the MATS planning area." Modify "is the lists" to "is the list" so it reads "The MATS Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is the list of specific transportation projects for the MATS planning area."	This typo has been corrected.
			3. Page 8 of 17, first paragraph "Once US DOT makes its 1997 ozone NAAQS conformity determination for the MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 - 2024 TIP, conformity will be required no less frequently than every four years." It has been that frequency already and this is a frequency requirement assuming no other triggers occur (like an amendment with non-exempt projects). So would recommend modifying the wording to read something like "conformity will not be required for up to 4 years" so it reads "Once US DOT makes its 1997 ozone NAAQS	This change has been applied.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			conformity determination for the MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021 - 2024 TIP, conformity will not be required for up to four years (assuming no other conformity trigger)."	
			4. Page 9 or 17, second paragraph under "Consultation Requirements": "This updated Conformity Determination Report was developed by consultation with the Interagency Consultation (IAC) participants via conference calls in late October and mid December 2018." This first statement I believe should be updated to reflect consultation for this specific update in 2021 with the appropriate months and dates replacing these. For the next statement in this paragraph, that mentions the established procedures going forward that encompass the CDR so those December 2018 to April 2019 time reference is perfect. The idea is the consultation requirements will be applied with each new CDR and it good to list the dates of these consultations with each amendment or update. So this would read "This updated Conformity Determination Report was developed by consultation with the Interagency Consultation (IAC) participants via conference calls in (some date in 2021) and (other date(s) in 2021)."	Commentor's point is well taken. In order to distinguish this CDR update from the original adoption, this paragraph is being re-written as follows: *"This updated Conformity Determination Report was developed by consultation with the Interagency Consultation (IAC) participants via conference calls between November 4, 2021 and December 13, 2021. The following Conformity Determination Review consultation practices were originally adopted by the MATS Policy Committee, based on IAC staff consultations from December 2018 through April 2019 (see Appendix A for full transcript)"*
			5. Last comment is about the project list. I like how on the last pages of the list you mention "widening" or "auxiliary lanes" which imply additional lanes hence clearly non-exempt. Is there a way to clarify in your project descriptions, especially on the first page of projects what makes them really non-exempt? I am referring to purely road and bridge projects. For the bridge projects where it is labelled "bridges" you could maybe just mention in the description "no lane change"	Commentor's point is acknowledged. The most efficient way to address Commentor's concern was to add a discussion in the narrative preceding Table 6-2. The following text has been added to the narrative on page 99: *"In addition to prioritizing the project list, Table 6-2 also provides the following information:* • *Whether or not the project is Exempt from Air Quality Conformity Review. Projects are*

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			and the "bridge reconstruction" project (the priority 1 project) that it does increase lanes if that is why it is non-exempt (if not, explain why). I realize all the "Bridges" are exempt but thought it would be good to mention no capacity change because bridge projects can be non-exempt if lanes increase. Another possibility is to change the label from "Bridges" to "Bridges/No Added Lanes"… Based on inference, I think the choice of exempt/non-exempt look good, just want it to be clarified in the description why so no guessing is involved.	*considered Exempt if they do not involve the construction of any new vehicle capacity (e.g., widening existing lanes or adding new lanes). Examples of Exempt projects include bridge repair and replacement, safety projects, projects improving traffic flow/traffic signalization, and pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure…."*
January 24, 2022	Georgia Environmental Protection Division- Air Protection Branch	Dr. Gil Grodzinsky	**1. Chapter 2, page 3 of 10, last paragraph before last set of bullets:** "The 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP continues the practices first established in the 2040 SWTP/2015 SSTP combines the traditional transportation analyses of the federally required metropolitan transportation plan with the strategic business case for transportation investment required by the State." Typo: Modify "continues the practice" to "continuing the practice" so it reads "The 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP continuing the practices first established in the 2040 SWTP/2015 SSTP combines the traditional transportation analyses of the federally required metropolitan transportation plan with the strategic business case for transportation investment required by the State."	Although the comment is correct that there is a typo in the sentence, the recommended solution would not be grammatically correct. Sentence has been changed to read as follows: "The 2050 SWTP/2021 SSTP continues the practices first established in the 2040 SWTP/2015 SSTP, <u>*combining*</u> the traditional transportation analyses of the federally required metropolitan transportation plan with the strategic business case for transportation investment required by the State (emphasis added)."
			2. Chapter 3, Figure 3.16, page 24-25 of 48: The orange and gray bars are both labelled the same "Worked outside of state residence" but there must be a difference in labels. Is there any missing info in one of the labels or an option for living outside county but in state?	The labels were incorrectly duplicated. The orange bars represent "Worked outside **county** of residence." The labels have been fixed.
			3. Chapter 3, page 19 of 48, paragraph after bullet list: "The proportion of Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			population in the MATS Area is a significant considerations in determining the scope and methods most appropriate to meet the requirements for public participation, as set forth under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 13166, FTA Circular 4702.1B and the FAST Act." Typo. Modify "MATS Area is a significant considerations" to "MATS Area is a significant consideration" so it reads "The proportion of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) population in the MATS Area is a significant consideration in determining the scope and methods most appropriate to meet the requirements for public participation, as set forth under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 13166, FTA Circular 4702.1B and the FAST Act."	
			4. Chapter 3, page 48 of 48, second paragraph: "The results indicate that the MATS area can anticipate approximately 11,588 additional jobs by the target year of 2050. Consistent with the observations from the 2015 base year (see Table 3-6 above), the vast majority of this job growth (11,261 out of 11,588; 97.18%) will accrue to the Macon-Bibb area. Exploring the changes by sector, across the entire MATS region, net job losses are anticipated in the Retail sector (-2,696 jobs), while Service and Manufacturing & TCUW are expected to see significant gains (i.e.,+12,101 jobs and +1,598 jobs, respectively). Significant gains are expected in the Retail (+1,230 jobs) and Service (+11,329 jobs) sectors." a. Table 3-6 provides only population growth information, nothing about job changes. Figure 3-22 provides the information that matches this paragraph so might consider replacing "(Table 3-6 above)" with "(Figure 3-22 above)"	a. Commentor is correct that Table 3-6 should actually be reference to Figures 3-22a through 3-22c. Correction has been made. b. Commentor is correct that the statement is a versioning error. Offending sentence has been deleted.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			b. "Significant gains are expected in the Retail (+1,230 jobs) and Service (+11,329 jobs) sectors.": This statement contradicts the previous ones. Is this an artifact of a different version of this report? If so, remove this sentence.	
			5. General statement: Chapter 1: Are LRTP and MTP interchangeable? In the beginning it was about MTP and then there are references to LRTP. If they are interchangeable, let the reader know at the point you first switch terminology that this is the case so there isn't any confusion. Maybe clarify that when you mention "short term" and "long term" which is on page 5: "The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are, respectively, long and short term lists of specific transportation projects for the MATS planning area." Maybe have it say: "The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are, respectively, long ("LRTP") and short term ("TIP") lists of specific transportation projects for the MATS planning area." I know that the 2040 plan was named "LRTP" and 2050 "MTP" but there are generic references to LRTP planning which apply to the 2050 plan so just recommend making sure terminology is clear to the reader.	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. There is now a clarifying statement in Chapter 1: Significant Changes Since the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Adoption where the relationship between the 2050 MTP and the 2040 LRTP is addressed. The remainder of the 2050 MTP will be edited so that historic references made to the 2040 LRTP document will not be confused with the current 2050 MTP document.
January 25, 2022	FHWA - Georgia Division	Ann-Marie Day Planning Team Leader	**1.** As mentioned in your email, the CDR is a subset of the MTP and must be submitted for official review with the MTP and TIP.	MATS staff is aware of this requirement. The MTP and the CDR have been submitted simultaneously, as separate documents, for IAC partner agency review.
			2. The CDR highlights Planning Assumption and Fiscal Constraint. The MTP is where these are documented. As such, we cannot comment on those areas for completion.	MATS staff acknowledges this comment. The discussions of the planning assumptions and fiscal constraint follow required language elements of the CDR template provided to MATS MPO from

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
				FHWA and U.S. EPA Division 4, as a result of the Federal Court decision in *South Coast Air Quality Mgmt. District v. EPA* (882 F.3d 1138).
			3. During this update, the only recognized TIP is the FY 2021 -2024 so please remove column in the CDR Project List that shows/mentions TIPs.	The project list described in this comment is the full Roads and Bridges project list approved by the MATS Policy Committee for the 2050 MTP. This list was approved on December 9, 2021, and is a core component of the MATS 2050 MTP Ch. 6 – Roads and Bridges. Commentor's point about the FY 2021 – 2024 TIP is duly noted. However, reflecting project expenditure information from previous TIPs is necessary for accurate fiscal balancing calculations. The discrepancy has been resolved by suppressing the table columns for the FY 2014-2017 and FY 2018-2021 TIPs, leaving the FY 2021-2024 TIP visible, and adjusting the header in the final column to read "Total Project Outstanding Balance (i.e., Total Cost - (Sum of Expended/Obligated Funds from Current and All Previous TIPs))"
			4. Since the MPO still has to list exempt/non-exempt projects, please provide more project details/description as well as Project Type so the IAC may concur/not with the assigned air quality status.	All projects in the 2050 MTP Roads and Projects list (Table 6-2) have been designated with Air Quality Exempt/Non-Exempt status. Project Type is already included as a classification column in this table. For projects with specific GDOT Project ID numbers, full descriptions can be found through the GDOT Project website (http://www.dot.ga.gov/BS/Projects/ProjectSearch) In addition, for those projects included in the FY 2021 – 2024 TIP, the TIP document contains the direct link to the full project summary on the GDOT project website. For projects not yet in the TIP/not in the current

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
				GDOT Construction Works Program, a more detailed description is not available at this time. As specific project details are developed further (e.g., concept plans, preliminary engineering and environmental assessment), these projects will be brought before IAC for review and final classification of air quality status.
			5. The MTP must be a multimodal plan; where are the transit projects? Is this total project cost only highway/roadways?	Transit projects are discussed in detail in the 2050 MTP, Chapter 7 – Public Transportation.
			6. How does the MPO determine what projects will move into the next TIP since everything now only show open to traffic/network year. Most MPOs use short, mid, long range.	MATS MPO coordinates with GDOT Office of Planning and Macon-Bibb County Engineering to identify projects to be included in each MTP. As funds and/or other resources become available, GDOT reprioritizes which projects will be pursued.
January 31, 2022	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4: Air Regulatory Management Section - ARD	Dianna B. Myers	*The following comments apply only to the Transportation Conformity Determination Report for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS for the MATS 2050 MTP and MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP (aka "MATS CDR"). At this time, U.S. EPA has not provided any observations on the main MATS 2050 MTP document.* **1. In the Acknowledgements Section**- There is a reference to the 2040 MATS-MTP. Please change to "2050"	This typo has been corrected.
			2. Section 1.1-Transportation Conformity- add "respectively at the end of the 3rd paragraph- for example…(83 FR 25776), respectively.	Commentor's recommended edit has been incorporated.
			3. Section 4.0 -Transportation Conformity Determination: General Process- I recommend making the MATS 2050 MTP and FY 2021-2024 TIP a link for easy access. You could provide the link earlier in the document if you desire.	MATS staff agree with this recommendation. Links have been inserted in the first lines of Sec. 2.0 and Sec. 3.0, respectively, to the page on the MATS website where each document will eventually reside. Links to the pages are deemed more prudent than direct links to the documents themselves, since:

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
				a. The final 2050 MTP document has not yet been approved; and b. Both the 2050 MTP and FY 2021 – 2024 TIP are subject to future amendments. Links to the topic page ensure that anyone seeking the most recent version of these documents can find them, while minimizing any future editing tasks for the MATS CDR.
			4. Section 5.2 Consultation Requirements - Please provide the correct dates for interagency consultation on the documents. We met several times in 2021 and attached the notes in the proper Appendix a. **Pg 10-** You mention the last regional emissions analysis on 4/26/2016 was determined by U.S. EPA Region IV. Conformity determinations are approved by US DOT. Please make a correction here. Also, please refer to EPA "Region IV" as EPA "Region 4"	In accordance with commentor's observations, the referenced paragraph has been re-written as follows: *"MATS latest conformity review with a regional emissions analysis was completed on 4/27/2016 by U.S. Department of Transportation, in coordination with U.S. EPA Region 4. The MATS MPO region was found to be in conformity with applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards."*
			5. Section Amendments- I know you are updating the MTP but I am not clear on whether the FY 2021-2024 TIP is being amended at this time. If there are no amendments to the TIP, I think you can delete the Amendments Section. In Section 3- Transportation Improvement Program-You can say that the FY 2021-2024 TIP adopted 4 November 2020 is being reaffirmed.	In accordance with commentor's observations, the last sentence in Sec., 3.0, Paragraph has been amended to read as follows: *"For this Conformity Determination Report, the MATS FY 2021 – 2024 TIP adopted on November 4, 2020 (and subsequently modified through Administrative Modifications, in accordance with the processes specified in the MATS Public Participation Plan) is hereby reaffirmed."*
January 31, 2022	Georgia Environmental Protection Division- Air Protection Branch	Dr. Gil Grodzinsky	**1. Chapter 7, page 5 of 23:** "In contrast, the Bellvue Express route continues directly along Napier Ave. at the Hillcrest Rd. intersection, avoiding all subsequent route diversions." Typo. Modify "Bellvue" to "Bellevue" so it reads "In contrast, the Bellevue Express route continues directly along	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			Napier Ave. at the Hillcrest Rd. intersection, avoiding all subsequent route diversions."	
			2. Chapter 7, page 7 of 23: "The schedule for the Ocmulgee Express is offset so as minimize service overlap with the normal Ocmulgee – Tom Hill Route." Typo. Modify "so as minimize" to "so as to minimize", so then it reads "The schedule for the Ocmulgee Express is offset so as to minimize service overlap with the normal Ocmulgee – Tom Hill Route."	This typo has been corrected.
			3. Chapter 7, page 12 of 23: "Areas served by this route include the Tindall Heights apartment complex, the Tindal Heights Senior residential towers, Mercer University, Atrium/Navicent Health Center, Macon downtown, and Coliseum Health Center." Typo. Modify "Tindal Heights Senior" to "Tindall Heights Senior" so it reads "Areas served by this route include the Tindall Heights apartment complex, the Tindall Heights Senior residential towers, Mercer University, Atrium/Navicent Health Center, Macon downtown, and Coliseum Health Center."	This typo has been corrected.
			4. Chapter 7, page 15 of 23: **a. First paragraph, line 4**: "Currently, MTA is pursuing plans to to begin additional routes that will serve the southern areas of Macon and Bibb County, to connect the industrial facilties around State Route 247 (Kuhmo Tire and Irving Paper), Interstate 75 (Tractor Supply Inc., Fed Ex, Amazon) and the Middle GA Regional Airport (First Quality Paper Products, Dean Baldwin Painting & Aircraft Maintenance) with potential employees who live in East and Central Bibb County." i. Typo. Modify "plans to to begin" to "plans to begin" ii. Typo. Modify "facilties" to "facilities" so it reads	These typos have been corrected

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			"Currently, MTA is pursuing plans to begin additional routes that will serve the southern areas of Macon and Bibb County, to connect the industrial facilities around State Route 247 (Kuhmo Tire and Irving Paper), Interstate 75 (Tractor Supply Inc., Fed Ex, Amazon) and the Middle GA Regional Airport (First Quality Paper Products, Dean Baldwin Painting & Aircraft Maintenance) with potential employees who live in East and Central Bibb County. " b. Under "Jones County", first paragraph: "While vehicles are regularly maintained as per recommendations in the owners' manuals, they not replaced on a regular schedule." Typo. Modify "they not replaced" to "they are not replaced" so it reads "While vehicles are regularly maintained as per recommendations in the owners' manuals, they are not replaced on a regular schedule."	
			5. **Chapter 7, pages 15-16 of 23:** "Buses" and "Busses" spelling interchanged. Suggest choosing one spelling and staying with it.	The spelling has been standardized throughout this chapter to read "buses"
			6. **Chapter 7, page 23 of 23:** Update blue link to "MATS Participation Plan" to https://www.maconmpo.com/wpcontent/uploads/2021/10/MATS_PublicParticipationPlan_20211013-FINAL.pdf The current link does not seem to work anymore.	This link has been updated
			7. **Chapter 8, page 3 of 10, under "Public Transportation", "Costs and Revenue Estimation", first line:** "As described in Chapter 7 – Public Transportation, the two transit systems operating in the MATS service area Jones County Transit System and the Macon Transit Authority." Typo. Modify "MATS service area Jones County" to	This typo has been corrected

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			"MATS service area are Jones County" so it reads "As described in Chapter 7 – Public Transportation, the two transit systems operating in the MATS service area are Jones County Transit System and the Macon Transit Authority."	
			8. Chapter 8, page 4 of 10, paragraph after bullet list: "Individual riders are not charged for trips qualifying under the various": Missing the end of the sentence. What words follow "under the various?"	The completed sentence now read: "Individual riders are not charged for trips qualifying under the various *programs covered by DHS*"
			9. Chapter 8, page 9 of 10, under "Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax", line 7: "To the extent that projects already on the road and bridges projects list for this 2050 MTP, these projects can have their match paid for through SPLOST funds, either in part or all the way up to the full 20% match requirement. Typo. Modify "To the extent that projects already" to "To the extent that projects are already" so it reads "To the extent that projects are already on the road and bridges projects list for this 2050 MTP, these projects can have their match paid for through SPLOST funds, either in part or all the way up to the full 20% match requirement."	The sentence construction has been simplified. The revised sentence now begins as: *"For projects already included* on the road and bridges projects list for this 2050 MTP…"
			10. Chapter 8, page 10 of 10, first line: "This has a less intense impact fiscal on the local government than financing the match requirement in each of the 5 budget years over which the bridge is being constructed." Very minor. Suggest modifying "fiscal" to "fiscally" so it reads "This has a less intense impact fiscally on the local government than financing the match requirement in each of the 5 budget years over which the bridge is being constructed."	The sentence construction has been simplified. The revised sentence now begins as: "This has a less intense *fiscal impact* fiscal on the local government…"
February	Georgia Dept. of	Kaniz Sathi	**1. Chapter 1, Page 4, 5 & 7:** Please replace all "Long-Range	The requested changes have been made. However,

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
3, 2022	Transportation—Office of Planning		Transportation Plan (LRTP)" with "Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)" to keep integrity of the document and avoid confusion.	when reference is made to the previous planning document (i.e., the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan), the LRTP acronym is maintained, for the sake of naming consistency. Going forward through the remainder of the planning document, the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan will be referred to as "2050 MTP." When reference is made to the 2040 predecessor, that document will continue to be referred to ask the "2040 LRTP."
			2. Chapter 2, Goals & Objectives, Page 3: Please replace the title "Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan & 2015 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan" with "Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan & 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan".	This typo has been corrected.
			3. Chapter 2, Goals & Objectives, Page 4: Please replace the title "Integrating Federal, State, and Local Priorities into the LRTP" with "Integrating Federal, State, and Local Priorities into the MTP".	This typo has been corrected.
			4. Chapter 2, Goals & Objectives, Page 4: Please replace "Table 2-1 shows how the updated goals and objectives approved by the MATS Policy Committee build upon the general goals areas specified in MAP-21, FAST Act, the Georgia 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan and 2015 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan, and the MATS specific goals and objectives adopted as part of the original 2040 LRTP" with "Table 2-1 shows how the updated goals and objectives approved by the MATS Policy Committee build upon the general goals areas specified in MAP-21, FAST Act, the Georgia 2050 Statewide Transportation Plan and 2021 Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan, and the MATS specific goals and objectives adopted as part of the original	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			2040 LRTP".	
			5. **Chapter 3, Sociodemographics and Forecasting, Page 24-25, Figure 3-16a, 316b and 3-16c:** The orange and gray bars are both labelled the same "Worked outside of state residence". Please check and do the corrections if the bars need to be labelled differently.	This mislabeling has been corrected. See response to January 24, 2022 Comment #2, from Dr. Gil Grodzinsky, GA Environmental Protection Division for additional details
			6. **Chapter 3, Sociodemographics and Forecasting, Figure 3-17c:** The description of the Figure "Mode of Travel to Work: Jones County MATS Area" needs to be replaced with "Mode of Travel to Work: Monroe County MATS Area".	This mislabeling has been corrected.
			7. **Chapter 6, Roads and Bridges Projects, Pages 1, 3 and 13 (first paragraphs):** Please replace all "LRTP" with "MTP".	This typo has been corrected.
			8. **Chapter 6, Roads and Bridges Projects, Page 9-11, Table 6-2: MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges Projects List:** During this MATS 2050 MTP update, the only recognized TIP is the FY 2021-2024 (current TIP). So, it's better to remove columns in the Projects List those show TIPs.	Commentors' request has been acknowledged by suppressing the table columns for the FY 2014-2017 and FY 2018-2021 TIPs, leaving the FY 2021-2024 TIP visible, and adjusting the header in the final column to read "Total Project Outstanding Balance (i.e., Total Cost - (*Sum of Expended/Obligated Funds from Current and All Previous TIPs*))"
			9. **Chapter 6, Roads and Bridges Projects, Page 9-11, Table 6-2: MATS 2050 MTP Roads and Bridges Projects List**: It would be good if the projects in the list are delineated by bands which display the shorter-term, mid-term and long-term projects along with priority numbers (already mentioned in the list).	Commentor's **request is not incorporated** at this time. Adding elements to the approved project list is a material change requiring the project list back to the MATS CAC, TCC and Policy Committee for formal approval before proceeding. The requested edit would result in a significant document formatting change, would not add any new information that isn't already available, and would push final MTP adoption beyond the May 3, 2022 hard deadline Commentor's organization has set for this project.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
				If Commentor still feels this change is necessary, it can be incorporated as part of the formal MTP amendment process in forthcoming MATS meetings.
			10. **Chapter 6, Roads and Bridges Projects, Page 13-14, Table 6-3, Column 4:** Typo, please modify "State & Local Sare" to "State & Local Share".	This typo has been corrected.
			11. **Chapter 6, Roads and Bridges Projects, Page 18, Table 6-5: Projects Identified for Further Study and Future Consideration:** During this MATS 2050 MTP update, the only recognized TIP is the FY 2021-2024 (current TIP). So, it's better to remove column in the Projects List that shows TIP.	Commentor's point has been addressed by giving the column a new title. Column heading now reads "In Current TIP?"
			12. **Chapter 7, Public Transportation, Page 1, Introduction:** Please update "This section of the Macon Area Transportation Study (MATS) 2040 LRTP Update provides an overview of the current transit system and ADA service in the MATS area, and any improvements planned in the next six fiscal years (i.e., FY 2018 through FY 2023, inclusive)" based on MATS2050 MTP.	This typo has been corrected.
			13. **Chapter 7, Public Transportation, Page 23, Introduction:** Please replace "PROJECTS FOR FUTURE STUDY, AND THE LRTP AMENDMENT PROCESS" with "PROJECTS FOR FUTURE STUDY, AND THE MTP AMENDMENT PROCESS", and replace all "LRTP" with "MTP" within this section to keep integrity of the document and avoid confusion.	This typo has been corrected.
			14. **Chapter 8, Fiscal Assessment, Page 1, Introduction:** Please replace "2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (LRTP)" with "2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)".	This typo has been corrected.
			15. **Chapter 8, Fiscal Assessment, Page 3, Highway Maintenance Revenue Estimates:** Please replace "Net	This correction has been made, and the referenced tables have been reconciled.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			Highway Capital Revenues Available" with "Net Maintenance Revenues Available", and exclude "Outstanding Road & Bridge Projects in LRTP" to avoid confusion (please revise and match with Chapter 6, Highway Maintenance Revenue Estimates, page 15).	
			16. Chapter 8, Fiscal Assessment, Page 10, Future Amendments: Please replace all "LRTP" with "MTP" within this section to keep integrity of the document and avoid confusion	This correction has been made
February 4, 2022	Georgia Environmental Protection Division- Air Protection Branch	Dr. Gil Grodzinsky	**1. Chapter 4, page 75 of document:** "The Participation Plan defines the process for ensuring that citizens from all segments of the public including, but not limited to, users of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, representatives of the disabled, the poor, and minority communities has an opportunity to be involved in the MTP update." Typo. Modify "has an opportunity" to "have an opportunity"	This typo has been corrected.
			2. Chapter 4, page 76 of document: "Stakeholders met virtually, three times throughout the beginning of the project that were coordinated with regularly scheduled MATS committee meetings." Wording. Did you mean "project" or did you mean "planning process" or "project list development" or something similar? So it could read "Stakeholders met virtually, three times throughout the beginning of the project list development that were coordinated with regularly scheduled MATS committee meetings." OR "Stakeholders met virtually, three times throughout the beginning of the planning process that were coordinated with regularly scheduled MATS committee meetings."?	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. Sentence has been changed to read as follows: "Stakeholders met virtually, three times throughout the beginning of the *planning process. Meetings were coordinated with regularly scheduled MATS committee meetings.*"
			3. Chapter 4, page 77 of document: "The survey launched on November 1 – December 31, 2021, garnering a total	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. Sentence has been changed to read as follows:

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			of 61 responses." Launched would only refer to the first day. Modify to read "The survey launched on November 1 and ended December 31, 2021, garnering a total of 61 responses" OR "The survey was conducted from November 1 – December 31, 2021, garnering a total of 61 responses."	"The survey was *conducted* November 1 *through* December 31, 2021, garnering a total of 61 responses."
			4. Chapter 4, page 85 of document: "Staff worked with local government public affairs office," Typo or clarification that you worked with various offices, not just one: Modify "public affairs office" to "public affairs offices" so it reads "Staff worked with local government public affairs offices,"	This typo has been corrected.
			5. Chapter 10, page 167 of document, top of page: "The crash and safety aspects of these modes were covered the previous chapter." Typo. Missing word. Modify "covered the previous chapter" to "covered *in* the previous chapter" so it reads "The crash and safety aspects of these modes were covered in the previous chapter."	This typo has been corrected.
			6. Same page: under "Personal Health": "Improved walking and bicycling infrastructure for recreation and daily trips to work, running errands, or take the kids to school creates a sustained increase in physical activity and a healthier community." Modify "or take the kids" to "or taking the kids" so it reads "Improved walking and bicycling infrastructure for recreation and daily trips to work, running errands, or taking the kids to school creates a sustained increase in physical activity and a healthier community."	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. Sentence has been changed to read as follows: "Improved walking and bicycling infrastructure for recreation and daily trips to work, running errands, or *taking* kids to school creates a sustained increase in physical activity and a healthier community"
			7. Same page: under "Improved Air Quality and Improved Travel Network Congestion": "Both fuel and space are limited resources that need to be managed in order to reduce negative impacts (i.e., pollution,	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. Sentence has been changed to read as commentor recommends (i.e., commas have been inserted at suggested locations).

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			excessive lost time in travel, wear and tear on infrastructure) extend the life of limited resources and reduced peak hour congestion for motorists." Possible typo/awkward sentence: Modify to read "Both fuel and space are limited resources that need to be managed in order to reduce negative impacts (i.e., pollution, excessive lost time in travel, wear and tear on infrastructure), extend the life of limited resources, and reduce peak hour congestion for motorists."	
			8. Same page, paragraph above last bullet on page: "The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015 continued the emphasis placed under its' predecessors (MAP-21) on promoting non-motorized travel." Typo. Modify "its' " to "its" so it reads "The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015 continued the emphasis placed under its predecessors (MAP-21) on promoting non-motorized travel."	This typo has been corrected.
			9. Chapter 10, page 168 of document, last bullet, bottom of page: "Each MPO must use at least 2.5% of its' PL funding allocation (and each State use 2.5% of its' State Planning and Research funding awarded under 23 USC 505) on specified planning activities to increase safe and accessible for multiple travel modes of all ages and abilities (Source: PL 117-58 §11206(b));" Replace "its' " with "its" so it reads "Each MPO must use at least 2.5% of its PL funding allocation (and each State use 2.5% of its State Planning and Research funding awarded under 23 USC 505) on specified planning activities to increase safe and accessible for multiple travel modes of all ages and abilities (Source: PL 117-58 §11206(b));"	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			10. Chapter 10, page 172 of document, top of page: Missing periods at end of sentences: Modify: a. "These goals are consistent with those already identified in Chapters 2 and 9 of the 2050 MTP" to "These goals are consistent with those already identified in Chapters 2 and 9 of the 2050 MTP." b. "The main strategies for promoting non-motorized travel are predominantly based on the efforts of Macon-Bibb County" to "The main strategies for promoting nonmotorized travel are predominantly based on the efforts of Macon-Bibb County."	This typo has been corrected.
			11. Same page: "Encourage an interconnection of bicycle and pedestrian facilities with other modes of alternative forms transportation such as transit in order to reduce dependence on private transportation, reduce traffic and improve air quality." Modify "alternative forms transportation" to "alternative forms of transportation" so it reads "Encourage an interconnection of bicycle and pedestrian facilities with other modes of alternative forms of transportation such as transit in order to reduce dependence on private transportation, reduce traffic and improve air quality."	This typo has been corrected.
			12. Chapter 10, page 173 of document, bottom paragraph: "Chapter 24 of the Macon-Bibb County Code or Ordinances" Typo. Modify "Macon-Bibb County Code or Ordinances" to "Macon-Bibb County Code of Ordinances" so it reads "Chapter 24 of the Macon-Bibb County Code of Ordinances"	This typo has been corrected.
			13. Chapter 10, page 176, subtitle: "Examples of Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilties" Typo. Modify "Facilties" to "Facilities" so it reads "Examples of	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities"	
			14. **Chapter 10, page 182,** "According to NACTO, shared lane markings "reinforce the legitimacy of bicycle traffic on the street and recommend proper bicyclist positioning." What does NACTO stand for?	NACTO is the acronym for National Association of City Transportation Officials (https://nacto.org). Sentence has been changed to reflect the definition of the acronym, and add the link
			15. **Chapter 10, page 182,** "Source: GDOT, Georgia BIKE SENSE: A Guide for Cyclists & Motorists" This blue link is broken/outdated. Modify to send to the document easily.	The link has been updated.
			16. **Chapter 10, page 183, middle of page under "Tucker Road Multi-Use Trail":** "Though separated from vehicle traffic, at 5 feet in width does not meet GDOT's minimum width or road separation requirements for a multi-use trail.[" Typo. Remove "[" so it reads "Though separated from vehicle traffic, at 5 feet in width does not meet GDOT's minimum width or road separation requirements for a multi-use trail."	This typo has been corrected.
			17. **Chapter 10, page 185, middle of page:** "To travel this bikeway safely most (if not all) bicyclist would have to use the 5-ft. sidewalks on Mercer University Drive, which were not designed to be and do not meet GDOT's minimum width or road separation requirements for a multi-use trail." Typo. Modify "most bicyclist" to "most bicyclists" so it reads "To travel this bikeway safely most (if not all) bicyclists would have to use the 5-ft. sidewalks on Mercer University Drive, which were not designed to be and do not meet GDOT's minimum width or road separation requirements for a multi-use trail."	This typo has been corrected.
			18. **Chapter 11, page 195, Table 11-2 (and Table 11-4 (which should be Table 11-5, see item 22 on my list of edits) on page 220 and Table 11-8 on page 229 which**	Commentor's points are addressed as follows: a. Commentor is correct that Table 11-2 and current 11-8 are redundant. Table 11-2 has

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			also show same table): The numbers and the sum don't match. If you add the Interstates/Freeways/Expressways + Arterial Roadways + Collectors and Local Roadways, they add up to 128,265, not 128,355. This table comes from another source where it was called "Table 1-7".	been removed from the draft; b. Response in a.) indirectly addresses identified issues with table numbering for 11-3 and 11-4; c. Commentor is correct that subtotals do not sum to grand total, as described. However, these numbers come from Table 1-7 in the Georgia State Rail Plan 2021 (GSRP 2021); GSRP 2021 sourced the data from FHWA Statistics for 2017 d. The "Table 1-7" header has been removed, and a reference to GSRP 2021 Table 1-7 has been included under the Table 11-5 title.
			19. Chapter 11, page 204, last sentence of page: "Highways to the north and south of the Region are also essential, such as such as I-20 in Atlanta, or I-10 in Florida that establish routes to markets to the east and west." Typo. Modify "such as such as I-20 in Atlanta" to "such as I-20 in Atlanta" so it reads "Highways to the north and south of the Region are also essential, such as I-20 in Atlanta, or I-10 in Florida that establish routes to markets to the east and west."	This typo has been corrected
			20. Chapter 11, page 208, bottom of page: "Figure 11-2 shows the truck terminal locations within Macon - Bibb County and Table 11-4 shows a list of freight companies in Macon – Bibb County." The figure is actually 11-8 although the title on the figure mentions "11-2" which may have been the case in previous documents, but 11-8 is the figure in this document. Figure 11-2 in this document is a map of railways in the state of GA. So would modify to read "Figure 11-8 shows the truck terminal locations within Macon - Bibb	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. The table reference has been updated.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			County and Table 11-4 shows a list of freight companies in Macon - Bibb County."	
			21. **Chapter 11, pages 213-214:** Table 11-4 formatting needs to be cleaned slightly on these pages to make sure each row is aligned properly (see GHS Distribution, Inc. for instance).	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. The table alignment issues have been addressed.
			22. **Chapter 11, page 220, Table 11-4:** Table 11-4 should be Table 11-5 as Table 11-4 is on pages 212-214. Also modify "Table 11-4 summarizes the Georgia rail network." to read "Table 11-5 summarizes the Georgia rail network."	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. The table reference has been updated.
			23. **Chapter 11, page 222, top of page:** "Table 2-2 breaks down the operating railroad mileage. Table 11-6 breaks down the operating railroad mileage." These are the same table and the former is the title of the table and 11-6 is the actual table designation in the document, so would remove Table 2-2 reference so it reads "Table 11-6 breaks down the operating railroad mileage."	Commentor's point has been acknowledged. The "Table 2-2" header has been removed, and a reference to GSRP 2021 Table 1-7 has been included under the Table 11-5 title.
			24. **Chapter 11, page 225, figure caption:** "Figure 11-13: Georgia Norfolk-Southern Rail Network". Typo. Modify "Figure 11-13" to "Figure 11-14" so it reads "Figure 11-14: Georgia Norfolk-Southern Rail Network"	This typo has been corrected.
			25. **Chapter 11, page 226, second paragraph:** "In all, GDOT owns 540 miles of track (465 active). The GDOT owned rail lines are displayed in Figure 11-14." Modify "Figure 11-14" to "Figure 11-15" so it reads "In all, GDOT owns 540 miles of track (465 active). The GDOT owned rail lines are displayed in Figure 11-15."	This typo has been corrected.
			26. **Chapter 11, page 227, figure caption:** Modify "Figure 11-14: GDOT Owned Rail Lines (Short Lines)" to read "Figure 11-15: GDOT Owned Rail Lines (Short Lines)"	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			27. Chapter 11, page 228, Table 11-7 caption: I know this is from another source, but could you fix up the caption to eliminate "Error! Reference source not found." and modify "Georgia rose in in rank" to "Georgia rose in rank"	Commentor's points are addressed as follows: a. For reasons addressed below, this table has been re-named Table 11-7a and Table 11-7b. b. Because it is not possible to access the underlying source for the table to correct the error, MATS has chosen to extract the relevant table from the source document (Georgia State Rail Plan 2021), crop the image to remove the original table reference, and include this as a picture. The GSRP 2021 source for this image is referenced under the heading for Table 11-7a c. The original text makes reference to Georgia's improvement in relative ranking. To support that narrative, additional text has been added in the main body to read as follows: *"According to the 2021 Georgia Statewide Rail Plan between 2012 and 2017, Georgia increased its ranking in eight out of twelve railroad criteria, and maintained its relative position in the remaining four."* To support this text, MATS has chosen to extract the relevant table from the source document (Georgia State Rail Plan 2021), crop the image to remove the original table reference, and include this as a picture. The GSRP 2021 source for this image is referenced under the heading for Table 11-7b
			28. Chapter 11, page 231, first paragraph: "Figure 11-15 shows the Rail Line weight limits for Georgia's Class I and short line railroads." Modify "Figure 11-15" to "Figure 11-16" so it reads "Figure 11-16 shows the Rail Line weight limits for Georgia's Class I and short line railroads	Commentor's points prompted an editorial review of all Figure references subsequent to Figure 11-11. Based on that review, the proper indexing for this Figure changes from 11-15 to Figure 11-*17*. Figure indexing and text has been updated accordingly.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			29. Chapter 11, page 231, second paragraph: "Vertical clearances on CSXT, NS and many of the State's short line railroads are mapped in Figure 11-16." Modify "Figure 11-16" to "Figure 11-17" so it reads "Vertical clearances on CSXT, NS and many of the State's short line railroads are mapped in Figure 11-17."	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-18, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			30. Chapter 11, page 232, figure caption: "Figure 11-15: Rail Line Weight Limits for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia" Modify "Figure 11-15" to "Figure 11-16" so it reads "Figure 11-16: Rail Line Weight Limits for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-17, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			31. Chapter 11, page 233, figure caption: "Figure 11-16: Rail Line Vertical Clearances for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia" Modify "Figure 11-16" to "Figure 11-17" so it reads "Figure 11-17: Rail Line Vertical Clearances for Class 1 and Shortline Railroads in Georgia"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-18, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			32. Chapter 11, page 234, bottom of paragraph: "The bottlenecks are shown in Figure 11-17 with the rail track in red the priority rail track in need of improvements to accommodate future demand." Modify "Figure 11-17" to "Figure 11-18" so it reads "The bottlenecks are shown in Figure 11-18 with the rail track in red the priority rail track in need of improvements to accommodate future demand."	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-19, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			33. Chapter 11, page 235, figure caption: "Figure 11-17: Rail System Throughput Bottlenecks -Class 1 Railroads in Georgia" Modify "Figure 11-17" to "Figure 11-18" so it reads "Figure 11-18: Rail System Throughput Bottlenecks - Class 1 Railroads in Georgia"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-19, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			34. Chapter 11, page 236, top of page: "The distribution	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-20, and text

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			by flow and mode is illustrated in chart 11-3." Recommend modifying "chart 11-3" to "Figure 11-19" so it reads "The distribution by flow and mode is illustrated in Figure 11-19."	has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			35. Same page: Figure caption: "Figure 11-18: Middle Georgia Rail Freight By Flow and Mode, 2013" Modify "Figure 11-18" to "Figure 11-19" so it reads "Figure 11-19: Middle Georgia Rail Freight By Flow and Mode, 2013"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-20, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			36. Chapter 11, page 237, figure caption: "Figure 11-19: Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Lane – 2013" Modify "Figure 11-19" to "Figure 11-20" so it reads "Figure 11-20: Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Lane – 2013"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-21, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			37. Same page, paragraph at bottom of page: "This rail freight is concentrated in the Savannah to Atlanta lane, with a 41.9 percent share of tons (Figure 11-19). The largest commodity from Savannah is Miscellaneous Mixed Shipments (intermodal commodities), accounting for 51.6 percent of rail tons (Figure 11-20)." Modify "Figure 11-19" to "Figure 11-20" and "Figure 11-20" to "Figure 11-21" so it reads "This rail freight is concentrated in the Savannah to Atlanta lane, with a 41.9 percent share of tons (Figure 11-20). The largest commodity from Savannah is Miscellaneous Mixed Shipments (intermodal commodities), accounting for 51.6 percent of rail tons (Figure 11-21)."	Text references have been updated to reference Figure 11-21 and Figure 11-22, respectively. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			38. Chapter 11, page 238, figure caption: "Figure 11-20: Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Lane – 2013" Modify "Figure 11-20" to "Figure 11-21" so it reads "Figure 11-21: Middle Georgia – Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Lane – 2013"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-22, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details Table has also been retitled to more accurately reflect content. Updated name is " Middle Georgia

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
				– Savannah BEA Rail Freight, By Commodity – 2013"
			39. Chapter 11, page 239, first sentence: "Georgia has approximately 104 publicly owned and used airports throughout the State, of which nine (9) offer scheduled commercial service and the remaining 95 are classified as general aviation, as illustrated in Figure 11-21." Modify "Figure 11-21" to "Figure 11-22" so it reads "Georgia has approximately 104 publicly owned and used airports throughout the State, of which nine (9) offer scheduled commercial service and the remaining 95 are classified as general aviation, as illustrated in Figure 11-22."	Text reference has been updated to reference Figure 11-23. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			40. Chapter 11, page 240, figure caption: "Figure 11-21: Overview of Public Airports by Level Of Service" Modify caption from "Figure 11-21" to "Figure 11-22" so it reads "Figure 11-22: Overview of Public Airports by Level Of Service"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-23, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			41. Chapter 11, page 241, bottom paragraph: "Macon Downtown Airport covers an area of 401 acres (162ha) at an elevation of 437 feet (133 m) above mean sea levels." Typo. Modify "levels" to "level" so it reads "Macon Downtown Airport covers an area of 401 acres (162ha) at an elevation of 437 feet (133 m) above mean sea level."	This typo has been corrected.
			42. Same page and paragraph: "Currently, the Macon Downtown Airport is owned and operated by Macon – Bibb County and is located approximately three (3) miles southeast of the Central Business District, as shown in figure 11-22." Modify "figure 11-22" to "Figure 11-23" so it reads "Currently, the Macon Downtown Airport is owned and operated by Macon – Bibb County and is located	Text reference has been updated to reference Figure 11-24. See response to #28 (above) for additional details

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			approximately three (3) miles southeast of the Central Business District, as shown in Figure 11-23."	
			43. Chapter 11, page 242, figure caption: "Figure 11-22: Macon Downtown Airport" Modify "Figure 11-22" to "Figure 11-23" so it reads "Figure 11-23: Macon Downtown Airport"	Figure has been indexed to Figure 11-24, and text has been edited accordingly to reference updated indexing. See response to #28 (above) for additional details
			44. Chapter 11, page 245, paragraph between bullet lists: "The proximity of the runways at WRAFB and MGRA requires coordination of aircraft approached and departures." Typo. Modify "aircraft approached" to "aircraft approaches" so it reads "The proximity of the runways at WRAFB and MGRA requires coordination of aircraft approaches and departures."	This typo has been corrected.
			45. Same page, last bullet: "Add additional airside and landside facilities will need to be improved or expanded to adequately serve the anticipated increase in both aircraft and passengers utilizing the facility" Modify "Add additional airside and landside facilities" to just "Additional airside and landside facilities" so it reads "Additional airside and landside facilities will need to be improved or expanded to adequately serve the anticipated increase in both aircraft and passengers utilizing the facility"	This typo has been corrected.
			46. Chapter 11, page 246, second to last paragraph: "In January 2021, a study was revised to examine locations in Middle Georgia to identify potential areas for a Middle Georgia Intermodal Hub and Prospective Container Por/Inland Port." Typo. Modify "Prospective Container Por" to "Prospective Container Port" so it reads "In January 2021, a study was revised to examine locations in Middle Georgia to identify potential areas for a Middle	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			Georgia Intermodal Hub and Prospective Container Port/Inland Port."	
			47. Chapter 11, page 247, "PIERS report", what does "PIERS" stand for?	The PIERS acronym was used in the "Master Planning for Middle Georgia Intermodal Hub and Prospective Container Port – Revised January 2021," which was prepared for Middle GA Regional Commission by Topping Consulting LLC. Upon further review, the report does not conclusively define the acronym. Therefore, reference to that acronym has been removed, and the referenced paragraph has been re-written to focus on the general findings of the master planning document.
			48. Chapter 12, page 250, under "Justice40 Initiative", "In furtherance of these goals, the Executive Branch has produced interim guidance on the Justice40 Initiative (authorized under Executive Order 14008), which has the stated goal "that 40 percent of the overall benefits of [Federal investments in housing, transportation water, wastewater infrastructure and healthcare] flow to disadvantaged communities." Typo? Did you mean "transportation water" or "transportation, water"? If the latter, modify to read "In furtherance of these goals, the Executive Branch has produced interim guidance on the Justice40 Initiative (authorized under Executive Order 14008), which has the stated goal "that 40 percent of the overall benefits of [Federal investments in housing, transportation, water, wastewater infrastructure and healthcare] flow to disadvantaged communities."	This typo has been corrected.
			49. Chapter 12, page 251, Table 12-1: Modify "Authorizing Zource" to "Authorizing Source"	This typo has been corrected.
			50. Chapter 12, page 253, middle of top paragraph:	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			"Macon's long range transportation must also comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that state, "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under and program or activity receiving federal assistance". Typo. Modify "Civil Rights Act of 1964 that state" to "Civil Rights Act of 1964 that states"	
			51. Chapter 12, page 262, second paragraph: "The query indicated that approximately 20 projects MTP projects will impact the MPO environmental justice area." Typo. Modify "approximately 20 projects MTP projects" to "approximately 20 MTP projects" so it reads "The query indicated that approximately 20 MTP projects will impact the MPO environmental justice area."	This typo has been corrected. In addition, the project count has been corrected to reflect updated maps in Figures 12-3 through 12-13, which identify the specific projects associated with specific possible Environmental and Natural/Historic factors.
			52. Chapter 12, page 270, second paragraph: "The GIS analysis indicated that there are approximate 30 MTP projects that may potentially be constructed on known recharge areas in MATS." Modify "approximate" to "approximately" so it reads "The GIS analysis indicated that there are approximately 30 MTP projects that may potentially be constructed on known recharge areas in MATS."	This typo has been corrected. In addition, the project count has been corrected to reflect updated maps in Figures 12-3 through 12-13, which identify the specific projects associated with specific possible Environmental and Natural/Historic factors.
			53. Chapter 13, page 293, last paragraph: "Only three of the six Performance Measures in Table 13 – 5 apply to the MATS area" Modify "Table 13-5" to "Table 13-4" (Table 13-5 is totally different) so it reads "Only three of the six Performance Measures in Table 13-4 apply to the MATS area"	This typo has been corrected.
			54. Chapter 13, page 294, top paragraph: "For the	This typo has been corrected.

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			performance measures in Table 13-5 that are applicable to the MATS area, the values demonstrate MATS is meeting or exceeding State goals." Modify "Table 13-5" to "Table 13-4" (Table 13-5 is totally different) so it reads "For the performance measures in Table 13-4 that are applicable to the MATS area, the values demonstrate MATS is meeting or exceeding State goals."	
			55. Chapter 13, page 296, last paragraph: "Pursuant to directions originally established by MATS Policy Committee under the resolution adopted on 8/1/2018, the MATS MPO anticipates updating Transit Asset Management Plan an/or Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) targets adopted by Georgia Dept. of Transportation into the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and current Transportation Improvement Plan through the Administrative Modification process." Typo. Modify "an/or Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan" to "and/or Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan" so it reads "Pursuant to directions originally established by MATS Policy Committee under the resolution adopted on 8/1/2018, the MATS MPO anticipates updating Transit Asset Management Plan and/or Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) targets adopted by Georgia Dept. of Transportation into the MATS 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and current Transportation Improvement Plan through the Administrative Modification process."	This typo has been corrected.
February 15, 2022	FHWA - Georgia Division	Olivia Lewis Transportation Planner	Is there a place in the draft MTP that specifically shows/states the progress achieved in meeting performance targets since the previous MTP? I didn't	Performance Measures are specifically covered in Chapter 13. With respect to MATS progress on the individual performance metrics, please take a look

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			notice it, and I want to make sure I haven't miss it during my reading.	at pages 289 through 294.
February 16, 2022	FHWA - Georgia Division	Olivia Lewis Transportation Planner	I have completed my review and I have no additional significant comments. But I will say that although there is a section on freight, more overall data is provided on freight than specific freight information relative to the Macon region. And for consistency, Metropolitan Transportation Plan and/or MTP should be used throughout the document instead of both LRTP and MTP. Ensure any comments/recommendations received from Ann-Marie are addressed as well.	1. MATS is currently examining the possibility of partnering with GDOT on a freight study at some point after the passage of the 2050 MTP. We are aware of the availability of PL Supplemental Funds for these purposes, and will keep GDOT and FHWA apprised of our efforts. 2. This edit has been noted by others. Please see the response provided on February 3, 2022 to Kaniz Sathi, GDOT Office of Planning. 3. See response to Ann-Marie Day's comments below
February 16, 2022	FHWA - Georgia Division	Olivia Lewis Transportation Planner	I have attached a link for the federal guidelines for the MTP, eCFR :: 23 CFR Part 450 Subpart C -- Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming, to ensure the draft Macon 2050 MTP is a federal compliant document. You can click on the link for the Table of Contents and go down to 450.324 for the Development and Content of the MTP. During your revision of the draft MTP to address all comments, I recommend the entire MPO staff review the guidelines to ensure the document has addressed the federal requirements. ***Although I did not submit any major comments,*** this will still be helpful to you and the other MPO staff as you incorporate all comments received. Also, developing a checklist is recommended, and including it with the revised draft can aid in a shorter review time of the revised draft MTP.	1. The MTP and the CDR are anticipated to be compliant with the cited federal regulations. The MTP document follows the same format as the previously approved 2040 LRTP, which was deemed compliant. MATS will provide a checklist for the final MTP document based on the required elements described in 23 CFR 450.324(f)
February 22, 2022	FHWA - Georgia Division	Ann-Marie Day Planning Team Leader	Adding to Olivia's email, it is important that the IAC is briefed on how the MPO addressed comments received from all as well as review the revised CDR and MTP prior to final approval/adoption from the Policy Committee/MPO Board.	1. IAC was provided a list of all comments received from IAC members, and responses to those comments, on March 25, 2022. All comments/recommended edits have been addressed in the final drafts of the respective

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			Additionally, I will reiterate that the MTP and CDR must be federally compliant for us to issue a Conformity Determination. Olivia provided the MPO staff the regulatory requirement for the MTP update. Please ensure that staff is revising the MTP alongside 23 CFR 450.306, 324, and 23 CFR 490 (Performance Management). If these two items are not address, this could delay the MTP/CDR concurrence.	chapters. 2. The MTP and the CDR are anticipated to be compliant with the cited federal regulations. The MTP document follows the same format as the previously approved 2040 LRTP, which was deemed compliant. The CDR follows the template provided by FHWA in April 2019, resulting from the South Coast II decision reinstating the MATS CDR requirement under the "orphan area" designation.
February 24, 2022	Middle Georgia Regional Commission (MGRC)	Greg Boike	*These comments were provided to MATS as summaries of what MGRC received from the general public as part of their ongoing efforts to update the Jones County Comprehensive Plan.* **1.** Throughout several topic sessions (not just Transportation), the Central Georgia Rail Trail project **(priority project #41)** received a very strong, positive reception. A number of folks talked about that project as the type of amenity that would really stand out within the region and state and would be a popular project. Often times it starts with the "is that still a thing?" question, but whenever its mentioned as a possibility folks seem to get excited.	MATS appreciates this comment, and will bring forward any opportunities staff becomes aware of to implement this project.
			2. Regarding bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, the stakeholder group talked about supporting bike lanes on some of the state highways in the northern parts of the county, particularly where surrounded by federally-owned forest lands or wildlife refuges. For areas outside of MATS, this mainly focuses on the GA-11 Scenic Byway. From the MATS perspective though, this would mainly focus on GA-18, west of Gray up to the Ocmulgee River. Specifically on GA-18,	MATS appreciates the Jones County stakeholder group's interest in enhancing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and will bring forward any opportunities staff becomes aware of to implement this project. With respect to projects outside the MATS Planning Area boundary, while MATS appreciates this comment, as the focus group already

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			community members also mentioned that when the bridge over the Ocmulgee on GA-18 is replaced **(priority project #8)**, that would be an ideal location to add parking and a river access point. They also expressed support for an onsite detour during the replacement, as opposed to directing traffic to the next crossing.	acknowledges, the project is located primarily outside the MATS MPO boundary. MATS cannot directly influence any project that is not within their Planning Area boundary. MGRC is advised to reach out to the GDOT Regional District 3 office, or the GDOT Office of Planning in Atlanta, to explore how these recommendations could be realized for this project.
			3. Another comment, this time on pedestrians, that's actually just over the county line in Macon-Bibb, was noting the number of folks seen walking along Gray Highway to the apartments between Walnut Creek and the Jones County line. I believe some of those may originate from the Walmart on Gray Highway. So, the Safety Improvements on Gray Highway **(priority project #22)** also has some cross-county support.	MATS appreciates the Jones County stakeholder group's interest in enhancing bicycle and pedestrian safety. We will bring forward any opportunities staff becomes aware of to implement this project.
			4. Regarding other projects on the MATS Priority List, we did not talk about any of the widening projects proposed (Henderson Rd, Griswoldville Rd, Joycliff Rd, or SR 49). I'll defer to the Jones County folks for more input, but from the general tenor of conversation, I don't know if widening of those streets in more residential areas would be popular. I would think widening of SR 49 is the most justified and likely would be the most well received, as the focus of conversation did follow an emphasis of controlled growth. With that said, if we're looking to 2050, conditions may change somewhat by then. **a.** Regarding Griswoldville Industrial Park, the only access from there is currently to SR 57 (Fall Line Freeway). I suspect that remains the goal, rather than putting any of it onto Griswoldville Road or	a. MATS appreciates the details on the Griswoldville Industrial Park. Based on the information provided, it appears this comment is intended to refer to GDOT Project #332450 (Priority Project #42). This project is included on the MTP list as a possible link in a proposed Interstate 14 corridor, linking Columbus, Macon and Augusta. MATS would anticipate that if this project proceeds, Jones County would seek to participate in the project scoping process, and perhaps adjust their future land use to take advantage of the enhanced access to the Industrial Park. b. Thanks for the clarification of the Henderson Rd. project (Priority Project #36). MATS has encountered a similar set of circumstances with

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
			Henderson Road. **b.** Also, just a technical note, the Henderson Road project would also include a sliver of Twiggs County.	GDOT PI #16130 (Priority Project #8). In that case, the majority of the project lies outside the MATS MPO area. In circumstances where a project only fall partially within an MPO area, past practice from GDOT has been to assign project costs to the MPO area in proportion to the amount of project centerline road miles that fall within the MPO area.
			5. Finally, one unrelated road paving project mentioned that might be of interest to MATS was Skinner Road, between Lite-N-Tie Road and Cumslo Road. I believe that's just outside of the MATS area's current boundary, but a resident mentioned that road had been on the "to-be-paved" list for some time and needed it.	MATS appreciates the Jones County stakeholder group's interest this project. Since project is outside the MATS Planning Area boundary, MATS cannot directly influence the schedule or scope of this project. However, this project might be eligible for alternative sources of funding, such as Georgia Transportation Infrastructure Bank
			6. And lastly, regarding Transit, the general focus on JCT was just that more folks needed to know about the service and it's availability. **a.** Technical note on page 142: the Jones County 5311 does not involve MGRC in any way. That's directly between JCT and the Community Action Agency.	This correction has been reflected in the text.
			7. Miscellaneous Page 254: Jones County BOC only has 1 minority member (Jonathan Pitts lost reelection since the last MTP).	This update has been reflected in the text.
March 4, 2022	Georgia Dept. of Transportation—Office of Planning	Vivian Canizares, Policy and Freight Branch	Our main recommendation is to reiterate Kaniz comments and incorporate the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) or Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), as the new transportation authorization to update the Draft MTP on	The Freight Planning Framework section of Chapter 11 (starting on pg. 190 in the Draft 2050 MTP) has been re written to reflect the IIJA as the current transportation authorization. The main points of

Date	Agency	Commenter	Comment	MATS Response
		Chief	Chapter 11. Per our review, the Freight Improvement and Aviation chapter contains an extensive background and information on multi-modal Freight planning in the region and we expect to see a multimodal freight and needs assessment based on data analysis to be able to develop project recommendations at the local/urban level on your future MTP update or as a standalone freight document.	the IIJA have been summarized, as they pertain to MATS, based on the guidance provided by FHWA, found at https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/nhfp.cfm