

2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

for the Hattiesburg-Petal-Forrest-Lamar
Metropolitan Planning Organization

October 2020 – DRAFT



2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Hattiesburg-Petal-Forrest-Lamar Metropolitan Planning Organization

This document is posted at:

[WILL BE UPDATED ONCE POSTED]

For additional information, please contact:

Andrew Ellard, Director of Urban Development

City of Hattiesburg

200 Forrest Street / PO Box 1898

Hattiesburg, MS 39401 / 39403

Phone: (301) 545-4609

Email: AEllard@HattiesburgMS.com

Date adopted: [PENDING]

Date amended:

This Plan was prepared as a cooperative effort of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT), and local governments in partial fulfillment of requirements in Title 23 USC 134 and 135, amended by the FAST Act, Sections 1201 and 1202, December 4, 2015. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Policy Committee

Name	Position
Toby Barker	Mayor, City of Hattiesburg
Hal Marx	Mayor, City of Petal
Chris Bowen	Forrest County Board of Supervisors
Steve Lampton	Lamar County Board of Supervisors
Kelly Castleberry, P.E.	District 6 Engineer, MDOT
Randel Jansen*	FHWA

*indicates non-voting status

Technical Committee

Name	Position
Andrew Ellard	HPFL-MPO Executive Director
Lamar Rutland	City of Hattiesburg
Hunter White	City of Hattiesburg
Jerald Little	City of Hattiesburg
Ginger M. Lowrey	City of Hattiesburg
Caroline Miles	City of Hattiesburg
John Weeks, P.E.	City of Petal
Amy Heath	City of Petal
Nick Connolly, P.E.	Forrest County
Corey Proctor	Forrest County
John Weeks	Forrest County
Kyle Wallace	Forrest County
Mike Slade	Forrest County
Robert “Bob” Taylor	Forrest County
JeVaughn Osgood	Forrest County
Don Walker, P.E.	Lamar County
Jason Lamb	Lamar County
Michael Hershman	Lamar County
Randal Jansen	Federal Highway Administration
Kelly Castleberry	Mississippi Department of Transportation
Perry Brown	Mississippi Department of Transportation
Jeff Aultman	Mississippi Department of Transportation
David Seyfarth	MDOT District 6 LPA Coordinator
Evan Wright	Mississippi Department of Transportation
Sammy Holcomb	Mississippi Department of Transportation
April Fairley	Mississippi Department of Transportation
Geoffrey Crosby, P.E.	Neel-Schaffer, Inc
Allison Beasley	Southern Mississippi Planning and Development District
Daniel Jayroe	Area Development Partnership
Dr. Robert Blevins	William Carey College
Dr. Rodney Bennett	University of Southern Mississippi

Technical Committee (Continued)

Name	Position
Thomas Heanue	Hattiesburg-Laurel Regional Airport
Calvin Russell	Hub City Transit Division Manager

Placeholder for MPO Adopting Resolution

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	1
What is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan?.....	2
The Role of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan	2
What is the Metropolitan Planning Organization?	3
The Planning Process	4
Public and Stakeholder Involvement	4
2.0 Transportation Today.....	5
Roadway and Bridge Conditions	6
Bicycle and Pedestrian Conditions	7
Public Transit Conditions	8
Freight Conditions.....	9
3.0 Planning for Tomorrow	11
Growth Impacts.....	12
Changing Demographics and Travel Behavior	13
Connected and Autonomous Vehicles (CAV)	14
Electric and Alternative Fuel Vehicles.....	16
4.0 The Vision.....	17
Strategic Framework and Vision	18
Goals and Objectives.....	19
Performance Measures.....	21
5.0 Implementation	23
Strategies	24
Roadway Projects.....	26
Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects	42
Public Transit Projects.....	50
Next Steps	57

List of Tables

Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects	30
Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects	32
Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects	38
Fiscally Constrained List of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects.....	46
Visionary, High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors	48
Fiscally Constrained List of Transit Projects.....	52

List of Figures

Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects	28
Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects	29
Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects	37
Fiscally Constrained Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors.....	44
Visionary, High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors	45
Fiscally Constrained Transit Plan	51

Technical Reports

- 1) Transportation Modeling and Forecasting
- 2) Existing Conditions
- 3) Transportation Performance Management Report
- 4) Needs Assessment
- 5) Plan Development
- 6) Federal Compliance Checklist

Acronym Guide

Acronym	Description
EJ	Environmental Justice
FAST Act	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
HCT	Hub City Transit
HPFL	Hattiesburg-Petal-Forrest-Lamar
MDOT	Mississippi Department of Transportation
MPA	Metropolitan Planning Area
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
PC	Policy Committee
TC	Technical Committee
TA	Transportation Alternatives
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program




1.0 Introduction


Learn about the background of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the regional organization that develops it, the Metropolitan Planning Organization.

1.0 Introduction

What is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan?



The Role of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan




What is the Metropolitan Planning Organization?

All urban areas with a population of 50,000 or greater are required to have a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to conduct regional transportation planning.

The MPO Structure (How It All Works)



The Metropolitan Planning Area



1.0 Introduction

The Planning Process



Public and Stakeholder Involvement

The planning process incorporated public and stakeholder input at key phases of the project, resulting in a plan that reflects local priorities and needs.



2.0 Transportation Today

Review highlights of existing transportation conditions in the region for all modes.

2.0 Transportation Today

Roadway and Bridge Conditions



Congestion – I-59, Hardy St, and W 4th Ave have the worst congestion in the region.




Pavement Conditions – The biggest areas of concern for pavement condition are on US 11, US 49, Old MS 42, and Central Ave.



Bridge Conditions – Most bridges within the region, including many on the National Highway System, are in good condition.



Safety – From 2014 to 2018 there were 82 deaths and 78 severe injuries resulting from vehicular crashes.



Congested Areas

- Excessive Delay
- Very Long Delay
- Long Delay

2.0 Transportation Today

Bicycle and Pedestrian Conditions



High Demand Areas – The highest demand for biking and walking is around USM and between downtown Hattiesburg and William Carey University.




Bicycle Facility Coverage – There is a strong backbone of bike facilities in Hattiesburg, including the Longleaf Trace and around Downtown Hattiesburg.



Pedestrian Facility Coverage – Sidewalk coverage is better around Downtown and in older neighborhoods but lacking in other areas.



Safety – From 2014 through 2018 there were 13 fatalities among bicyclists and pedestrians.



Bike / Ped Facilities

- Bicycle Facility or Shared-Use Path
- Sidewalks

2.0 Transportation Today

Public Transit Conditions



High Demand Areas – The highest transit demand in the region exists in downtown Hattiesburg, near USM, and near William Carey University.




Less Service than Peer Regions – When compared to peer regions, Hub City Transit provides much more limited transit service.



Maintenance – Most vehicles in the Hub City Transit fleet exceed their useful life benchmark.



Safety – Hub City Transit has had a low prevalence of safety and security events over the last five (5) years.



Hub City Transit

- Fixed Route Service
- Paratransit Service Area

2.0 Transportation Today

Freight Conditions



Freight Truck Traffic – The highest truck volumes are on I-59, US 49, US 98, and MS 42.




Freight Truck Congestion – Freight truck congestion occurs on I-59, MS 42, and Hardy St, largely at interchanges.



At-Grade Rail Crossings – There are 87 at-grade rail crossings in the region.



Safety – There were two (2) fatal crashes in the region from 2014 to 2018 involving a heavy vehicle (e.g. freight truck).



Freight Corridors

- Statewide Network
- Rail Lines

2.0 Transportation Today

This page is intentionally left blank.



3.0 Planning for Tomorrow

Learn how growth and redevelopment, new mobility options, and evolving lifestyle preferences will transform the way people get around the region.

3.0 Planning for Tomorrow

Growth Impacts

Over the next 25 years, the region is projected to continue growing. This growth will concentrate in certain areas, creating new transportation challenges and opportunities for the region.



Suburban Neighborhoods – Most residential growth is projected to occur at the edges of developed areas and in key redevelopment areas.




Industrial Areas – Most industrial growth is anticipated to occur near existing and planned industrial parks and other existing industrial clusters.




Commercial Areas – Commercial development is projected to increase in growing areas and redevelop along key regional corridors.

Population Growth



Employment Growth



Note: These numbers are for the Metropolitan Planning Area - covering parts of Forrest and Lamar Counties.

3.0 Planning for Tomorrow

Changing Demographics and Travel Behavior

In recent years, travel patterns have changed dramatically due to demographic changes and technological advances. Many of these changes are part of longer-term trends and others are newer, emerging trends.



The Population is Aging

Nationally, the population aged 65 or older will grow rapidly over the next 25 years, nearly doubling from 2012 to 2050. This growth will increase the demand for alternatives to driving, especially for public transportation for people with limited mobility or disabilities.



Most People Are Traveling Less

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, except for people over age 65, all age groups are making fewer trips per day. There are many factors driving this trend, including working from home, online shopping, and less face-to-face socializing. If this trend continues, travel demand may be noticeably impacted. Some major roadway projects may no longer be required and smaller improvements, such as intersection or turn lane improvements, may be sufficient for these needs.



Relationships with Cars Are Evolving

People are increasingly interested in car-free or car-lite lifestyles. In the short-term, people are paying premiums for walkable and bikeable neighborhoods and more frequently using ride-hailing (Uber/Lyft) and shared mobility (car share/bike share) services. In the long-term, car ownership rates could decrease, increasing the need for investments in bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and other mobility options.

3.0 Planning for Tomorrow

Connected and Autonomous Vehicles (CAV)

Today, most newer vehicles have some elements of both connected and autonomous vehicle technologies. These technologies are advancing rapidly and becoming more common.

Connected Vehicles



Connected vehicles are vehicles that use various communication technologies to exchange information with other vehicles, roadside infrastructure, and the Cloud.

Communication Types


V2I •Vehicle to Infrastructure

V2V •Vehicle to Vehicle

V2C •Vehicle to Cloud

V2X •Others

Autonomous Vehicles



Autonomous, or “self-driving” vehicles, are vehicles in which operation of the vehicle occurs with limited, if any, direct driver input.

vs.

Levels of Automation

1 •Driver Assistance

2 •Partial Automation


3 •Conditional Automation

4 •High Automation

5 •Full Automation

3.0 Planning for Tomorrow

Potential Timeline



Potential Transportation Impacts



Overall Safety – In the long-term, CAV technology is anticipated to reduce human error and improve overall traffic safety.



Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety – CAV interactions with bicyclists and pedestrians is a major area of concern that still needs improvement.



Traffic – CAVs have the potential to improve overall traffic flow and reduce congestion, even as they may increase vehicle miles traveled.



Big Data for Planning – Connected vehicle technology may provide valuable historical and real-time travel data for transportation planning.



Parking Reform – Autonomous vehicles could dramatically reduce demand for parking, opening this space up for other uses.



Transit – CAV technology has the potential to drastically reduce the cost of operating transit in environments that are safe for autonomous transit.



Freight – Both delivery and long-haul freight look to be early adopters of CAV technology, reducing costs and improving safety and congestion.



Development Patterns – The benefits of CAV technology may make longer commutes more attractive and increase urban sprawl.

3.0 Planning for Tomorrow

Electric and Alternative Fuel Vehicles

There has been growing interest and investment in alternative fuel vehicle technologies in recent years, especially for electric vehicles. This renewed interest has also included the transit and freight industries. By 2030, some projections show electric vehicles making up nearly one-third of all cars in the United States.



Potential Transportation Impacts



Air Quality Improvement – Electric and other alternative fuel vehicles have the potential to drastically reduce automobile related emissions.



Infrastructure Needs – There may be a long-term need for public investment in vehicle charging stations.



Gas Tax Revenues – If adoption rates increase substantially, gas tax revenues will be impacted and new user fees may need to be considered.

4.0 The Vision

The vision and goals in this plan lay the foundation for identifying strategies and projects that will help the region meet its established performance targets.

4.0 Visioning

Strategic Framework and Vision



Goals and Objectives



Goal 1: Improve and expand transportation choices

- Objective 1.1: Improve mobility and access across the region for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Objective 1.2: Make public transportation a viable choice mode of transportation.
- Objective 1.3: Support shared mobility options to put more people into fewer vehicles.
- Objective 1.4: Support convenient and affordable access to local and regional air, rail, and water transportation.



Goal 2: Improve safety and security

- Objective 2.1: Reduce motor vehicle crash fatalities and serious injuries.
- Objective 2.2: Reduce pedestrian and bicycle crash fatalities and serious injuries.
- Objective 2.3: Strategically enhance corridors for safety and context.
- Objective 2.4: Support coordination among local and state stakeholders to improve enforcement of traffic regulations, transportation safety education, and emergency response.
- Objective 2.5: Increase the redundancy and diversity of the transportation system to provide emergency alternatives for evacuation and access during disruptive man-made or natural incidents.



Goal 3: Provide a reliable and high performing transportation system

- Objective 3.1: Enhance regional connectivity.
- Objective 3.2: Maintain the transportation infrastructure and assets in a good state of repair.
- Objective 3.3: Improve mobility by reducing traffic congestion and delay.
- Objective 3.4: Prepare for technological advances that will efficiently and dynamically manage roadway demand and capacity and overall systems operations.

4.0 Visioning



Goal 4: Support the economic vitality of the region

- Objective 4.1: Improve the transportation system to enhance economic competitiveness and to provide access to national and global markets.
- Objective 4.2: Use transportation improvements to provide equitable benefits across the region.
- Objective 4.3: Use transportation improvements to support vibrant activity centers and that are consistent with local plans for growth and economic development.
- Objective 4.4: Improve the mobility of freight by truck, rail, and other modes.
- Objective 4.5: Support a fiscally constrained 25-year Metropolitan Transportation Plan that addresses existing and future needs while maximizing projected revenues.



Goal 5: Manage the relationship of transportation, community, and environment

- Objective 5.1: Make the transportation system resilient, especially to effectively manage and mitigate stormwater runoff.
- Objective 5.2: Minimize or avoid adverse impacts from transportation improvements to the natural environment and the human environment (historic sites, recreational areas, environmental justice populations).
- Objective 5.3: Improve mobility for underserved communities.
- Objective 5.4: Provide an inclusive setting for regional transportation decision-making.
- Objective 5.5: Support the reduction of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions and the improvement of air quality through fleet fuel management and the reduction of congestion.
- Objective 5.6: Provide access to active transportation options, healthcare facilities, and healthy food.

Performance Measures

Using a performance-based approach to transportation planning helps the region understand its current needs and allows planners and decision-makers to track progress over time. As required by federal legislation, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) adopted performance targets for several federally required transportation performance measures and is monitoring performance for these measures over time.

Current Performance

The graphic below summarizes how the MPO and region are performing today regarding these required performance measures. For more detailed information, see the Transportation Performance Management Report.

Safety	Pavement	Bridge Conditions	Travel Time Reliability	Truck Time Reliability	Transit State of Repair
					
Needs Improvement	Needs Improvement	Good	Good	Good	Poor
Good	Meets Target	Needs Improvement	Does Not Meet Some Targets	Poor	Does Not Meet Most Targets

Improving Performance

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan uses data and stakeholder input to identify the root causes of poor performance in federally required performance measures. It prioritizes investments that will improve current and future performance.

4.0 Visioning

This page is intentionally left blank.



5.0 Implementation

This section presents the strategies and associated improvement plan that will help the region achieve its goals and meet its performance targets. It also provides guidance on the next steps for the MPO.

5.0 Implementation

Strategies

These strategies, identified from a technical needs assessment and stakeholder and public input, will help the region achieve the transportation goals previously stated.



Responsibly Improve Roadway System

Funding for new roads and widening roads is limited. The MPO will prioritize roadway expansion projects that have a high benefit/cost ratio.



Redesign Key Corridors and Intersections

This plan has identified major corridors that should be redesigned to be safer, more efficient, and more accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians. These corridors can be found in the list of non-capacity roadway projects.



Rapidly Expand Biking and Walking Infrastructure

There were frequent comments from public input advocating for better walking and biking conditions. The MPO should encourage more bicycle and pedestrian projects and encourage bicycle and pedestrian improvements as part of planned roadway projects.



Redesign and Enhance Public Transit

The MPO will work with stakeholders to redesign existing transit services in the region and explore opportunities for new mobility options, such as microtransit. The MPO will also continue to encourage rider experience upgrades, such as bus stop and technology improvements.

5.0 Implementation



Address Freight Bottlenecks and Needs

The MPO should prioritize projects that reduce delay for freight vehicles to support local businesses and industry.



Prioritize Maintenance

The MPO should proactively address pavement conditions, bridge conditions, and transit asset management. Additional studies may be worthwhile to collect maintenance data on roadways outside of the National Highway System.



Establish a Safety Management System

The typical traffic safety program includes a crash record system, identification of hazardous locations, engineering studies, selection of countermeasures, prioritization of projects, planning and implementation, and evaluation.



Monitor Emerging Technology Options

Transportation technology is changing rapidly but much is still uncertain. The MPO should continue to monitor trends in emerging mobility options and consider partnerships with mobility companies and pilot programs as appropriate.


5.0 Implementation

Roadway Projects

Over the next 25 years, the MPO plans to implement a variety of capacity (adding lanes or new roadways) and non-capacity roadway projects.


Financial Plan

The MPO receives funding from many federal sources and provides local funding in addition to federal funding. Based on projections by MDOT, approximately \$738 million in federal funds will be available to the MPO for roadway projects from 2020 to 2045.



Prioritizing Roadway Capacity Projects

All roadway capacity projects identified in existing plans and the MTP needs analysis were prioritized based on the criteria below. High scoring projects were included in the fiscally constrained plan and the remaining projects are in a list of visionary projects.



5.0 Implementation

Impact of Roadway Capacity Projects


Implementing the planned roadway capacity projects is projected to reduce overall delay in the region by 31 percent in 2045. However, there will still be delay in parts of the region and the MPO will also need to implement non-capacity type projects to mitigate congestion.

31% Reduction in Vehicle Hours of Delay




2045 - No New Projects

Only Existing and Committed Projects



2045 - The Plan

All Existing, Committed, & Planned Projects



Congested Corridors


- Excessive Delay
- Very Long Delay
- Long Delay

5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects

Legend

- New Roadway
- Widening
- Other/Multiple



0 5 Miles


NORTH

5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects

Legend

- Pavement
- Interchange/Intersection
- Corridor Redesign
- Other/Multiple
- Intersection/Interchange



0 5 Miles



5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects

Project ID	Funding	Stage	Route	Location
66	N/A	2020-2025	Lincoln Rd	US 11 to 28th Ave
67	N/A	2020-2025	Martin Luther King Extension	Bowling St to Helveston Rd
132	Local/MPO	2020-2025	Lincoln Rd	S 40th Ave to S 28th Ave
116	MDOT	2020-2025	Old MS 42	US 49 to Glendale Ave
145	MDOT	2020-2025	US 11	1.1 miles south of I-59 to I-59
106	MDOT	2020-2025	Evelyn Gandy Pkwy (MS 42)	Old Richton Rd to Herrington Rd
153	MDOT	2020-2025	Springfield Rd Extension	Corinth Rd to Evelyn Gandy Pkwy
125	MDOT	2020-2025	US 49	Broadway Dr to N 31st Ave
135	MDOT	2020-2025	Richburg Rd	I-59 to US 49
107	MDOT	2020-2025	US 11	W Central Ave to Evelyn Gandy Pkwy
118	MDOT	2020-2025	Pine St/Front St	Hardy St to Market St
201	Local/MPO	2026-2035	S 40th Ave	Lincoln Rd to Hardy St
126	MDOT	2026-2035	US 49	Rawls Springs Loop Rd to North Study Area Boundary
146	MDOT	2026-2035	Western Bypass Phase I	Richburg Rd to US 98
110	MDOT	2026-2035	CBD Bypass Phase I	Bouie St/Gordon St to E Hardy St
127	MDOT	2026-2035	US 49	@ Broadway Dr
124	MDOT	2026-2035	US 49	US 98 Bypass to Broadway Dr
129	Local/MPO	2026-2035	W Arlington Loop Extension	S 40th Ave to S 37th Ave
108	MDOT	2026-2035	US 11	Chapel Hill Rd to Leeville Rd
121	Local/MPO	2026-2035	Timothy Ln Extension	W Pine St to Eastside Ave
112	MDOT	2026-2035	Bouie St	E 4th St to Old MS 42/US 11
138	Local/MPO	2036-2045	W 4th St	Weathersby Rd to N 38th Ave
202	MDOT	2036-2045	Western Bypass Phase III	Jc Bryant Rd to I-59
147	MDOT	2036-2045	Western Bypass Phase II	US 98 to MS 42 Realignment
128	Local/MPO	2036-2045	N 31st Ave Extension	W 4th St to W 7th St
119	Local/MPO	2036-2045	S 17th Ave	Adeline St to Mamie St
120	Local/MPO	2036-2045	Broadway Dr Extension	W Pine St to Hall Ave

Note 1: YOY refers to the Year of Expenditure and reflects the expected cost at the time of implementation.

Note 2: Bicycle and pedestrian improvements should be part of the overall design phase of all projects and included unless restrictions apply consistent with FHWA guidance.

Improvement Type: ● New Roadway ● Widening ● Other/Multiple

Design Considerations: EJ – High Concern for Environmental Justice Impacts
EC – High Concern for Environmental and Community Impacts

5.0 Implementation

Improvement	Length (mi)	Type	Cost (YOE)	Design Considerations
Widen to 4 Lanes	0.64	●	\$3,347,000	--
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.81	●	\$2,788,000	--
Widen to 5 Lanes	1.00	●	\$3,588,202	EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	1.64	●	\$5,884,651	EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	1.19	●	\$4,269,960	--
Add New Service Roads	2.29	●	\$13,851,484	EC
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.32	●	\$1,935,579	EC
Widen to 6 Lanes	3.01	●	\$10,800,487	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes, New 4 Lane Roadway	2.09, 0.81	●	\$17,464,291	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	0.72	●	\$2,583,505	EC
Convert to Two Way	0.63	●	\$1,025,201	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	1.41	●	\$5,478,567	EJ EC
Widen to 6 Lanes	4.77	●	\$18,533,875	--
Widen to 4 Lanes, New 4 Lane Roadway	1.94, 1.28	●	\$24,589,717	--
New 4 Lane Roadway	0.96	●	\$12,788,873	EJ EC
Reconstruct Interchange	--	●	\$22,202,905	EJ EC
Widen to 6 Lanes	5.33	●	\$20,709,759	EJ EC
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.25	●	\$1,637,464	EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	2.82	●	\$10,957,133	EC
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.13	●	\$851,481	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	0.57	●	\$2,214,740	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	1.34	●	\$5,751,305	EJ EC
New 4 Lane Roadway	3.57	●	\$52,534,306	--
Widen to 4 Lanes, New 4 Lane Roadway	4.89, 2.77	●	\$61,749,883	--
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.26	●	\$1,881,130	EJ EC
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.14	●	\$1,012,916	EC
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.22	●	\$1,591,726	EJ EC

5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects

Project ID	Stage	Route	Location
NC-1	2020-2025	I-59	@ MS 42
NC-2	2020-2025	Country Club Rd	Timothy Lane and Hwy 49
NC-3	2020-2025	Old Hwy 11	Hattiesburg Corp Limits South to Richburg Rd
NC-4	2020-2025	Oak Grove Rd/Weathersby Rd Intersection	Shears Rd to Oak Grove Rd
NC-5	2020-2025	Oak Grove Rd/Hegwood Rd/Lincoln Rd	plus/minus 600' either side of Hegwood Intersection & Lincoln Rd
NC-6	TBD	I-59	@ US 98
NC-7	TBD	Hardy St	Westover Dr to 38th Ave
NC-8	TBD	Hardy St	Westover Dr to 38th Ave
NC-9	TBD	MS 42 (Evelyn Gandy Pkwy)	@ I-59
NC-10	TBD	4th St	@ Westover Dr
NC-11	TBD	US 49 and I 59	@ I-59
NC-12	TBD	US 98	@ Weathersby Rd
NC-13	TBD	Cross Creek Pkwy	W 4th St to US 98 (Hardy St)
NC-14	TBD	US 98	Hegwood Rd/Jackson Rd to Cross Creek Pkwy
NC-15	TBD	S 40th Ave	MS 98 (Hardy St) to 0.83 miles south
LI-1	2020-2025	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-2	2020-2025	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-3	2020-2025	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-4	2020-2025	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-5	2020-2025	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-6	2020-2025	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-7	2026-2035	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-8	2026-2035	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-9	2026-2035	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-10	2026-2035	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-11	2026-2035	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-12	2026-2035	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-13	2036-2045	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-14	2036-2045	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-15	2036-2045	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-16	2036-2045	Line Item Funding	Various

5.0 Implementation

	Improvement Type	Length (mi)	Type	Cost (YOE)
	Interchange Modification	1.07	●	\$2,111,631
	Reconstruction	3.13	●	\$778,750
	Overlay and Maintenance	1.13	●	\$623,292
	Intersection Improvement	0.92	●	\$1,010,164
	Intersection Improvement	1.11	●	\$5,185,000
	Signal Retiming/Signal Improvement	N/A	●	TBD
	Signal Retiming/Signal Improvement	N/A	●	TBD
	Corridor Study	N/A	●	TBD
	Signal Retiming/Signal Improvement	N/A	●	TBD
	Signal Retiming/Signal Improvement	N/A	●	TBD
	Signal Retiming/Signal Improvement	N/A	●	TBD
	Signal Retiming/Signal Improvement	N/A	●	TBD
	Safety Study	N/A	●	TBD
	Safety Study	N/A	●	TBD
	Safety Study	N/A	●	TBD
	Reconstruction	Various	●	\$14,289,642
	Overlay	Various	●	\$23,070,056
	Bridge	Various	●	\$15,380,038
	Enhancement	Various	●	\$4,568,224
	Safety	Various	●	\$14,809,049
	Maintenance	Various	●	\$2,764,362
	Reconstruction	Various	●	\$27,764,624
	Overlay	Various	●	\$41,646,935
	Bridge	Various	●	\$27,764,624
	Enhancement	Various	●	\$13,882,312
	Safety	Various	●	\$36,094,011
	Maintenance	Various	●	\$5,552,925
	Reconstruction	Various	●	\$30,669,418
	Overlay	Various	●	\$46,004,126
	Bridge	Various	●	\$30,669,418
	Enhancement	Various	●	\$15,334,709

5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects (Continued)

Project ID	Stage	Route	Location
LI-17	2036-2045	Line Item Funding	Various
LI-18	2036-2045	Line Item Funding	Various

Note: YOE refers to the Year of Expenditure and reflects the expected cost at the time of implementation.

Improvement Type: ● Bridge ● Pavement ● Intersection/Interchange
● Corridor Redesign ● Other/Multiple

5.0 Implementation

Improvement Type		Length (mi)	Type	Cost (YOE)
	Safety	Various	●	\$39,870,243
	Maintenance	Various	●	\$6,133,884


5.0 Implementation

This page is intentionally left blank.

Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects

Legend

- New Roadway
- Widening
- Turning Lane
- Other/Multiple



0 5 Miles

NORTH

5.0 Implementation

Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects

Project ID	Funding	Route	Location
131	Local/MPO	Lincoln Rd	Sandy Run Rd/Hegwood Rd to I-59
203	Local/MPO	Oak Grove Rd	Old Hwy 11 to Lincoln Rd
105	Local/MPO	Batson Rd Extension	Sunrise Rd to MS 42
141	Local/MPO	Oak Grove Rd/Weathersby Rd	Lincoln Rd to US 98
122	Local/MPO	WSF Tatum Blvd Extension	US 49 to Edwards St
115	Local/MPO	Glendale Ave	Old MS 42 to Evelyn Gandy Pkwy (MS 42)
152	Local/MPO	Old Richton Rd	Evelyn Gandy Pkwy to Herrington Rd
142	Local/MPO	Sullivan-Kilrain Rd/Richburg Rd	US 11 to Richburg Rd
102	Local/MPO	Sims Rd	James St/Old US 49 to Old River Rd
103	Local/MPO	Sims Rd Extension	Old River Rd to Indian Springs Rd
109	Local/MPO	Hall Ave Extension	James St to E Hardy St
137	Local/MPO	Classic Dr Extension	W 4th St to J Ed Turner Rd
111	MDOT	CBD Bypass Phase II	E Hardy St to Edwards St
148	Local/MPO	Old US 11	Richburg Rd to 6th Section Rd
123	MDOT	US 49	South Study Area Boundary to US 98 Bypass
130	Local/MPO	Lincoln Rd	Old US 11 to Sandy Run Rd/Hegwood Rd
136	Local/MPO	J Ed Turner Dr/Classic Dr	Jackson Rd to N Beverly Hills Rd
154	Local/MPO	J Ed Turner Dr Extension	Classic Dr to W 4th St
133	MDOT	I-59	@ Lincoln Rd
140	MDOT	I-59	@ W 4th St
113	Local/MPO	Edwards St	US 49 to Tuscan Ave
117	Local/MPO	W 4th St	US 49 to Bouie St
139	Local/MPO	Weathersby Rd	Methodist Blvd to W 4th St
114	Local/MPO	Edwards St	Tuscan Ave to James St
104	Local/MPO	Sunrise Rd	Indian Springs Rd to MS 42
149	Local/MPO	Old Hwy 24	MS 589 to Old US 11
101	Local/MPO	Ralston Rd	US 98 Bypass to James St/Old US 49
204	MDOT	Western Beltway Phase I	Slade Rd to I-59
205	MDOT	Western Beltway Phase II	MS 589 to Slade Rd
206	MDOT	Western Beltway Phase III	US 98 to MS 589
207	MDOT	Outer Western Bypass	US 98 to MS 42
150	MDOT	MS 589	Luther Lee Rd to US 98

5.0 Implementation

Improvement	Length (mi)	Type	Cost (2020\$)	Design Considerations
Widen to 4 lanes	2.85	●	\$9,975,000	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	2.45	●	\$8,575,000	EC
New 2 Lane Roadway	2.55	●	\$15,045,000	--
Widen to 4 Lanes	1.54	●	\$5,390,000	EC
New 4 Lane Roadway	1.30	●	\$15,600,000	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	1.44	●	\$5,040,000	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	3.55	●	\$12,425,000	EC
Add Center Turn Lane	2.12	●	\$6,890,000	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	1.81	●	\$6,335,000	EC
New 4 Lane Roadway	3.99	●	\$47,880,000	--
New 2 Lane Roadway	1.32	●	\$7,788,000	EJ EC
New 2 Lane Roadway	0.98	●	\$5,782,000	--
New 4 Lane Roadway	2.02	●	\$24,240,000	EJ EC
Add Center Turn Lane	2.50	●	\$8,125,000	EC
Upgrade to Expressway	2.18	●	\$21,582,000	--
Add Center Turn Lane	0.68	●	\$2,210,000	--
Widen to 4 Lanes	2.02	●	\$7,070,000	--
New 2 Lane Roadway	1.84	●	\$10,856,000	--
New Interchange	--	●	\$24,000,000	EC
New Interchange	--	●	\$24,000,000	EJ EC
Add Center Turn Lane	2.06	●	\$6,695,000	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	2.47	●	\$8,645,000	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes	0.68	●	\$2,380,000	EJ
Widen to 5 Lanes	0.72	●	\$2,520,000	EJ EC
Widen to 4 Lanes, Realign Intersections	2.25	●	\$7,875,000	--
Add Center Turn Lane	3.72	●	\$12,090,000	EC
Add Center Turn Lane	0.99	●	\$3,217,500	EC
New 4 Lane Roadway and Interchange Modification	3.51	●	\$48,370,000	--
New 4 Lane Roadway	4.17	●	\$50,040,000	--
New 4 Lane Roadway	7.82	●	\$93,840,000	EC
Widen to 4 Lanes, New 4 Lane Roadway	3.28, 5.39	●	\$76,160,000	--
Widen to 4 Lanes	6.90	●	\$24,150,000	EC

5.0 Implementation

Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects (Continued)

Project ID	Funding	Route	Location
151	MDOT	MS 589	US 98 to MS 42
134	Local/MPO	Richburg Rd	Old US 11 to I-59
143	MDOT	US 98 Bypass Extension Phase I	Richburg Rd to I-59
144	MDOT	US 98 Bypass Extension Phase II	US 98 to US 98 Bypass Extension Phase I

Note: Bicycle and pedestrian improvements should be part of the overall design phase of all projects and included unless restrictions apply consistent with FHWA guidance.

Improvement Type: ● New Roadway ● Widening ● Turning Lane ● Other/Multiple

Design Considerations: EJ – High Concern for Environmental Justice Impacts
EC – High Concern for Environmental and Community Impacts

5.0 Implementation

Improvement	Length (mi)	Type	Cost (2020\$)	Design Considerations
Widen to 4 Lanes	9.49	●	\$33,215,000	EC
Widen to 4 Lanes, New 4 Lane Roadway, New Interchange	3.20, 0.84	●	\$45,280,000	EC
New 4 Lane Roadway and Interchange Modification	5.08	●	\$67,210,000	--
New 4 Lane Roadway	7.03	●	\$84,360,000	--

5.0 Implementation

This page is intentionally left blank.


Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

In addition to bicycle and pedestrian improvements included with planned roadway projects, the region will continue to fund stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Financial Plan


The major federal source for bicycle and pedestrian projects is the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside program, which MDOT administers for the region. Based on historical funding levels and the region's share of the state population, this plan assumes that approximately \$16.72 million in federal TA funds will be available to the MPO from 2020 to 2045.

While the MTP does not identify specific bicycle and pedestrian projects, the MPO will encourage local agencies to make improvements along the high-priority bicycle and pedestrian corridors.



High-Priority, Visionary Project Corridors

All bicycle and pedestrian projects identified in the MTP were prioritized based on the criteria below, resulting in a list of visionary bicycle and pedestrian project corridors. Local governments should prioritize projects in these corridors for TA funding.




5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors

Legend

-  Bicycle and Pedestrian
-  Pedestrian




5.0 Implementation

Visionary, High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors

Legend

- Bike Route or Sharrow
- Bike Lane
- Shared-Use Path



0 5 Miles



5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained List of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Project ID	TIP ID	Stage	Route	Location
BP-1	502	2020-2025	Classic Drive	Pine Tree Drive to US Hwy 49
BP-2	505	2020-2025	Country Club Rd	Country Club Rd across Us Hwy 49

Note: YOE refers to the Year of Expenditure and reflects the expected cost at the time of implementation.

Facility Type: ● Pedestrian ● Bicycle and Pedestrian

5.0 Implementation

Type	Length (mi)	Responsible LPA	Fiscal Year	Total Cost (YOE)	Federal Cost (YOE)
●	1.8	Forrest County	2022	\$296,250	\$237,000
●	0.1	Forrest County	2022	\$1,300,000	\$1,040,000

5.0 Implementation

Visionary, High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors

Project ID	Responsible LPA	Route
BP-3	City of Hattiesburg	Main St
BP-4	City of Hattiesburg	N 40th Ave and Montague Blvd
BP-5	City of Hattiesburg	McLeod and Jackson St
BP-6	City of Hattiesburg	Buschman Blvd and Shared Use Path
BP-7	City of Hattiesburg	Black and Gold Blvd and Golden Ave Sidepaths
BP-8	City of Hattiesburg	34th Ave Bike Route- Sharrows
BP-9	City of Hattiesburg	Arlington Loop
BP-10	City of Hattiesburg	Walnut St
BP-11	City of Hattiesburg	Memorial Dr Bike Lanes
BP-12	City of Hattiesburg	Thornhill Dr and Shared-Use Path
BP-13	City of Hattiesburg	Columbia St and West St
BP-14	City of Hattiesburg	Hardy St West
BP-15	City of Hattiesburg	Hardy St Bike Lane
BP-16	City of Hattiesburg	26th Ave Bike Lanes
BP-17	City of Hattiesburg	25th Ave Bike Route
BP-18	City of Hattiesburg	Front Street Bike Route
BP-19	City of Hattiesburg	Old RR/ROW Shared-Use Path
BP-20	City of Hattiesburg	Columbia St Bike Route
BP-21	City of Hattiesburg	W. Pine St/Broadway Bike Lane
BP-22	City of Hattiesburg	MLK Ave Bike Route
BP-23	City of Hattiesburg	4th St Bike Lane
BP-24	City of Hattiesburg	Beverly Hills Rd Bike Route
BP-25	Town of Petal	W. Pine St
BP-26	Town of Petal	Main St Petal

Facility Type: ● Bike Lane ● Bike Route ● Shared-Use Path

5.0 Implementation

Location	Length (mi)	Type	Cost (2020\$)
Jackson St to Southern Ave	0.65	●	TBD
N 40th Ave: Hardy St to Montague Blvd; Montague Blvd: N 40th Ave to Ross Blvd	0.74	● ●	TBD
McLeod St: Hardy St to Forrest St; Jackson St: Forrest St to E 5th St	0.62	● ●	TBD
Buschman Blvd: Main St to Rail ROW; Shared-Use Path: Buschman Blvd to 750 ft from E 5th Ave	1.02	● ●	TBD
Black and Gold Ave: Golden Eagle Ave to Championship Ln; Golden Eagle Ave: Pearl St to W 4th St	0.67	●	TBD
Hardy St to Beverly Ln	0.57	●	TBD
S 37th Ave to US 49	0.87	● ●	TBD
Katie Ave to Main St	0.68	●	TBD
Hardy St to Arcadia St	1.04	●	TBD
Thornhill Dr: N 40th Ave to W 4th St; Shared-Use Path: Thornhill Dr to Longleaf Trace	1.17	● ●	TBD
Columbia St: Rawls Ave to Main St; West St: Columbia St to Longleaf Trace (Programmed)	0.79	●	TBD
S 40th Ave to Cross Creek Pkwy	2.00	●	TBD
US 49 to W Front St	2.21	●	TBD
Hardy St to Eddy St	1.11	●	TBD
7th St to Quinn St	0.50	●	TBD
Forrest St to Gordon St	0.48	●	TBD
Bouie River Shared Use Path to Mobile St	1.51	●	TBD
Rawls Ave to Main St	0.79	●	TBD
Service Rd to 83 ft from 7th Ave	0.94	●	TBD
Hall Ave to Tuscan Ave	0.80	●	TBD
N 38th Ave to US 49	1.01	●	TBD
Campbell Dr to N 37th Ave	0.69	●	TBD
Lincoln Rd to Broadway Dr	1.16	●	TBD
Main St: E Hardy St to W 1st Ave; W 1st Ave: Main St to Rails with Trails Path	2.94	● ●	TBD


5.0 Implementation

Public Transit Projects

Over the next 25 years, the region will continue to provide its fixed route and demand response services. At a minimum, the MTP assumes that existing transit services will continue to operate at current levels and that vehicles will be kept in a good state of repair.

Financial Plan

If recent funding levels continue, the region will have enough federal funding to continue operating public transit at current levels. The main limitation to expanding service will be local funding to match and exceed federal funding.



Regional Transit Study

The Needs Assessment revealed regional demand for increased and improved transit service. To address these needs, the MTP recommends performing a Regional Transit Study. The Regional Transit Study should consider the following questions:


- How could existing routes and services be redesigned to provide more effective service?
- Are there any new modes or trends in the transit industry that could serve the area (i.e. microtransit)?

Answers to these questions should inform the study's recommended strategies for improving Hub City Transit in the short, mid, and long-term horizons.

Fiscally Constrained Transit Plan

Legend

 Continue and Redesign Existing Service



5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained List of Transit Projects

Project ID	TIP ID	Description
HCT-1	N/A	SECTION 5307 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE
HCT-2	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
HCT-3	N/A	SECTION 5307 ROLLING STOCK
HCT-4	N/A	SECTION 5307 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE
HCT-5	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
HCT-6	N/A	SECTION 5307 PASSENGER AMENITIES
HCT-7	N/A	SECTION 5307 BUS SHELTERS
HCT-8	N/A	SECTION 5307 ROLLING STOCK
HCT-9	N/A	SECTION 5307 SUPPORT VEHICLES
HCT-10	N/A	SECTION 5307 HCT OPERATIONS CENTER
HCT-11	N/A	SECTION 5339 HCT OPERATIONS CENTER
HCT-12	N/A	SECTION 5307 ADA VEHICLE EQUIPMENT
HCT-13	N/A	SECTION 5307 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE
HCT-14	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
HCT-15	N/A	SECTION 5307 ROLLING STOCK
HCT-16	N/A	SECTION 5307 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE
HCT-17	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
HCT-18	N/A	SECTION 5307 BUS SHELTERS
HCT-19	N/A	SECTION 5307 ROLLING STOCK
HCT-20	N/A	SECTION 5337 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE

5.0 Implementation

	Type	Sponsor	Fiscal Year	Total Cost (YOE)	Federal Cost (YOE)
	●	HCT	2020	\$1,000,000	\$500,000
	●	HCT	2020	\$428,750	\$343,000
	●	HCT	2020	\$240,964	\$200,000
	●	HCT	2021	\$1,436,628	\$718,314
	●	HCT	2021	\$168,096	\$134,477
	●	HCT	2021	\$320,630	\$256,504
	●	HCT	2021	\$366,878	\$293,502
	●	HCT	2021	\$611,239	\$507,328
	●	HCT	2021	\$51,140	\$40,912
	●	HCT	2021	\$256,219	\$204,975
	●	HCT	2021	\$1,309,793	\$1,047,834
	●	HCT	2021	\$256,219	\$204,975
	●	HCT	2022	\$1,000,000	\$500,000
	●	HCT	2022	\$428,750	\$343,000
	●	HCT	2022	\$240,964	\$200,000
	●	HCT	2023	\$960,000	\$480,000
	●	HCT	2023	\$300,000	\$240,000
	●	HCT	2023	\$79,876	\$63,901
	●	HCT	2023	\$240,964	\$200,000
	●	HCT	2024	\$960,000	\$480,000

5.0 Implementation

Fiscally Constrained List of Transit Projects (Continued)

Project ID	TIP ID	Description
HCT-21	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
HCT-22	N/A	SECTION 5307 PASSENGER AMENITIES
HCT-23	N/A	SECTION 5307 BUS SHELTERS
HCT-24	N/A	SECTION 5307 ROLLING STOCK
HCT-25	N/A	SECTION 5307 SUPPORT VEHICLES
HCT-26	N/A	SECTIONS 5307 AND 5339 CAPITAL
HCT-27	N/A	SECTION 5337 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE
HCT-28	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
HCT-29	N/A	SECTIONS 5307 AND 5339 CAPITAL
HCT-30	N/A	SECTION 5337 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE
HCT-31	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
HCT-32	N/A	SECTIONS 5307 AND 5339 CAPITAL
HCT-33	N/A	SECTION 5337 OPERATIONS ASSISTANCE
HCT-34	N/A	SECTION 5307 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE

Note: YOE refers to the Year of Expenditure and reflects the expected cost at the time of implementation.

Improvement: ● Operating ● Capital ● Preventative Maintenance

5.0 Implementation

	Type	Sponsor	Fiscal Year	Total Cost (YOE)	Federal Cost (YOE)
	●	HCT	2024	\$300,000	\$240,000
	●	HCT	2024	\$150,000	\$120,000
	●	HCT	2024	\$79,876	\$63,901
	●	HCT	2024	\$60,241	\$50,000
	●	HCT	2024	\$37,500	\$30,000
	●	HCT	2025	\$293,186	\$234,549
	●	HCT	2025	\$10,245,602	\$5,122,801
	●	HCT	2025	\$3,201,751	\$2,561,401
	●	HCT	2026-2035	\$3,098,045	\$2,478,436
	●	HCT	2026-2035	\$10,245,602	\$5,122,801
	●	HCT	2026-2035	\$3,201,751	\$2,561,401
	●	HCT	2036-2045	\$3,422,169	\$2,737,735
	●	HCT	2036-2045	\$11,317,520	\$5,658,760
	●	HCT	2036-2045	\$3,536,725	\$2,829,380

5.0 Implementation

This page is intentionally left blank.

Next Steps

Implementation Timeline

