Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2052

South Tangipahoa Metropolitan Planning Area

Regional Planning Commission for Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany, and Tangipahoa Parishes

Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2052

South Tangipahoa Metropolitan Planning Area

Adopted August 9, 2022

Amended May 9, 2023

Regional Planning Commission
10 Veterans Blvd.
New Orleans, LA 70124

Phone: 504-483-8500
Email: rpc@norpc.org
Web: www.norpc.org

U.S. DOT Funding: The preparation of this document was financed in part through grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, in under the Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f) of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

GIS Disclaimer: The data herein, including but not limited to geographic data, tabular data, analytical data, electronic data structures or files, are provided "as is" without warranty of any kind, either expressed or implied, or statutory, including, but not limited to, the implied warranties or merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. The entire risk as to the quality and performance of the data is assumed by the user. No guarantee of accuracy is granted, nor is any responsibility for reliance thereon assumed. In no event shall the Regional Planning Commission for Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany, and Tangipahoa Parishes (RPC) be liable for direct, indirect, incidental, consequential, or special damages of any kind, including, but not limited to, loss of anticipated profits or benefits arising out of use of or reliance on the data. The RPC does not accept liability for any damages or misrepresentation caused by inaccuracies in the data or as a result of changes to the data caused by system transfers or other transformations or conversions, nor is there responsibility assumed to maintain the data in any manner or form. These data have been developed from the best available sources. Although efforts have been made to ensure that the data are accurate and reliable, errors and variable conditions originating from physical sources used to develop the data may be reflected in the data supplied. Users must be aware of these conditions and bear responsibility for the appropriate use of the information with respect to possible errors, scale, resolution, rectification, positional accuracy, development methodology, time period, environmental and climatic conditions and other circumstances specific to these data. The user is responsible for understanding the accuracy limitations of the data provided herein. The burden for determining fitness for use lies entirely with the user. The user should refer to the accompanying metadata notes for a description of the data and data development procedures. Although these data have been processed successfully on computers at the RPC, no guarantee, expressed or implied, is made by RPC regarding the use of these data on any other system, nor does the act of distribution constitute or imply any such warranty. Distribution of these data is intended for information purposes and should not be considered authoritative for navigational, engineering, legal and other site-specific uses. Data was prepared by Geographic Information System (GIS) professionals, not by licensed professional land surveyors or engineers.

Demographic Data Citation: Data compiled from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Summary File (2015-2019) published December, 2020 by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau. Data received in text format, and joined to spatial geography files by the

New Orleans Regional Planning Commission (RPC). Specific tabular data relating to RPC Activities formatted for mapping and analytical purposes. For Further information please contact Lynn Dupont, GIS Manager.

Title VI Notice: The Regional Planning Commission (RPC) fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes, executive orders, and regulations in all programs and activities. RPC operates without regard to race, color, national origin, income, gender, age, and disability. Any person who believes him/herself or any specific class of persons, to be subject to discrimination prohibited by Title VI may by him/herself or by representative file a written complaint with the Louisiana Department of Transportation (LADOTD). LADOTD Title VI Program Manager may be reached via phone at 225-379-1361. A Complaint must be filed no later than 180 days after the date of the alleged discrimination.

RPC meetings are conducted in accessible locations and materials can be provided in accessible formats and in languages other than English. If you would like accessibility or language accommodations, please contact the Title VI Coordinator at RPC at 504-483-8513 or mgivhan@norpc.org. If you wish to attend a RPC function and require special accommodations, please give RPC on week's notice in advance.

Contents

Introduction

Introduction

Background

The Regional Planning Commission

The Regional Planning Commission (RPC) for Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany and Tangipahoa Parishes, is a 54-member board of local elected officials and citizen members, appointed to represent the public on regional planning issues. The Commission is supported by a staff of professionals with a diverse range of expertise, including transportation, land use, economic development, and environmental planning, as well as data management, analysis, and geographic information systems (GIS).

The RPC serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region of southern Tangipahoa Parish that includes the cities of Hammond, Ponchatoula, and Amite City. In this capacity the agency is responsible for planning the metropolitan transportation system and programming the expenditure of federal transportation funds allocated to the region. The RPC's mandate for regional transportation planning is established in a series of agreements with local governments, state and federal legislation. The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, passed in 2015, provided requirements and guidance for the RPC's programs from 2016-2021. The FAST Act was recently replaced with the Infrastructure, Investment, and Jobs Act (IIJA)[1], passed in November 2021, which outlines new programs and

[1] Also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL).

requirements for federally-funded transportation projects that will govern the RPC's metropolitan transportation process starting in 2022.

Regional transportation planning is accomplished through close coordination with a variety of partners, including elected officials; local, state and federal agencies; public transit providers; community and advocacy groups; and the public. The Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), which includes representatives from various transportation interests in the region, including transit agencies, railroads, airports, ports, and over the road freight, serves as the MPO policy board for the RPC.

The South Tangipahoa Urbanized Area and Metropolitan Planning Area

The U.S. Census Bureau defines Urbanized Areas (UZAs) as those locations that meet certain population density thresholds and that have a population over 50,000. Multiple municipalities, parishes, or parts thereof may be included in a single UZA, and by federal law each UZA must designate an MPO to carry out a metropolitan transportation planning process that considers the needs of the entire region.

The UZA boundaries established by the Census Bureau frequently exclude portions of roadways, developed areas, or other important features that should logically be included in the transportation planning process. For this reason the RPC, in consultation with the state and local governments, creates adjusted or "smoothed" UZA boundaries that are inclusive of those features critical to regional planning efforts but which are not within the boundaries originally created by the Census Bureau.

The long-term nature of regional transportation planning also requires the RPC to consider areas that are not yet urbanized but may become so in the future. In consultation with local governments, and in agreement with the Governor, the RPC has identified the parts of the region that are likely to become urbanized in the next 20 years. These areas, combined with the existing UZA, are collectively known as the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). This plan addresses the long term transportation needs of the South Tangipahoa MPA, which encompasses multiple municipalities and unincorporated areas in the southern half of the parish. In 2019, the total estimated population of the South Tangipahoa MPA was just under 135,000[2]. The RPC also serves as MPO to three other MPAs: Mandeville-Covington, New Orleans, and Slidell.

[2] ACS 5-Year Estimates (2015-2019, pub. 2020)


South Tangipahoa Urbanized Area, Adjusted Urbanized Area, and Metropolitan Planning Area
Washington Parish
Tangipahoa
Roseland
Amite
St. Helena Parish
Tangipahoa Parish
Independence
Livingston Parish
Tickfaw
55
St. Tammany Parish
Hammond
51
190
12
Ponchatoula
22
Legend
Urbanized Area Census 2010
Ubanized Area Adjusted (Smoothed) RPC / LADOTD) 2013
Metropolitan Planning Area
N
Lake Pontchartrain
Lake Maurepas

About This Plan

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is the overarching legal document reflecting the goals and objectives, the resources, the fundamental planning process, and the project implementation schedule for the region over the next 30 years. The MTP must be revised at least every five years so that incoming or newly identified projects and priorities can be identified and updated. This plan describes the regional vision for transportation for the years 2022-2052.

The region's previous Metropolitan Transportation Plan, entitled MTP 2048, was adopted in 2019 and provided a clear vision for regional transportation planning that is still largely applicable nearly four years after its adoption. Rather than fully reimagining the regional plan, this new plan, MTP 2052, builds upon its predecessor by incorporating new data and trends based on recent events and providing a more directed, implementable course of action.

MTP 2052 provides an overview of the South Tangipahoa MPA, its transportation needs, and the RPC's process for addressing those needs moving forward. The MTP first identifies the region's key planning Priorities, which are the major topics that the RPC will incorporate into its decision-making, and which will be used as guiding considerations during program and project development. The plan further describes broad Strategies that provide direction for implementing a planning process that will address the Priorities. Critically, each Strategy includes specific Actions that will be completed by the RPC in the coming years. Through completing the defined Actions the RPC will implement the plan's Strategies and address the region's Priorities.

The MTP goes on to describe the various RPC programs that impact regional transportation planning, detailing work to date as well as future expectations. The plan concludes with a discussion of the project selection and prioritization process, as well as a description of how the RPC uses data and Performance Based Planning and Programming. A fiscally-constrained list of projects planned for implementation over the next thirty years is included in the final chapter of the MTP.

Plan Requirements

The federal requirements for the MTP are outlined in the FAST Act (23 CFR 450.324; IIJA final rules pending) and describe a plan that addresses a wide range of transportation related issues and is created through a coordinated, comprehensive process. Per federal legislation, the MTP shall explicitly consider the following factors:

- Economic Vitality
- Safety
- Security
- Accessibility and Mobility
- Environmental Protection & Quality of Life
- Connectivity
- Efficient Management & Operations
- System Preservation
- Resilience and Reliability
- Travel and Tourism

In addressing the factors listed above the plan must include discussions of current and projected transportation demand, existing and proposed facilities, transportation system performance measures and targets, and strategies to improve all aspects of the transportation system. Importantly, it must also include a fiscally-constrained financial plan that is based on costs and revenues that can reasonably be expected to be available. Each of these components of the plan must be developed in coordination with existing local, state, and federal programs related to land use, environmental protection, safety, and other relevant topics.

Plan Development Process

RPC staff created MTP 2052 through a deliberate and thoughtful process over more than fourteen months. From the outset, the RPC sought to synthesize quantitative data and stakeholder input to determine regional priorities and inform decision making.

Stakeholder Engagement

During the MTP development process, the RPC consulted with partner agencies such as parishes and cities, as well as the general public. All comments and feedback received during the MTP's development are logged and tracked in a general database. This database is used to assess comments for

- Common themes
- Frequency
- Outliers
- Specific areas of concern

Stakeholder input has been analyzed to help guide the development of priorities and strategies, as well as identifying potential projects. Frequent and common themes provide a greater understanding of universal issues and priorities among stakeholders.

Common themes identified by South Tangipahoa MPA stakeholders include:

- Need for improved roadway operations for current roads
- Proactively planning for future growth
- Congestion management, road network development, and a focus on more access points to evenly distribute traffic
- Developing bike trails and sidewalks for greater non-motorized access
- Improved ability for the transportation system to withstand natural hazards, particularly flooding

Coordination With Other Plans

The MTP guides the RPC's regional transportation planning process but importantly it must also support the planning goals of local jurisdictions and the state. As such the plan is informed by other existing plans created by the RPC's partner agencies. All efforts have been made to ensure the MTP is consistent with and supportive of state and local plans, including:

- LADOTD Statewide Transportation Plan, Freight Mobility Plan, Highway Safety Improvement Plan, and Transportation Asset Management Plan
- Parish and city master plans and comprehensive plans
- Other mode- or agency-specific plans as available.

Given the breadth and variety of existing plans it can be expected that there are competing priorities among the RPC's many partner agencies. The MTP attempts to balance the needs of all the entities that have an interest in maintaining or improving the regional transportation system, and the RPC will continue to seek input from its partners during future planning efforts and the project development process.

Planning Priorities, Strategies, and Actions

Planning Priorities, Strategies, and Actions

Overview

Regional transportation planning will be guided by six overarching **Priorities** that will be considered throughout all levels of decision making. These priorities synthesize the MTP's planning input data, stakeholder feedback, and RPC staff expertise. The plan further identifies a series of **Strategies** that describe the broad activity types that will address one or more of the Priorities. Subsequent chapters of the MTP describe specific **Actions** that the RPC will complete, via its programs and projects, to implement the Strategies. Accomplishing defined Actions that are part of broader Strategies, which in turn are guided by the MTP's Priorities, will result in a transportation planning process that comprehensively addresses the region's needs in a thoughtful, deliberative manner.

Planning Priorities

The six Planning Priorities that will guide the RPC's transportation planning process are:

- Safety & Security
- Sustainability & Resilience
- Equity
- Economic Opportunity
- Reliability & Connectivity
- System Preservation & Stewardship

Invest in safe transportation options that will contribute to greater community health by enhancing physical safety and by increasing a sense of security in public spaces.

Safety & Security

Incorporating safety improvements wherever possible directly contributes to the preservation of human life and prevention of serious injuries. Transportation safety also has broad implications for the community. Crashes cause severe economic impacts through property damage and congestion delays. Safe transportation options contribute to greater community health by enhancing physical safety and by increasing a sense of security in public spaces. Travel hazards also create a less effective transportation system as they discourage or prohibit travel, particularly among people who walk, bike, or take transit. A safer transportation system is one that will be used more frequently, contributing to public health, community connectivity, and economic opportunity.

Recent trends in transportation safety demonstrate that significant improvements are required. Each new project introduces an opportunity to create a safer system, and even during routine maintenance work, minor modifications can make roadways safer for all users. Interventions to protect lives and minimize the impacts of crashes should be considered throughout the project development process.

The transportation system should minimize negative environmental impacts while also enhancing the region's ability to withstand and recover from natural hazards.

Sustainability & Resilience

The transportation planning process is well situated to address the dual objectives of protecting environmental sustainability and ensuring the community is resilient against natural hazards. In many cases, strategies that address one concern will also address the other; transportation at once affects and is affected by the natural environment. Vehicle emissions diminish air quality and contribute to climate change, while impermeable surfaces such as asphalt strain drainage infrastructure, contribute to water pollution via urban runoff, and prevent groundwater replenishment. The available transportation infrastructure also directly influences land uses that displace and fragment native landscapes, encourage development in vulnerable environments, and result in fur ther emissions due to increased travel distances. At the same time natural hazards that may be exacerbated by these impacts, such as hurricanes and extreme rainfall, pose a risk to the infrastructure itself.

The transportation system can also contribute to more sustainable interactions with the natural environment, and enhance community resilience to inevitable threats and hazards. A well-connected, reliable, and safe system encourages the use of alternative modes as well as development patterns that have a reduced environmental impact. Planning for improved access to basic needs and economic opportunity enhances individual community members' ability to minimize risk, and a robust system provides multiple evacuation options when necessary. Physical infrastructure can also be designed to mitigate routine hazards, withstand extreme events, and recover more quickly.

All residents of the region will accrue benefits from the transportation system, and no person or community will suffer disproportionately from the RPC's transportation decisions.

Equity

Southeast Louisiana is extraordinarily diverse, but many communities and individuals have been historically disadvantaged through lack of inclusion in the transportation decision-making process or by being disproportionately, negatively impacted by the system itself. These inequities can be addressed through a deliberative and equitable transportation planning process that not only improves quality of life for disadvantaged communities but also benefits the region as a whole. Including a diversity of voices in decision-making leads to programs and policies that are responsive to a larger portion of the population, ensuring as many the needs of as many people as possible are met. Moreover, enhancing people's access to jobs, education, and businesses leads to broader, region-wide economic growth. Perhaps most importantly, considering the impacts of the transportation system to communities whose voices have historically been minimized helps to ensure environmental justice, wherein certain segments of the population are not disproportionately affected.

All aspects of the transportation planning process should include consideration of which populations will be impacted, and to what extent. In practice this will entail defining and identifying disadvantaged communities through the Social Vulnerability Index tool and other means, directly engaging them during the project development process, and periodically evaluating impacts as projects move towards implementation. By undertaking these efforts the RPC strives to direct transportation investments towards improvements that will comprehensively benefit the region's entire population.

The transportation system will provide residents with access to employment, facilitate the movement of goods, and connect businesses with customers.

Economic Opportunity

Transportation infrastructure directly impacts the regional economy in a number of ways. It provides a means for workers to access employment, and allows customers to access businesses. Businesses use it to deliver goods and services, and it is the means by which visitors reach the region. Importantly, the shipment of goods to, from, and through the region via all freight modes is a significant source of employment and revenue. Providing better access to an area can support new and existing businesses, or encourage development of underutilized property. Alternatively, lack of access can contribute to loss of customers and economic decline in a neighborhood, or serve as a disincentive to new investment.

The health and well being of the region is also directly linked to the economic resiliency of the community. Individuals in poverty face significant disparities in travel time based upon income and mode, causing higher rates of transportation energy burden (i.e. the cost of travel) for low income residents versus higher income individuals. This impacts people's ability to access jobs, affordable housing, and basic needs such as healthcare or outdoor recreation, which are all especially important considerations for historically disadvantaged or underserved populations. The RPC has a responsibility to not only recognize these impacts, but to strategically direct its transportation investments to projects that will connect people to where they want to travel while having the most positive impact on the strength and resilience o f the regional economy.

Travel times throughout the region will be predictable, and the transportation system will be easy to use.

Reliability & Connectivity

All travelers should have some reasonable assurance of how long a trip will take. A reliable transportation system is one in which transit riders can expect vehicles to arrive at the scheduled time, and trips to have the same duration each time they ride. It is also a system in which people walking, biking, or driving do not encounter unexpected delays.

Travelers should similarly expect the system to provide easy access to their desired destinations. Ensuring that the region is interconnected by multiple modes of travel, and that those modes are well-connected to each other, gives people the freedom to choose how they will move from one place to another.

A transportation system that can predictably bring people to a variety of destinations is an asset to the community; conversely, unexpected delays and a lack of connection become a hindrance

to activity. Improving reliability and connectivity requires the RPC to balance the needs of all system users. Drivers of private vehicles and trucks value high travel speeds and minimal congestion, but fast moving traffic can be a dangerous obstacle to people walking and biking. Transit riders need a network of routes that reach important destinations, but the automobile-oriented built environment in some portions of the region makes it difficult to access transit stops. The transportation planning process will consider how best to address these competing needs while also maximizing system reliability and creating more connections across the region.

System Preservation & Stewardship

Emphasis should be placed on maintaining and enhancing the multimodal functionality of existing infrastructure before investing in the addition of new roadway capacity.

The region's transportation system represents a massive public investment that provides the backbone for nearly all the activities that take place in the area. Given the importance of the system and the significant investment in its creation, its maintenance is one of the RPC's most important tasks. The RPC recognizes that system preservation does not simply extend the useful life of investments made in the past; it also prevents the need for expensive mitigation of the effects of deferred maintenance.

It is also important to strike a balance between the provision of new infrastructure and more efficient use of the existing system. New infrastructure can take the burden off of parts of an aging system, but will in turn stretch maintenance resources even thinner. More efficient use and preservation of the existing system can be less expensive than new construction, but an overburdened system sacrifices functionality and requires more frequent and intensive maintenance. Emphasis should be placed on maintaining and enhancing the multimodal functionality of existing infrastructure before investing in new capacity. Transportation facilities should also be designed in a way that can endure anticipated future conditions, including routine use and extreme events.

Strategies

The MTP's Planning Priorities will be incorporated into the RPC's planning process by implementing a series of Strategies. These Strategies direct the RPC to create policies, programs, and projects that will comprehensively address the needs previously identified in this plan. The MTP's Priorities are interrelated, and as such many Strategies address more than one of the Priorities.

Each Strategy is summarized below, and they have been grouped by their overall impact into the following categories:

- **Human Impact Strategies** focus on improving outcomes for the people who use and are affected by the transportation system.
- **Modal Strategies** will improve the effectiveness of specific transportation modes.
- **Systems Strategies** address the transportation system as a whole or functions of the RPC as an agency.

Each strategy includes specific Actions, which are tasks that the RPC staff will complete to implement the Strategies and thereby address the MTP Priorities. The descriptions below further indicate which Priorities are addressed by each Strategy and its associated Actions.

Human Impact Strategies

Human Impact Strategies	Actions	Safety & Security	Sustainability & Resilience	Equity	Economic Opportunity	Reliability & Connectivity	System Preservation & Stewardship
Ensure people have access to jobs, education, recreation, and other activities throughout the region.	• Incorporate recommendations of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy into the project development process. • Identify major employment centers, educational institutions, and other major destinations, and ensure they are well-connected to affordable housing via all transportation modes. • Consider the needs of visitors and the tourism industry in the project development process. • Study the impacts of transportation network companies and micromobility solutions to increase mobility options for all.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Ensure that programs and projects do not have adverse impacts on disadvantaged communities.	• Ensure that the transportation system is sensitive to its cultural and social context. • Use data such as the Social Vulnerability Index to identify disadvantaged communities and populations throughout the region and use these data to identify appropriate methods to garner substantive community input on projects.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

	• Identify data and tools that can be used to assess potential project impacts to disadvantaged communities. • Ensure all staff comply with Title VI requirements and the RPC's Title VI Policy						
Improve access and mobility within identified communities of need, and connect those communities to opportunity.	• Analyze past and future investments to ensure that transportation improvements and their benefits are equitably distributed throughout the region. • Use data such as the Social Vulnerability Index to identify and implement projects and programs that will benefit disadvantaged communities. • Proactively engage with the Justice 40 Initiative and seek to accomplish the program's goals wherever possible. • Seek out meaningful public input from all of the region's residents, particularly those whose voices have historically been minimized. • Work with relevant stakeholders to identify opportunities to implement recommendations of the Coordinated Human Services Plan. • Study the potential benefit of designating a Human Services Mobility Manager, who would help connect elderly and disabled residents with appropriate transportation services.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Enhance the community's ability to withstand disasters and disruptions.	• Continue to implement the recommendations of the 2019 Regional Resilience Study. • Create a regional Resilience Improvement Plan as outlined in the IIJA and subsequent guidance. • Use data and national best practices to assess the vulnerability of the region's transportation system. • Identify opportunities to improve resilience during the project development process, including the incorporation of green infrastructure, flood mitigation, evacuation routes, emergency access, and social and economic impacts.	✓	✓	✓			✓
Reduce adverse environmental impacts and seek opportunities to improve conditions.	• Form an environmental advisory committee that will advise the RPC on matters related to sustainability and resilience. • Prioritize projects that contribute to reduced emissions, particularly those that reduce VMT. • Study mechanisms for estimating projects' potential carbon emission impacts. • Use data and national best practices to consider project impacts to natural systems, including watersheds, air quality, and wildlife.	✓	✓	✓			✓

Modal Strategies

Modal Strategies	Actions	Safety & Security	Sustainability & Resilience	Equity	Economic Opportunity	Reliability & Connectivity	System Preservation & Stewardship
Improve the effectiveness and usability of non-Single Occupant Vehicle modes.	• Prioritize opportunities to improve walking and biking safety during the development of all projects. • During project development ensure access for disabled persons is a consideration, and identify projects that will further increase ADA compliance.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ensure freight moves efficiently throughout the region.	• Continue to monitor freight congestion and associated performance measures via the Congestion Management Process, and identify locations that require study and improvement. • Implement the recommendations of the regional Freight Mobility Plan, including identified projects and studies. • Continue to use the Freight Roundtable as a forum to learn about freight trends and industry needs	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Enhance the efficient management and operations of the	• Continue to monitor regional congestion via the Congestion Management Process, and identify opportunities for congestion mitigation.	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓

existing vehicular roadway network.	• During project development encourage the use of management and operations strategies to improve traffic movement and reliability. • Continue to support the LADOTD MAP Patrol units in the region to address roadway vehicle crashes & incidents.						

Systems Strategies

System Strategies	Actions	Safety & Security	Sustainability & Resilience	Equity	Economic Opportunity	Reliability & Connectivity	System Preservation & Stewardship
Engage the community throughout the planning process	• During project development, identify potentially affected communities and define appropriate outreach strategies. • Define appropriate levels of engagement for all programs. • Maintain a database of community groups that can aid in outreach efforts. • Update and comply with the RPC's Public Participation Policy.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ensure the transportation system is safe for all users, on all modes.	• Identify projects that will reduce crashes, particularly those that cause serious injuries and fatalities, for all modes. • Ensure that multi-modal safety improvements are considered during the development of all projects. • Seek opportunities to implement behavior-based safety programs. • Incorporate public health best practices into RPC safety analyses.	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓

	• Continue to support the Regional Safety Coalition and identify opportunities to incorporate innovative programs and policies. • Expand training for the Screening Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) program. • Include health and wellness experts in project committees and advisory boards.						
Enhance system connectivity.	• During the project development process, analyze nearby land uses and consider opportunities to increase access to major destinations. • Identify projects that increase network connectivity for all modes. • Combine congestion management analyses with the Social Vulnerability Index, safety data, and infrastructure condition data to create a more comprehensive understanding of local needs.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Prioritize system preservation over system expansion	• Ensure transportation investments are directed towards system preservation, maintenance, and repair. • Continue to monitor infrastructure condition and proactively identify locations that will require maintenance or repair. • Implement roadway capacity increases only when detailed analysis has shown that congestion cannot be adequately addressed through operational improvements or alternative modes.		✓	✓			✓

	• Study innovative uses for existing resources and underutilized infrastructure.						
Ensure that transportation planning processes are coordinated with other RPC programs and projects.	• Develop subject specific whitepapers around MTP programs and projects. • Incorporate MTP Priorities in LWI Regional Watershed Plan and identify opportunities to coordinate watershed and transportation projects. • Ensure that future Brownfields studies consider upcoming transportation projects and identify Brownfields opportunities during the transportation project development process. • Use Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership resources to identify opportunities to incorporate alternative fuels in future transportation projects. • Seek input from the Emergency Preparedness Public Private Partnership when developing transportation projects. • Ensure transportation projects are supportive of regional economic development goals.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

RPC's Programs

RPC's Programs

MPO Programs

The major programs that comprise the RPC's transportation planning process are described in this section. These programs are undertaken as part of the RPC's role as an MPO, and directly contribute to advancing the Priorities and Strategies described in the MTP. While these efforts are described separately, the RPC will continue to treat the region's transportation network as an integrated system, and will accordingly conduct holistic planning efforts that utilize best available practices, methods, and technologies. A separate section below further describes other programs managed by the RPC that are not related to its functions as an MPO but which nonetheless contribute to regional quality of life.

Walking and Biking

Facilitating safe walking and biking is integral to RPC's planning process, and the potential for adding or enhancing non-motorized facilities is considered during the development of all projects. This can range from simple improvements such as enhanced crosswalks to more complex treatments like buffered bike lanes or separated paths.

In addition to considering the needs of people walking and biking at the project level the RPC also continues to engage in larger-scale programs intended to increase the use of non-motorized modes across the region. The agency works to accomplish this with data-driven analysis and decision-making; planning and design for comprehensive land use and sustainable transportation; and a range of educational and outreach tools.

In 2006 RPC produced a Regional Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, an important step in educating and formalizing the need for on-street bicycle accommodations, improved crash data, counts, increased

law officer training and enforcement, and education and training for engineers and designers. Since the 2006 plan, the RPC has helped to implement significant improvements to active transportation facilities and planning. These include biking and walking master plans for member jurisdictions, on- and off-street facilities, and pedestrian crossing upgrades. The RPC has also conducted multiple public outreach and education campaigns regarding non-motorized safety, and has helped local jurisdictions and LADOTD to craft Complete Streets policies, which are designed to enable safe use of the roadway and support mobility for all users.

Looking Forward

Looking ahead the RPC will continue to integrate biking and walking considerations into its planning process, while also emphasizing community engagement to identify needs and enhancing its focus on the needs of those who face challenges while traveling such as the disabled or elderly. In the near future the RPC will also engage with new programs and funding at the federal level that have been introduced in the IIJA.

Coordinated Public Transit - Human Services

RPC's Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Program is complementary to its transit planning program, and focuses on serving the needs of low-income, elderly, and disabled populations in the region. In the coming years the Committee will continue to work to expand access to safe and reliable demand response transportation for elderly and disabled residents. It is guided by the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Plan, most recently updated in 2020, which outlines regional needs and presents a series of goals, objectives and strategies for serving vulnerable populations. The Human Services Transportation Committee is composed of transportation providers and professionals, community advocates, and citizen members who meet regularly to share best practices and identify opportunities to advance the strategies in the Plan.

Looking Forward

In the coming years the Committee will continue to work to expand access to safe and reliable demand response transportation for elderly and disabled residents.

Roads, Highways, and Bridges

Maintaining and improving the region's roads and highways has been a central concern of the RPC since its creation. While improving the usability and effectiveness of transit and non-motorized transportation is an important goal, motor vehicles remain the transportation mode of choice for the vast majority of the region's residents. Ensuring that these travelers can expect reliable travel times on roads and bridges that are in a state of good repair will continue to be a primary focus for the transportation planning process.

Much of the RPC's work regarding travel reliability for motor vehicles centers on the Congestion Management Process (CMP), an ongoing series of activities that identifies traffic congestion throughout the region, defines needs related to congestion reduction, and recommends congestion mitigation strategies. The process was updated in 2021 and includes a system performance report that describes overall congestion on the many of the region's most significant corridors.

The RPC evaluates the need for roadway maintenance and repair through two primary mechanisms: quantitative performance measures and stakeholder input. Road and bridge conditions are two of the federally-required performance measures tracked by the RPC, further discussed in the Performance Based Planning and Programming section below. The measures provide both an overview of regional conditions as well as conditions on specific roadways. The RPC receives further detail about which roadways should be prioritized for repair from local and state partners, who are encouraged to utilize the RPC's resources to maintain the system in a state of good repair.

Looking Forward

The RPC seeks to continually improve its ability to identify and address needs on the region's roads and bridges, and future work in this area will largely focus on incorporating new and existing data into the planning process. The CMP provides the basis for identifying potential congestion mitigation measures, and it should be further incorporated into the project selection process. Similarly, road and bridge condition data should be used when determining priorities for network preservation funding. Importantly, these data can also be combined with other related datasets to create a more comprehensive understanding of needs on the region's roadways. Analyzing congestion alongside road and bridge condition, crash data, and the Social Vulnerability Index will allow the RPC to not only improve travel reliability but also concurrently address multiple MTP Priorities.

Freight

In 2012, MAP-21 encouraged State departments of transportation to develop freight transportation plans for the first time. In2015, the FAST Act included several provisions to improve the condition and performance of the national freight network and to support investment in freight-related surface transportation projects. The FAST Act also established new dedicated funding and programs to address growing freight needs and improve road and bridge conditions, reliability, and the U.S. economy. These provisions in federal legislation have continued with the IIJA.

MPOs are not required to develop a regional Freight Mobility Plan; however, the centrality of freight to the region's economy and the significance of the region to national freight networks point to the need for a deliberative freight planning process. The regional Freight Mobility Plan, under development concurrently with this MTP, will further the RPC Freight Program and inform the overall planning process. The first task of the Freight Mobility Plan, completed in 2021, was to develop a regional Freight Profile. This extensive document updated the inventory of geographical and modal elements that make up the freight system in the region. This document was a major update to the RPCs Freight Facts and Figures profile released in 2014. The 2020-2021 Freight Profile highlights significant projects and policy changes since 2014 and also attempts to describe new concerns that freight stakeholders must negotiate in the region.

Building on the Freight Profile, the Freight Mobility Plan outlines a regional vision for freight and focuses on the goals of Reliability, Stewardship, Freight Industry Growth, Connectivity, and Safety & Security. The strategies and objectives laid out in the plan are closely aligned with the MTP's Priorities, ensuring that future freight projects and planning contribute to the region's overall transportation vision. In addition to broad policy goals, the Freight Mobility Plan also describes processes for project evaluation and implementation as well as recommendations for projects and

studies that will improve freight movement throughout the region. The Freight Profile can be viewed online at https://www.norpc.org/transportation/programs/freight/.

The RPC also regularly convenes a Freight Roundtable to bring public and private sector freight based entities together to share information, identify needs and inform the MPO planning and project prioritization process. The Roundtable is an opportunity for the RPC to learn about current freight trends and issues, and participants provided valuable input during the development of the Freight Mobility Plan.

Looking Forward

With the completion of the regional Freight Mobility Plan the RPC will have established a vision and process for considering freight needs and identifying necessary improvements. Moving forward the RPC will work to implement the Plan's recommended strategies and will update the Plan as appropriate. Overall, ensuring that our region continues to have an updated regional freight plan will safeguard overarching regional goals, guide short- and long-term projects and plans, and contribute to statewide multimodal freight planning efforts in the years to come.

Safety

The RPC continues to integrate safety within all projects and programming to reduce fatalities and serious injuries. Safety goals for the RPC are closely linked to Louisiana's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), a data-driven approach led in part by LADOTD. As part of its statewide safety efforts, LADOTD established nine multidisciplinary regional safety coalitions tasked with reviewing local crash data and developing a continually evolving, data-driven action plan linked to the SHSP with the goal of reducing traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries by 50% by 2030. The South Tangipahoa MPA is served by the North Shore Regional Safety Coalition (NSRSC). The NSRSC is structured to coincide with the Louisiana State Police Troop L boundary and therefore serves the Mandeville-Covington, Slidell, and South Tangipahoa MPAs by working in St. Tammany and Tangipahoa Parishes. The coalition also works with Washington and St. Helena Parishes, which are outside of RPC's MPA's.

Utilizing strategies in engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency services (the 4E approach), the SHSP identifies main contributing factors for crashes and creates emphasis areas. Emphasis areas allow for a more targeted approach and include distracted driving, impaired driving, occupant protection, young drivers, and infrastructure and operations. In addition to these, the NORTSC also has a walking and bicycling emphasis area.

The guiding document for each emphasis area is its action plan. Each action plan consists of five categories of action steps- coordination, education, enforcement, operations, and outreach. Each action step is tracked on a quarterly basis. In addition to working on targeted action steps, the safety coalition coordinators provide support by analyzing crash data for projects within the region. The safety program also produces safety performance measures each year, as required with the passage of the FAST Act, to help inform planning goals and ensure safety is integrated throughout RPC's projects and programs.

Looking Forward

The FHWA and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) have formally committed to the long term goal of reducing road fatalities to zero, the only acceptable number. This commitment is part of a new strategy to implement the National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS), which outlines the USDOT's comprehensive approach to significantly reduce deaths and serious injuries to zero on our nation's roadways. The NRSS adopted the Safe System approach, which was founded on the principles that humans make mistakes and that human bodies have limited ability to tolerate crash impacts. The RPC is committed to this approach and addressing traffic safety as a public health issue. In practice this will mean continued emphasis on behavioral changes implemented through the Safety Coalition's programs, while also incorporating nationally recognized best practices. The Safe Streets and Roads Program, and other initiatives introduced in IIJA, provide new opportunities to implement infrastructure improvements that increase safety for all road users and expand the tools and resources available to do so. Each project introduces opportunities to evaluate crash histories and unsafe conditions, and to identify modifications that will reduce injuries and fatalities.

Transportation Resilience

As the need to protect the community against hazardous events becomes increasingly apparent the RPC has begun building a transportation resilience planning program. These efforts have included consideration of flood mitigation, green infrastructure, and other improvements on a project-by-project basis, and have grown into more sophisticated and comprehensive efforts to include resilience throughout the planning process.

In 2019 the RPC completed a Regional Transportation Resilience Analysis that studied existing plans at the local, regional, and state level to address the resilience of the transportation system. The analysis also identified opportunities for the RPC to use its resources to better address resilience through the transportation planning process. Many of the study's recommendations have been gradually implemented over time, and it will continue to serve as an important guide as the RPC continues to build its resilience planning program.

Looking Forward

The region is at an important turning point for resilience planning, and the RPC is committed to identifying opportunities to better protect the region's infrastructure and, by extension, the community. Importantly, this work will need to consider more than just the tangible transportation system. While definitions of resilience vary, all sources agree that the community's ability to withstand and recover from disaster are impacted by far more than infrastructure and the built environment. Access to resources, social connections, and economic opportunity all play critical roles in resilience. As the RPC seeks to enhance the resilience of the system itself it will also need to carefully consider how those improvements can most effectively benefit the community. The IIJA includes important provisions that will help guide the RPC's work. In particular, it describes optional Resilience Improvement Plans that may be developed by MPOs. These plans will provide a systemic approach to addressing transportation vulnerabilities, and identify potential courses of action for improving regional resilience. The RPC intends to create a Resilience Improvement Plan when full guidance becomes available, likely in the fall of 2022, and will incorporate the plan into the larger planning process.

Non-MPO Regional Planning Programs

In addition to its work as an MPO, the RPC operates several other programs that benefit the region. The geographies served by these programs are not always co-terminus with the MPA boundaries, and the funding sources and regulatory authorities of each program are similarly separate from the RPC's role as an MPO. Nevertheless, each program provides valuable benefits to the region's residents and facilitating coordination between all the RPC's activities allows the organization to more comprehensively serve regional needs. The programs are briefly summarized below along with their relationships to the MTP's Priorities and ways in which they can be coordinated with the transportation planning process.

Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership

In 2009 the RPC established the Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership (SLCFP) to further the work of the region's environmental and climate goals. The SLCFP works with regional partners, municipalities, and state agencies to increase the use of cleaner fuels and alternative fuel vehicles, diversify our transportation fuel sources, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by promoting cleaner and more efficient fuel saving technology and policies.

The SLCFP is a U.S. Department of Energy-designated Clean Cities Coalition and works with over 75 other nationwide coalitions to provide education, technical assistance, and access to grant funds to promote the use of cleaner fuels and energy efficient technologies in transportation. In the recent past, SLCFP has hosted in person electric vehicle ride and drive events for the public, conducted extensive outreach to local car dealerships to provide further training on low and zero emission vehicles, and worked with local fleet managers for acquisition of low to zero emission vehicles.

SLCFP continues to work closely with regional partners on clean transportation funding opportunities and has been the lead on a variety of state and federal grants from agencies such as the EPA Clean Diesel Program, Volkswagen Settlement, Louisiana Revolving Loan Fund Program, Louisiana Petroleum Gas Commission Incentive, and Entergy eTech Program Incentives. More recently the SLCFP has worked with state partners to develop plans to expand alternative fuel infrastructure through new programs introduced in the IIJA, and this work is expected to be a major focus for the SLCFP in the coming years.

The SLCFP directly contributes to the MTP's Sustainability & Resilience Priority by seeking ways to reduce harmful transportation-related emissions. In its 2021 annual report the SLCFP estimates that the region's various alternative fuel programs reduced over 3,000,000 Gallons of Gasoline Equivalent (GGE) and over 16,000 tons of Greenhouse Gasses (GHG). The SLCFP is committed to helping regional partners continue to increase these promising gains, and in coming years its work will be further aligned with the RPC's work as an MPO. As the region and state work to implement alternative fueling infrastructure through the programs introduced in the IIJA, the RPC's transportation expertise will provide valuable input in the identification of community needs and opportunities. The SLCFP will further inform the transportation planning process by contributing alternative fuel considerations into policy and project development.

Brownfield Redevelopment Program

Brownfield sites are defined by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as "real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant." Addressing potential environmental issues, especially financial and regulatory hurdles, is often intimidating, creating a barrier to the redevelopment or expanded use of Brownfield sites. RPC's Brownfield Redevelopment Program helps convert these properties from community liabilities to community assets by providing assistance and technical guidance to navigate the environmental process from investigation to cleanup. The program serves Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Tammany and Tangipahoa Parishes.

The RPC Brownfield program is funded through grants from the EPA. Recent projects include Phase I and II environmental assessments (ESAs) at eight Port of New Orleans industrial sites along the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal. In addition to the Port properties, assessments were performed at the former McDonogh No. 19 School and the former Giordano Warehouse in New Orleans. To lay the groundwork for future brownfield work, the program also funded brownfield inventories along the General Taylor commercial corridor in Algiers and along the Judge Perez corridor in St. Bernard Parish. The RPC also recently received its next round of brownfield funding from the EPA – a $500,000 grant for assessments and cleanup plans in St. Bernard Parish, between Judge Perez Dr. and the Mississippi River. Priority brownfield candidate sites include the old Ford Plant in Arabi and the former Wastewater Plant on the Chalmette Battlefield. Over 100 other potential brownfield sites have been identified in the study area.

The program directly addresses several of the Priorities identified in the MTP, including Sustainability & Resilience, Equity, and Economic Opportunity. Brownfield revitalization is a key strategy that supports community efforts to become more resilient to climate change impacts by incorporating adaptation and mitigation strategies to these redevelopment opportunities. The U.S. EPA has recently released a Climate Smart Brownfields Manual (Summer 2021). In this guide they acknowledge that "[many members of vulnerable populations, including children, the elderly, low-income communities of color and tribal communities, live close to brownfields and other blighted properties (EPA, 2020a).]" The report found that children and the elderly are among the most sensitive to changes in water and air quality are the most susceptible to disease and environmental health impacts. Recommendations in the manual to incorporate resiliency strategies through brownfield redevelopment include identifying factors such as sea-level rise that may affect long-term suitability of the site; considering how factors, such as increasing temperature, may alter the toxicity of site contaminants; or determining which flora and fauna can be supported at the site in the future as climate conditions change (EPA, 2021).

The Brownfield Redevelopment Program will be a key resource for the RPC member parishes to consider as part of their toolkit for resiliency planning in the coming years. There are also ample opportunities for the Brownfields Program at the RPC to enhance economic, social, and environmental resiliency for the region. Brownfield redevelopment presents opportunities to improve the quality of life and resiliency of vulnerable populations while reducing blight. Future considerations towards include using the newly developed RPC Vulnerability Index to identify low-income communities, communities of color, and other vulnerable populations.

Emergency Preparedness Public-Private Partnership

The RPC manages the Southeast Louisiana Emergency Preparedness Public-Private Partnership. This entity leverages resources to support emergency management in Southeast Louisiana and South Mississippi, while streamlining the flow of accurate information between the public and private sectors. Additionally this group works with the Louisiana Business Emergency Operations Center (BEOC) to connect stakeholders with opportunities associated with rebuilding communities following a disaster.

Organizations and agencies are used as "force multipliers" in getting the word out on key issues and alerts. The RPC hosts semi-monthly Emergency Preparedness meetings where participants share best practices and lessons learned, while encouraging organizations and businesses to build resilience into their continuity plans. The entity also hosts annual briefings prior to hurricane season. Members include emergency managers, the Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness (GOHSEP), Louisiana State Police, LADOTD, utility companies, ports, transit agencies, health agencies, the U.S. Federal Executive Board, National Weather Service, Corps of Engineers, universities, professional trade associations, the American Red Cross, chambers of commerce, economic development organizations, convention centers/sports arenas, local police & fire departments, and faith-based organizations. Issues and topics addressed vary from emergency management, storm preparedness, threat of terrorism, health & wellness, cybersecurity, business continuity plans, contra-flow and re-entry post disaster, and strategic partnerships that build resilience in the region.

The Partnership is a valuable part of the RPC's regional planning activities and directly contributes to multiple MTP Priorities, including: Safety & Security; Sustainability & Resilience; and Reliability & Connectivity. It supports Safety & Security by providing input from experts who can offer guidance at the policy and project level, and it similarly allows the RPC to learn from emergency preparedness practitioners as it continues to build its resilience planning program. It further enhances system reliability through its focus on improving response to roadway incidents and crashes, which are a major contributor to congestion.

Linking Transportation/Non-Transportation Programs to each other and Planning Priorities

The region's residents directly benefit from the the RPC's status as a multi-faceted planning agency. Housing multiple programs within a single agency allows staff to exchange ideas and best practices, and gives local partners a single entity with which to engage on a variety of issues. Each program contributes to the Priorities outlined in this MTP, and in turn the RPC's transportation planning activities add value to its other work as an agency. While this multidisciplinary approach has long been one of the RPC's greatest advantages, it is committed to further strengthening the coordination between its various programs.

Implementation

Implementation

The preceding sections of this plan describe the region and its needs, the RPC's Priorities for addressing those needs, and how the agency's various planning programs will incorporate the Priorities. One of the RPC's main tasks as an MPO is to translate this work into real-world projects that will positively impact the transportation system, and therefore the community. This will be accomplished through a thoughtful and deliberative project development and selection process that is informed by the principals of fiscal constraint and clearly defined performance measures. Importantly, the RPC has also established mechanisms for tracking its progress over time to ensure that the MTP's recommendations are fully implemented.

Project Development & Selection Process

Moving from planning to project implementation requires evaluating the feasibility of potential system improvements, and a means by which to prioritize projects. Though the process of identifying, developing, and implementing projects is complex, it can be simplified into the following steps:

1. **Identify Opportunities for Improvement:** Most projects begin with the identification of an opportunity to change the transportation system in a way that will better serve the region. For example, there may be a problem that needs to be solved such as congestion at a major intersection, or there may be an unmet need that can be addressed, such as increasing non-motorized access to a neighborhood. Such opportunities are identified through a wide variety of sources, including public engagement, input from elected officials, RPC's planning programs, and staff expertise.
2. **Study Potential Options:** Once an opportunity for change has been identified the RPC studies how it can be accomplished through modifications to the transportation system. For example, if there is a need to reduce crashes at a particular location, can that be done

through infrastructure improvements, operational changes, or other alterations? The timeline and level of effort required for such studies depend on the complexity of the issue and its potential impacts on the community.

3. **Define Projects:** The previous two steps result in recommendations for real-world projects that will improve the transportation system. Once a potential project has been defined, further refinements are completed as necessary, including design and cost estimates.
4. **Fund and Prioritize Projects**: After a project has been defined, the RPC determines how it may be funded and how its implementation will be prioritized among the many other projects within the RPC's program. Project prioritization depends on multiple interrelated factors, including stakeholder support, potential impact and need, and funding availability.

These steps inform, and are informed by, the RPC's plans, policies, and programs. Throughout project development the RPC will ensure that projects consider the MTP's Priorities. The Strategies and Actions outlined in the plan provide the roadmap for including the Priorities in the project development process. In addition to the MTP and the programs it describes, two other documents outline the RPC's work and the projects it will implement. The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is produced annually and describes the work that the RPC will complete during each fiscal year, including tasks to be completed by staff and studies that the RPC will fund. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) provides a detailed list of projects with allocated funding, and which are planned to be implemented over the next four fiscal years. Taken together, the UPWP, TIP, MTP, and the RPC's planning programs give structure to the project development and prioritization process.



Projects that have been selected for inclusion in the MTP and prioritized for implementation are further organized by Tier. Tier I projects are those for which funding has been identified and which are expected to be implemented in the next four federal fiscal years (FFY), FFY 2023-2026. Tier 1 is also identical to the TIP. Tier II includes projects that are still in the planning or development phase, and are expected to advance based on funding between 2027 and 2036; Tier III projects are more complex to implement and are planned for the years 2037-2052.

Financial Planning & Fiscal Constraint

Both the MTP and the TIP have been financially constrained to reflect realistic and available levels of project funding. A review of the state's proposed construction program was carried out jointly by RPC and LADOTD. This effort resulted in the selection of project priorities that were in a position to go forward and for which funding could reasonably be expected to be available in Tier I.

Other methods were also employed to establish financial constraint. This consisted of a review of the actual letting list of projects over the last ten years to establish a history of federal and state funding by project category. An average estimated amount of both federal and non-federal financial resources was thereby derived and used as a benchmark in the prioritization process.

Infrastructure, Investment and Jobs Act Changes

IIJA includes notable changes to policies, priorities, and funding levels for federal transportation investments, which are reflected in the RPC's project development and selection process, as well as the development of the MTP planning baseline. The law authorizes approximately $284 billion in new transportation funding nationwide, effectively doubling federal transportation investments. These increases apply to existing funds that the RPC has traditionally used for system improvements as well as entirely new programs. Importantly, the law allows for investment in planning programs and projects that will expand the RPC's ability to positively impact the region. In addition to increased funding, some of the more significant changes included in IIJA are:

- **Expanded project eligibilities** within previously existing funding programs, including resilience improvements, electric vehicle charging stations, underground utilities, and protection from cybersecurity threats.
- **New formula funding** programs, including:
  - Carbon Reduction Program: Provides funding for projects to reduce transportation emissions or the development of carbon reduction strategies.
  - Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, & Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program: Provides funding for planning, resilience improvements, community resilience and evacuation routes, and at-risk coastal infrastructure.
  - Bridge Replacement, Rehabilitation, and Construction Program: Provides funding to replace, rehabilitate, preserve, protect, and construct bridges on public roads.
  - National Electric Vehicle (NEVI) Program: Provides funding to strategically deploy electric vehicle charging infrastructure and establish an interconnected network to facilitate data collection, access, and reliability.

- Multiple **new discretionary grant programs**, many of which serve the same purposes as new formula programs described above, but also including:
  - Bridge Investment Program: Provides funding to improve bridge and culvert condition, safety, efficiency, and reliability.
  - Safe Streets and Roads for All: Provides funding to support local initiatives to prevent transportation-related death and serious injuries.
  - Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program: Provides funding to restore community connectivity by removing, retrofitting, or mitigating highways or other transportation facilities that create barriers to community connectivity.
  - Charging and Refueling Infrastructure Program: Provides funding to deploy electric vehicle charging or other alternative fueling infrastructure.
  - All-Stations Accessibility Program (ASAP): Provides funding to upgrade the accessibility of legacy rail fixed guideway public transportation systems for people with disabilities.
- A new requirement that MPOs must use at least 2.5% of metropolitan planning (PL) funds each year to develop and adopt **Complete Streets standards and policies** and develop a prioritization plan.
- An **increased focus on housing and transportation**: MPOs are required to consult with affordable housing organizations as part of the transportation planning process.

Importantly, guidance on many programs in the law have not yet been published as of the writing of this plan. RPC will continue to monitor regulatory changes as they become available and will incorporate them into the planning process.

Project Development and Environmental Justice

The RPC strives to address Title VI and Environmental Justice at all stages of the planning process. The Title VI Process and Justice40 Initiative will guide the RPC's efforts to identify and mitigate potential barriers faced by traditionally under-served groups, engage them in the decision-making process, and ensure they receive the benefits of federal transportation investments.

Title VI

Implementing Title VI through the project development process is comprised of two steps: Identification and Mitigation. The RPC will complete these for all projects as described below

Step 1: Identification

During the scoping process, management and staff determine the Project Limits for a study, which are then used GIS staff and the Title VI coordinator to establish the Area of Interest (AOI), i.e., the areas adjacent to the project limits that have populations that may be impacted by a project. The AOI will necessarily be coterminous with existing census boundaries. Geographically referenced data will be used to provide:

- A demographic profile for Title VI study area based on federal guidelines

- An Environmental Justice profile for Title VI study area based on federal guidelines
- A determination of socially vulnerable communities within the Title VI study area using the RPC Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) model as needed

Step 2: Mitigation

After identifying communities within a planning area that may face barriers in the participation processes the RPC will in "Good Faith Effort" deploy the following strategies to ensure equitable representation:

- Seek representatives of minority, disability, and low-income groups will be identified and an effort will be made to include them on the board and advisory committees and in RPC mailings.
- Whenever possible, meetings will be held at locations accessible to persons with a disability, bus riders, and bicyclists, and that are convenient to neighborhoods with a concentration of minority and low-income persons.
- Translators/interpreters will be provided for meetings, if requested.
- A statement is included at the bottom of all meeting notices in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese indicating that an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations will be made available, if requested at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.
- Information, including meeting notices and press releases, will be provided to minority news media.
- Meeting materials relevant to ensure equal participation will be translated based on Limited English Proficiency assessment for given project areas

Justice40

In January 2021 President Biden established the Justice40 Initiative via Executive Order 14008, which aims to deliver forty percent of the overall benefits of certain federal investments, including sustainable transportation systems, to disadvantaged communities. Guidance on the initiative and how it can be implemented by MPOs continues to be developed by USDOT and other relevant agencies, but many existing transportation funding programs and new programs under IIJA will be designed to ensure the Justice40 goal is met.

For the purposes of transportation planning, USDOT's interim definition of a transportation disadvantaged community is based on twenty-two indicators in six categories: transportation access; health; environment; economy; resilience; and equity. New tools are currently being developed by DOT to help MPOs, states, and local governments identify disadvantaged communities and analyze potential impacts of federal investments. These include a Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool and an Interim DOT Disadvantaged Communities Definition and Mapping Tool.

The Justice40 initiative supports the Priorities described in MTP 2052, as well as the RPC's overall mission to provide transportation benefits to the entire community. As additional guidance on the initiative becomes available the RPC will continue to refine its planning process to support the aims of the program.

Performance Based Planning and Programming

Performance Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) is an approach adopted by FHWA, FTA, state DOTs, transit agencies, and MPOs that uses quantitative data and other information to strategically direct transportation decision-making. PBPP is a systematic, evidence-based method for integrating data into the transportation planning process at all levels, from concept to design and implementation. It is important to note that PBPP is intended to supplement, not replace, the decision-making roles and responsibilities of the general public, elected officials, or technical experts. As such it plays an important part in the overall project development, prioritization, and evaluation process.

Performance Measures

The use of PBPP by MPOs was formally codified by the FAST Act (23 CFR Part 490). Since 2018 MPOs, DOTs, and transit agencies have been required to identify targets for several performance measures within five key policy areas: Safety; Pavement and Bridge Condition; System Reliability; Congestion Mitigation Air Quality[3] (CMAQ); and Transit Asset Management.

For Safety, Pavement and Bridge Condition, System Performance and Freight, and CMAQ measures, LADOTD is required to establish statewide targets; at the regional level the RPC may choose to develop its own targets or adopt those of the state. For Transit Asset Management measures, the region's transit providers establish their own targets and the RPC, in coordination with the providers, develops regional targets.

[3] CMAQ performance targets shall be set by MPOs that contain area(s) designated as nonattainment or maintenance for ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO) or particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). There are currently no areas served by the RPC that meet any of these criteria.

Safety

[Note: Safety performance targets were amended on 2/14/2023. See Appendix E.]

Performance measures defined by the FAST Act for tracking safety on the region's roadways are:

- Number of fatalities.
- Number of serious injuries.
- Rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT.
- Rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT.
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

Safety targets for the South Tangipahoa MPA were first established in January 2018 and have been updated annually thereafter. In each year to date the RPC has adopted the same targets as LADOTD – a 1% annual reduction in all measures. The targets are compared to a base period comprising the average of the five calendar years ending prior to the year the targets are set. The current LADOTD targets were set in 2022; therefore, the base period consists of the five calendar years ending in 2020 (i.e., 2016-2020). The measures, base values, and target values are listed in the table to the right.[4] Where VMT is included in target calculations, both base and target values are based on an estimated 2019 VMT as provided by DOTD. It should also be noted that the targets reflect two years of change from the

South Tangipahoa MPA 2022 Safety Targets

	2022 Baseline (2016-2020 Avg.)	Targeted Annual Change*	2022 Target (2018-2022 Avg.)
Number of Fatalities	24.6	-1%	24.1
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	1.53	-1%	1.50
Number of Serious Injuries	36.2	-1%	35.5
Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	2.25	-1%	2.21
Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries	11.4	-1%	11.2

*Note: Baseline period ends two years prior to target period; targets are therefore calculated based on two years of annual reductions (i.e., (Baseline-1%)-1%).

[4] **Crash & Safety Data Statement:** This document and the information contained herein is prepared solely for the purposes of identifying, evaluating and panning safety improvements on public roads which may be implemented utilizing federal aid highway funds; and is therefore exempt from discovery or admission into evidence pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 409. Contact the LADOTD Traffic Safety Office at (225) 379-1871 before releasing any information.

base: a 1% reduction in 2021 and another 1% reduction in 2022.

Since 2018 less than half of the safety targets in the South Tangipahoa MPA have been achieved. This indicates a need for enhanced focus on safety improvements, as illustrated by this MTP's Safety and Security Priority, and associated Strategies and Actions. The RPC will also review its safety target setting methodology prior to setting new targets in 2023. At that time enough historical target data will be available to discern trends in target achievement or non-achievement, and those trends can be used to determine how the target setting process should change.

South Tangipahoa MPA Safety Target Achievement, 2018-2020



Road & Bridge Condition

The performance measures used to track the condition of roads and bridges on the NHS are:

- Percentage of Interstate lane miles in Good or Poor condition;
- Percentage of non-Interstate NHS lane miles in Good or Poor condition;
- Percentage of NHS bridge deck area in Good or Poor condition.

States are required to set 2- and 4-year targets for each measure; MPOs may adopt the state's targets or set their own. For the current period (2018-2022) the RPC chose to set its own targets, but used the state targets as the basis for regional calculations with some modifications. LADOTD created the statewide targets based on projected project funding and forecasts of pavement and bridge condition. The targets reflect an expectation that overall pavement and bridge condition would decline over the four-year reporting period. The RPC derived a 2- and 4-year rate of change from each state target, and applied those rates to its own regional baseline measures from 2017. Exceptions to this method were made in two categories: non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition and NHS bridges in Poor condition. For those measures the state rates of change would have resulted in unacceptably high regional targets for the percentage of pavements or bridges in Poor condition, and the RPC developed alternative, regionally-appropriate rates of change. The baseline measures and targets for the South Tangipahoa MPA are listed below.

South Tangipahoa MPA Pavement & Bridge Condition Targets, 2018-2022

	Interstate		Non-Interstate NHS		NHS Bridge	
	Good %	**Poor %**	**Good %**	**Poor %**	**Good %**	**Poor %**
Baseline	9.56%	0.00%	23.33%	4.97%	86.83%	0.00%
2-year Target (2020)	8.69%	0.00%	20.97%	5.02%	67.84%	0.00%
4-year Target (2022)	7.25%	0.00%	18.35%	5.07%	58.15%	0.00%

Baseline Source: LADOTD, 2018

Both DOTD and the RPC are within the initial 4-year reporting period as of the writing of this plan. Updated condition data has not yet been made available by DOTD, so progress towards target achievement cannot be determined. DOTD is expected to produce targets for the next reporting period (2022-2026) in October, 2022, and the RPC will produce its new targets within 180 days.

System Reliability

Three performance measures are used to track the reliability of passenger and freight travel on the National Highway System (NHS):

- Interstate Level of Travel Time Reliability (Interstate LOTTR) - The percentage of person-miles traveled on the Interstate system that are considered reliable (i.e., 100% is ideal);
- Non-Interstate NHS Level of Travel Time Reliability (Non-Interstate NHS LOTTR) - The percentage of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are considered reliable (i.e., 100% is ideal);
- Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (Truck TTRI) - A ratio indicating the reliability of truck travel times on the Interstate system (i.e., 1.0 is ideal).

For the LOTTR and Truck TTRI measures, data for all four of the MPAs served by the RPC (South Tangipahoa, Slidell, Mandeville-Covington, and New Orleans) have been aggregated to provide region-wide measures and targets. These reliability-focused measures are primarily used to assess congestion on the transportation system, and the RPC's Congestion Management Process includes the entire RPC region under a single process due to the highly interrelated nature of regional congestion. Combining LOTTR and Truck TTRI measures on a larger, regional scale is therefore consistent with existing RPC practice. Moreover the CMP itself provides for procedures to evaluate congestion at the urbanized area

and corridor levels. As such the regional reliability measures and sub-area CMP analyses provide the RPC with multiple scales of congestion analysis that have not been previously available.

The state is required to set 2- and 4-year targets; MPOs may use the state targets or set their own. As with road and bridge condition the RPC has chosen to set its own regional system performance targets for the current reporting period (2018-2022), but using a similar target-setting methodology as LADOTD. To calculate targets an annual growth rate was applied to baseline measurements from 2017. LOTTR projected growth rates are based on the 2013-2015 average annual growth; Truck TTRI growth rates are the inverse of the Interstate LOTTR growth rate. Overall the targets reflect an expectation that system reliability would change minimally over the reporting period. This assumption is based on (1) prior year trends; (2) relatively slow regional growth; and (3) relatively few projects that will have a significant impact on reliability measures.

None of the system reliability targets were achieved in 2018 or 2019, but all were achieved in 2020. In 2021, the regional Interstate Level of Travel Time Reliability performed above the set targets, the Non-Interstate NHS LOTTR fell below the target, and the Truck TTRI surpassed its target. Two years into the targets being introduced, the regional transportation network began to see interruptions of regular traffic patterns during the various COVID-19 pandemic variant outbreaks. This impacts how the RPC analyzes system reliability in the region due to the unpredictability of when these





LOTTR and TTRI Source: National Performance Management Research Dataset, 2022

variants occur and how much of an impact they may have on regional travel patterns. Conversely, the increase in system reliability during 2020 for all the measures, and some of the measures in 2021 is likely a result of reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT) during the last two years and changing travel patterns. The RPC will attempt to incorporate these findings into future congestion reduction strategies and will continue to monitor the impacts of the pandemic on regional travel.

The RPC will conduct a review of current targets in coordination with DOTD as it updates statewide targets. As with the Road and Bridge Condition targets, both DOTD and the RPC are within the initial 4-year reporting period as of the writing of this plan. DOTD is expected to produce targets for the next reporting period (2022-2026) in October, 2022, and the RPC will produce its new targets within 180 days.

Transit Asset Management

Transit performance measures focus on tracking asset condition, and Transit Asset Management (TAM) programs are in place at each of the region's transit agencies. These programs assist the agencies in tracking the age and condition of their vehicles, facilities, and other equipment, and guide their maintenance and replacement schedules. As part of the TAM program agencies set annual targets for asset conditions in the following categories:

- Rolling Stock – the percentage of revenue vehicles meeting or exceeding their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB);
- Equipment – the percentage of non-revenue vehicles meeting or exceeding their ULB;
- Infrastructure – the percentage of track segments with performance restrictions;
- Facilities – the percentage of assets with a condition rating exceeding 2.5 on FTA's TERM scale.

Targets for the transit asset management measures are established every year by transit providers and provided by them directly to FTA via the National Transit Database. These targets are provided to the MPO, which sets regional targets regional asset management targets when updating the MTP. See the table below for the current, four-year targets. Rolling Stock and Equipment percentages are those that will reach their ULB; Infrastructure is the percentage of track segments with performance restrictions; Facility percentages are those that will exceed 2.5 on FTA's TERM scale. As such, in all cases, the lower the better.

The MPO assists transit agencies in achieving these targets through our annual distribution of federal transit funds, which can be used to purchase and rehabilitate capital assets. For more information on federal transit funding and how it is allocated, see the Financial Planning section.

Regional, 4-year Transit Asset Management Targets

Rolling Stock	**ULB**	**TARGET**
Bus	14	15%
Cutaway Bus	14	5%
Articulated Bus	14	5%
Van/Minivan	8	20%
Streetcar	31	0%
Streetcar (Vintage)	58	0%
Ferryboat	42	50%
Equipment	**ULB**	**TARGET**
Automobiles	8	5%
Trucks, SUVs, Vans	8	18%
Steel Wheel	25	100%
Facilities		**TARGET**
Admin and Maintenance		20%
Passenger and Parking		10%
Infrastructure		**TARGET**
Streetcar Rail		5%

Source: Regional Transit Providers, 2022

Tracking Progress

The recommendations of the MTP will not be enacted at a single point in time; rather, the plan directs the RPC to undertake a series of activities that will influence the overall transportation planning process. To ensure the MTP is fully implemented, the RPC has developed mechanisms to track progress over time and to hold itself accountable.

Linking Projects to MTP Priorities

All projects in the MTP are evaluated for their consideration of each of the MTP's Priorities. Each project is expected to contribute to the advancement at least one Priority, and many contribute to multiple Priorities (see chart at right). Taken together, the program of projects holistically addresses the recommendations outlined in the plan.



Linking Projects to Performance Measures

The RPC tracks the extent to which each project helps to achieve Performance Measure targets. By implementing a program of projects that comprehensively addresses the Performance Measures, it is expected that the region will incrementally reach the targets it has set for itself. Each project listed in the MTP contributes to the achievement of one or more targets, and each has been categorized to identify its relationship to the performance measure policy areas: Motorized Safety; Non-motorized Safety; Vehicle Congestion; Freight Vehicle Congestion; and State of Good Repair. The chart on the right indicates the number of projects that contribute to each category. It should be noted that many projects contribute to more than one category. For example, projects that contribute to improved system performance may also improve freight movements. Importantly, the percentage of projects and the percentage of expenditures are fairly evenly split among the performance



measure categories. This indicates that the RPC has taken a balanced approach to addressing the region's transportation needs as defined by the federally required performance measures.

Annual Report

Beginning with the introduction of PBPP in 2018, the RPC has published an Annual Performance Report that describes each of the regional performance measures and whether the established targets have been met. The targets are also updated as appropriate. Moving forward this report will be expanded to include additional information related to MTP implementation, including Actions and Strategies accomplished, studies completed, and updates on how projects have contributed to MTP Priorities and Performance Measures.

Other Tracking Mechanisms

Progress towards MTP implementation is also aided and tracked via other RPC processes. The UPWP is updated annually and incorporates the MTP's recommendations into its work plan for RPC staff, budget, and description of studies to be completed. The RPC also annually produces a List of Obligated Projects, which details projects for which federal funding has been obligated in the preceding fiscal year. Completion of the List of Obligated projects provides a valuable opportunity to assess and report on the degree to which implemented projects are addressing the recommendations of the MTP. Though the TIP is updated every four years, concurrently with the MTP, it is frequently amended to include new projects and revised project scopes. During the amendment process, projects are evaluated for their contributions to MTP Priorities. The RPC also receives regular input from stakeholders that informs staff about its progress toward implementing the MTP's recommendations and introduces opportunities for adjustment. Finally, each update of the MTP provides a new opportunity to assess the prior MTP's impact and to evaluate how the RPC should modify its practices. In this manner each MTP contributes to an iterative process through which the regional transportation planning process can be continually improved.

Project List

Project List

Highway Projects

Highway Projects in the MTP are listed in ascending order by year, then state project number. An example project page and field descriptions are included below.



1.	State Project Number
2.	Project Title
3.	Is/Is Not a Line Item in State TIP
4.	Route Number
5.	State Control Section
6.	Beginning State Log Mile
7.	Ending State Log Mile
8.	Parish in which Project is Located
9.	Non-state Road Name
10.	Additional Comments
11.	Improvement Description
12.	Work Category
13.	FHWA Performance Measure Category
14.	MTP Priority (1 = Safety; 2 = Sustainability & Resilience; 3 = Equity; 4 = Econ. Opportunity; 5 = Reliability; 6 = Preservation)
15.	Project Phase
16.	Project Cost
17.	Project Cost plus 10% Contingency
18.	Federal Share of Phase
19.	Funding Source(s)
20.	Federal Fiscal Year
21.	Project Sponsor
22.	Funding Totals
23.	Project Urbanized Area
24.	Project Parish(es)

Project: H.009425 LA 16: US 51 TO LA 445

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 16	047-01	0.000	9.045	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ROADWAY FLOODING

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (2) (3) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$250,000.00	$250,000.00	$200,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 23	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$7,000,000.00	$7,700,000.00	$6,160,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 23	

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$7,250,000.00	$7,950,000.00	$6,360,000.00

Project: H.010289 LA 22: ROUNDABOUT DUNSON RIDGEDELL RDS.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	RIDGEDELL RD @ DUNSON RD
LA 22	261-04	2.609	2.844	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUT @ LA 22/DUNSON/RIDGEDELL	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,680,000.00	$1,848,000.00	$1,848,000.00	HSIP	FFY 23	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,680,000.00	$1,848,000.00	$1,848,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.010702 IC SEVERAL RR XINGS (HAMMOND)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	HAZEL STREET
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	MAGNOLIA STREET
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	OAK STREET
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	PINE STREET
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	SPRUCE STREET

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL F/L'S & GATES AT SEVERAL IC XINGS	RAILROADS TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICS

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(3)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$600,000.00	$660,000.00	$660,000.00	HSIP	FFY 23	DOTD

Total Cost:	$600,000.00	$660,000.00	$660,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):

ST

Project Parish(es):

TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.011512 US 51 @ SYCAMORE ST. AMITE CITY DRAINAGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 51	017-05	4.600	4.900	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ADDITIONAL PIPE(S), CATCH BASINS, AND/OR ASPHALT	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ROADWAY FLOODING

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (2) (3) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000.00	$110,000.00	$88,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 23	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$100,000.00	$110,000.00	$88,000.00

Project: H.012071 US 51: YELLOW WATER RIVER BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 51	017-04	3.690	4.030	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON NHS SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,774,000.00	$3,051,400.00	$1,774,960.00	STPFLEX	FFY 23	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,774,000.00	$3,051,400.00	$1,774,960.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.013245.ST MOTORIST ASSISTANCE PATROL (MAP)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-12	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	
I-55	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MAP PATROL ALONG I-12 AND I-55	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE INTERSTATE

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$664,000.00	$664,000.00	$332,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 23	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$664,000.00	$664,000.00	$332,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 24	
CONSTRUCTION	$664,000.00	$664,000.00	$332,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 25	
CONSTRUCTION	$664,000.00	$664,000.00	$332,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 26	
Total Cost:	**$2,656,000.00**	**$2,656,000.00**	**$1,328,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.013372 LA 22:PINE ST CORRIDOR IMPRV PONCHATOULA

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 22	261-04	0.000	0.112	TANGIPAHOA	
US 51-X	853-36	2.000	2.180	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF PONCHATOULA	SIGNALS, LANDSCAPING, CURB AND GUTTER, PED IMPROVEMENTS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,742,000.00	$1,916,200.00	$1,532,960.00	STPENH	FFY 23	CITY OF PONCHATOULA

Total Cost:	$1,742,000.00	$1,916,200.00	$1,532,960.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014271 I-12: US 51B (HAMMOND) INTCH LIGHTING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-12	454-03	5.630	6.450	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING INTERSTATE LIGHTING SYSTEM	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE INTERSTATE LIGHTING

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,400,000.00	$1,540,000.00	$1,386,000.00	NHPP	FFY 23	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,400,000.00	$1,540,000.00	$1,386,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014308 POPE LN: IC RR XING (AMITE CITY)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	POPE LANE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONSTRUCT LOCAL RD TO ALLOW POPE LN CROSSING TO BE CLOSED	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$56,000.00	$61,600.00	$0.00	LOCAL	FFY 23	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$444,000.00	$488,400.00	$0.00	RAIL HE	FFY 23	

Total Cost:	$500,000.00	$550,000.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014822 US 51: US 190 - LA 3234

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 51	017-04	2.120	3.380	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MEDIUM OVERLAY	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON NHS SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,500,000.00	$1,650,000.00	$1,320,000.00	NHPP	FFY 23	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$1,500,000.00	$1,650,000.00	$1,320,000.00

Project: H.014868 **LA 1056: LA 38-WASHINGTON P/L**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1056	853-14	0.000	2.785	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PATCH AND THIN OVERLAY	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE NFA

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$975,000.00	$1,072,500.00	$0.00	NFA	FFY 23	DOTD

Total Cost:	$975,000.00	$1,072,500.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.013007 DIST62:ABC BR REPLACE TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1054	853-22	4.400	4.500	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 1061	853-20	6.200	6.300	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 1062	415-04	2.530	5.140	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 38	263-03	0.200	0.300	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 40	415-02	1.600	1.700	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 442	269-04	4.700	4.800	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,364,000.00	$2,600,400.00	$0.00	NFA	FFY 24	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$2,600,000.00	$2,860,000.00	$2,288,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 24	

Total Cost:	$4,964,000.00	$5,460,400.00	$2,288,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.013886 LA 3158: I-12 TO HIPARK RD.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3158	853-39	0.200	0.600	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH MATCH FROM CITY OF HAMMOND	TSM IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$12,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 23	TANGIPAHOA PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$4,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 23	CITY OF HAMMOND
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$550,000.00	$440,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 24	
Total Cost:	**$520,000.00**	**$570,000.00**	**$456,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014262 **RANDALL ROAD OVER YELLOW WATER RIVER**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.013	TANGIPAHOA	RANDALL RD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT NO NEW ALIGNMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (OFF SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$570,000.00	$627,000.00	$501,600.00	FBROFF	FFY 24	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$570,000.00	$627,000.00	$501,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014263 N. HOOVER ROAD OVER UNNAMED CREEK

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	N. HOOVER ROAD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT NO NEW ALIGNMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (OFF SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$560,000.00	$616,000.00	$492,800.00	FBROFF	FFY 24	DOTD

Total Cost:	$560,000.00	$616,000.00	$492,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014801 LA 443: US 190 - LA 1064

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 443	853-27	0.000	3.040	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 443	853-27	3.040	4.412	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 443	853-27	4.412	4.420	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PATCH MILL AND OVERLAY	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,755,000.00	$3,030,500.00	$2,424,400.00	STPFLEX	FFY 24	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,755,000.00	$3,030,500.00	$2,424,400.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **I-12 @ LA 1249 (PUMPKIN CENTER)**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	INTERCHANGE LIGHTING	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,600,000.00	$1,760,000.00	$0.00	LOCAL	FFY 24	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,600,000.00	$1,760,000.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.007598 **AMITE LA 16 PEDESTRIAN PROJECT - PHASE I**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 16	047-01	0.000	0.220	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 16	262-07	3.270	3.580	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TOWN OF AMITE CITY	NEW SIDEWALKS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$604,000.00	$664,400.00	$531,520.00	TAP<200K	FFY 25	TOWN OF AMITE CITY

Total Cost:	$604,000.00	$664,400.00	$531,520.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.008399 US 51 BUSINESS (LA 22 - CLUB DELUXE RD)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 51-X	853-40			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$800,000.00	$800,000.00	$640,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 25	DOTD

Total Cost:	$800,000.00	$800,000.00	$640,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014252 LA 1054: TYNER CREEK BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1054	853-22	4.400	4.410	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$402,000.00	$442,200.00	$0.00	STGEN	FFY 25	DOTD

Total Cost:	$402,000.00	$442,200.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.014340 E. MINNESOTA PARK RD AT RANGE RD.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	E. MINNESOTA PARK
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.000	TANGIPAHOA	S. RANGE ROAD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	$60,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 25	TANGIPAHOA PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$92,000.00	$92,000.00	$73,600.00	STP50-200K	FFY 25	
CONSTRUCTION	$1,568,000.00	$1,724,800.00	$1,379,840.00	STP50-200K	FFY 25	

Total Cost:	$1,735,000.00	$1,891,800.00	$1,513,440.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **OLD COV HWY IMPR:CHESTNUT - PON. CRK. BR** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	MINOR WIDEN, ADA SIDEWALKS	CORRIDOR NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,765,000.00	$4,141,500.00	$3,313,200.00	STP50-200K	FFY 25	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$3,765,000.00	$4,141,500.00	$3,313,200.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.010108 INDEPENDENCE SRTS PH II

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.206	TANGIPAHOA	OAK STREET
A LOCAL	000-53	0.000	0.049	TANGIPAHOA	PINE STREET
LA 40	415-02	3.720	3.870	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SIDEWALK IMPROV. CROSSING & STRIPING	SAFETY SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$440,000.00	$484,000.00	$440,000.00	SR2S	FFY 26	DOTD

Total Cost:	$440,000.00	$484,000.00	$440,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **HAMMOND BIKE ROUTES**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF HAMMOND *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BIKE ROUTES IN HAMMOND	UNKNOWN

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,000,000.00	$1,100,000.00	$880,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 26	CITY OF HAMMOND

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$1,000,000.00	$1,100,000.00	$880,000.00

Project: RPC* **LA 1040 (KLEIN DR. TO US 51)**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF HAMMOND *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	CONSTRUCT SHARED USE PATH	UNKNOWN

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$612,000.00	$673,200.00	$538,560.00	STP50-200K	FFY 26	CITY OF HAMMOND

Total Cost:	$612,000.00	$673,200.00	$538,560.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.003672 **KENTWOOD WEIGH STATION REHAB**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	DEMO CONST. & PIT SCALE REHAB	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,901,000.00	$3,191,100.00	$2,552,880.00	NHPP	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$2,901,000.00	$3,191,100.00	$2,552,880.00

Project: H.008399 **US 51 BUSINESS (LA 22 - CLUB DELUXE RD)**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,200,000.00	$1,200,000.00	$960,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD
UTILITY RELOCATION	$400,000.00	$400,000.00	$320,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$63,800,000.00	$70,180,000.00	$51,040,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$65,400,000.00	$71,780,000.00	$52,320,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.008915 LA3234 EXT FROM LA1065 - HAMMOND AIRPORT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3234	853-40			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ROADWAY EXTENSION	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$27,500,000.00	$30,250,000.00	$24,200,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$27,500,000.00	$30,250,000.00	$24,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.009977 **N TANGIPAHOA PARISH PARK TRAILS**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONSTRUCTION OF 2900 FT OF TRAILS	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$125,000.00	$137,500.00	$110,000.00	RTP	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$125,000.00	$137,500.00	$110,000.00

Project: H.011401 US 51: W UNIV AVE TO I55 CORRIDOR STUDY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 51	017-04			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CORRIDOR/TRAFFIC STUDY FOR ACCESSMAN AND	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RPC STUDY	$372,000.00	$372,000.00	$372,000.00	HSIPPEN	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$372,000.00	$372,000.00	$372,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.011402 **US 51 BUS: I12 TO COLEMAN CORRIDOR STUDY**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 51-X	853-36			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	TRAFFIC/CORRIDOR STUDY FOR ACCESS MGMT A	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RPC STUDY	$289,000.00	$289,000.00	$289,000.00	HSIPPEN	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$289,000.00	$289,000.00	$289,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.011618 LA 22 CORRIDOR STUDY: ROU MAR NEI TO 1ST

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 22	261-03			TANGIPAHOA	
LA 22	261-04			TANGIPAHOA	
US 51-X	853-36			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CORRIDOR STUDY FOR ACCESS MGMNT/TRAFFIC	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RPC STUDY	$320,000.00	$320,000.00	$281,600.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$320,000.00	$320,000.00	$281,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.011858 **HAMMOND: JW DAVIS, CM FAGAN SW**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF HAMMOND	SIDEWALKS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$570,000.00	$627,000.00	$501,600.00	TAP<200K	TIER II	CITY OF HAMMOND

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$570,000.00	$627,000.00	$501,600.00

Project: RPC* **I-12 AT LA 3158 I/C**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ROUNDABOUTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,000,000.00	$8,800,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,000,000.00	$8,800,000.00

Project: RPC* **LA 445 IMPROVEMENTS, LA 22 -US 190**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	CAPACITY	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$38,200,000.00	$42,020,000.00	$33,616,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$38,200,000.00	$42,020,000.00	$33,616,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **OLD COV HWY IMPR: CYPRESS - CHESTNUT PH1** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	MINOR WIDEN/ ADA SIDEWALKS	CORRIDOR NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$455,000.00	$500,500.00	$400,400.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$455,000.00	$500,500.00	$400,400.00

Project: RPC* **OLD COV HWY IMPR:PON. CRK. BR - LA 3158** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	MINOR WIDEN, ADA SIDEWALKS	CORRIDOR NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,821,000.00	$3,103,100.00	$2,482,480.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,821,000.00	$3,103,100.00	$2,482,480.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **US 190 AT LA 3158**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ROUNDABOUTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,500,000.00	$2,750,000.00	$2,200,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$2,500,000.00	$2,750,000.00	$2,200,000.00

Project: RPC* **US 51 (YELLOW WATER CREEK TO LA 1064)** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN TO 3 LANE SECTION	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (3) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,300,000.00	$2,640,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,000,000.00	$3,300,000.00	$2,640,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **US 51 @ LA 442 (TICKFAW)**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	INTERSECTION OFFSET IMPROVE	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,400,000.00	$3,520,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,400,000.00	$3,520,000.00

Project: RPC* **US 51B: LA22 TO CLUB DELUXE RD.**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$5,000,000.00	$5,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 25	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$58,300,000.00	$64,130,000.00	$51,304,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$63,300,000.00	$69,130,000.00	$55,304,000.00

Project: RPC* **ANDERSON ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **BEACH ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE 1** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,509,200.00	$1,660,120.00	$1,494,108.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$1,509,200.00	$1,660,120.00	$1,494,108.00

Project: RPC* **BEACH ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE 2**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,058,000.00	$2,263,800.00	$2,037,420.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,058,000.00	$2,263,800.00	$2,037,420.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **BENNETT ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$578,200.00	$636,020.00	$572,418.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$578,200.00	$636,020.00	$572,418.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **BERRY BOWL ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project: RPC* **BROCK ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **BYERS ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$558,600.00	$614,460.00	$553,014.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$558,600.00	$614,460.00	$553,014.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **CAMPBELL LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **COLEMAN ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$499,800.00	$549,780.00	$494,802.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$499,800.00	$549,780.00	$494,802.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **E. LEWISTON ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$558,600.00	$614,460.00	$553,014.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$558,600.00	$614,460.00	$553,014.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **EASLEY ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$460,600.00	$506,660.00	$455,994.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$460,600.00	$506,660.00	$455,994.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **FANNIE POWELL ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$411,600.00	$452,760.00	$407,484.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$411,600.00	$452,760.00	$407,484.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **FIRETOWER RD INTERCHANGE @ I-12** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	NEW INTERCHANGE	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$19,100,000.00	$21,010,000.00	$15,280,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$19,100,000.00	$21,010,000.00	$15,280,000.00

Project: RPC* **FIRETOWER RD WIDENING (LA 22 TO US 190)** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN TO FOUR LANES	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$34,000,000.00	$37,400,000.00	$29,920,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$34,000,000.00	$37,400,000.00	$29,920,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **HARVEY LAVIGNE ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$568,400.00	$625,240.00	$562,716.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$568,400.00	$625,240.00	$562,716.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **HINSON ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$362,600.00	$398,860.00	$358,974.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$362,600.00	$398,860.00	$358,974.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **I-12 SERVICE RD: LA 445 TO FIRETOWER RD**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	NEW TWO LANE SERVICE RD (NORTH & SOUTH)	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$40,800,000.00	$44,880,000.00	$35,904,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$40,800,000.00	$44,880,000.00	$35,904,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **I-12: LA 1249 - LA 445, WIDENING**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN 6 LANES	CAPACITY INTERSTATE

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$50,000,000.00	$55,000,000.00	$49,500,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$50,000,000.00	$55,000,000.00	$49,500,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **I-12: LA 445 - LA 1077 WIDENING**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN 6 LANES	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$74,300,000.00	$81,730,000.00	$59,440,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$74,300,000.00	$81,730,000.00	$59,440,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **I-55 (US190 TO LA3234)**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	AUXILLIARY LANES (NB/SB)	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$12,000,000.00	$13,200,000.00	$11,880,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$12,000,000.00	$13,200,000.00	$11,880,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **I-55 @ I-12 INTERCHANGE REHAB**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	REHAB INTERCHANGE	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$50,000,000.00	$55,000,000.00	$49,500,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$50,000,000.00	$55,000,000.00	$49,500,000.00

Project: RPC* **I-55 AT US 190**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	I/C IMPROVEMENTS (NW QUADRANT)	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,000,000.00	$9,900,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,000,000.00	$9,900,000.00

Project: RPC* **I-55: US 190 TO WARDLINE RD**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	AUXILIARY LANES (NB/SB)	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,000,000.00	$9,900,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,000,000.00	$9,900,000.00

Project: RPC* **I-55@ LA 22 INTERCHANGE REHAB**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	REHAB INTERCHANGE	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$25,000,000.00	$27,500,000.00	$24,750,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$25,000,000.00	$27,500,000.00	$24,750,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **ILLINOIS JONES RD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$499,800.00	$549,780.00	$494,802.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$499,800.00	$549,780.00	$494,802.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **KENTWOOD FIRESTATION OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **LA 22 (LA 1085- 3RD ST. PONCHATOULA)** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN TO FOUR LANES	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$89,000,000.00	$97,900,000.00	$71,200,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$89,000,000.00	$97,900,000.00	$71,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **LA 445 IMPROVEMENTS, US 190 TO LA 40**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN/HARDEN LA 445	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$42,000,000.00	$46,200,000.00	$36,960,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$42,000,000.00	$46,200,000.00	$36,960,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **LANIER LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR / REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **LAROCK RD BR OV NAT. CRK OFF SYSTEM BR.**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,195,600.00	$1,315,160.00	$1,183,644.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,195,600.00	$1,315,160.00	$1,183,644.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **M. WILLIAMS ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **NARRETTO ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR / REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$264,600.00	$291,060.00	$261,954.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$264,600.00	$291,060.00	$261,954.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **NORTH BRICKYARD ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$558,600.00	$614,460.00	$553,014.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$558,600.00	$614,460.00	$553,014.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **NORTH JACKSON ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$420,420.00	$462,462.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$420,420.00	$462,462.00	$378,378.00

Project: RPC* **NUCCIO RD. OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$735,000.00	$808,500.00	$727,650.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$735,000.00	$808,500.00	$727,650.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **OLD GENESSEE ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **PALMER LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$303,800.00	$334,180.00	$300,762.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$303,800.00	$334,180.00	$300,762.00

Project: RPC* **RABORN ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$372,400.00	$409,640.00	$368,676.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$372,400.00	$409,640.00	$368,676.00

Project: RPC* **SHINGLE MILL ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$754,600.00	$830,060.00	$747,054.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$754,600.00	$830,060.00	$747,054.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **SINGING WATER FALLS RD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$421,400.00	$463,540.00	$417,186.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$421,400.00	$463,540.00	$417,186.00

Project: RPC* **STATE LINE ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$744,800.00	$819,280.00	$737,352.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$744,800.00	$819,280.00	$737,352.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **STATELINE ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$568,400.00	$625,240.00	$562,716.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$568,400.00	$625,240.00	$562,716.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **STEIN ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,185,800.00	$1,304,380.00	$1,173,942.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,185,800.00	$1,304,380.00	$1,173,942.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **TRAVIS LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$509,600.00	$560,560.00	$504,504.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$509,600.00	$560,560.00	$504,504.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **US 190: ST. TAMMANY P/L TO HAMMOND**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$97,600,000.00	$107,360,000.00	$85,888,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$97,600,000.00	$107,360,000.00	$85,888,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **V. LAMBERT ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$362,600.00	$398,860.00	$358,974.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$362,600.00	$398,860.00	$358,974.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC* **WALNUT STREET OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$372,400.00	$409,640.00	$368,676.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$372,400.00	$409,640.00	$368,676.00

Project: RPC* **WALSH ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,215,200.00	$1,336,720.00	$1,203,048.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$1,215,200.00	$1,336,720.00	$1,203,048.00

Project: RPC* **WEST CHESTNUT STREET OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$372,400.00	$409,640.00	$368,676.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$372,400.00	$409,640.00	$368,676.00

Project: RPC* **WEST YELLOW WATER ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE** **Project is in a STIP Line Item** ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	Priorities:
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00	BDP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$420,420.00	$378,378.00

Transit Projects

Note: The first four years of the Transit MTP comprise the Transit Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

2023 S. Tangipahoa Transportation Improvement Program - Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match
Operating Assistance (Urban)	800,000	400,000			400,000	400,000
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	200,000	160,000			160,000	40,000
Transit Associated Improvements	350,000	280,000			280,000	70,000
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	277,500	290,000			290,000	72,500
Total	**$1,627,500.0**	**$1,130,000.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,130,000.0**	**$582,500.0**

2024 S. Tangipahoa Transportation Improvement Program - Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match
Operating Assistance (Urban)	820,000	410,000			410,000	410,000
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	180,000	144,000			144,000	36,000
Transit Associated Improvements	375,000	300,000			300,000	75,000
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	277,500	300,000			300,000	75,000
Total	**$1,652,500.0**	**$1,154,000.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,154,000.0**	**$596,000.0**

2025 S. Tangipahoa Transportation Improvement Program - Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match
Operating Assistance (Urban)	830,000	415,000			415,000	415,000
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	181,250	145,000			145,000	36,250
Transit Associated Improvements	387,500	310,000			310,000	77,500
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	277,500	310,000			310,000	77,500
Total	**$1,676,250.0**	**$1,180,000.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,180,000.0**	**$606,250.0**

2026 S. Tangipahoa Transportation Improvement Program - Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match
Operating Assistance (Urban)	820,000	410,000			410,000	410,000
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	225,000	180,000			180,000	45,000
Transit Associated Improvements	375,000	300,000			300,000	75,000
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	277,500	310,000			310,000	77,500
Total	**$1,697,500.0**	**$1,200,000.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,200,000.0**	**$607,500.0**

South Tangipahoa Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Transit Element Tiers II and III		
	Tier II	**Tier III**
Operating Expenses	$9.9 million	$14.9 million
Revenue Vehicles	$4.9 million	$7.4 million
Facilities	$1.6 million	$2.5 million

Appendix

Appendix A: List of Acronyms

Acronym	Description
ACS	American Community Survey
LEHD	Longitudinal Employment Household Dynamics program
NTD	National Transit Database
NHS	National Highway System
NHFS	National Highway Freight System
SOV	Single Occupant Vehicle
RPC	Regional Planning Commission
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act
IIJA	Infrastructure, Investment, and Jobs Act (aka BIL)
BIL	Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (aka IIJA)
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
TPC	Transportation Policy Committee
UZA	Urbanized Area
TMA	Transportation Management Area
MPA	Metropolitan Planning Area
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VHT	Vehicle Hours Traveled
CBD	Central Business District
EDD	Economic Development District
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
LADOTD	Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
CEDS	Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards

ICPP	United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
CTPP	Census Transportation Planning Package
NHTS	National Household Travel Survey
SOV	Single Occupant Vehicle
RTA	Regional Transit Authority
PPG	Plaquemines Parish Government
SBURT	St. Bernard Urban Rapid Transit
JP Transit	Jefferson Parish Transit
UNOTI	University of New Orleans Transportation Institute
MSY	Louis Armstrong New Orleans International Airport
UPT	New Orleans Union Passenger Terminal
Port NOLA	Port of New Orleans
NHS	National Highway System
NHFS	National Highway Freight System
SSI	Sustpected Serious Injuries
SVI	Social Vulnerability Index
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
SBIRT	Screening Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment
LWI	Louisiana Watershed Initiative
SLCFP	Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership
CMP	Congestion Management Process
NORTSC	New Orleans Regional Traffic Safety Coalition
SCRSC	South Central Regional Safety Coalition
SHSP	Strategic Highway Safety Plan
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
NRSS	National Roadway Safety Strategy
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
GGE	Gallons of Gasoline Equivalent

GHG	Greenhouse Gasses
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
BEOC	Louisiana Business Emergency Operations Center
GOHSEP	Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
PBPP	Performance Based Planning and Programming
LOTTR	Level of Travel Time Reliability
TTRI	Travel Time Reliability Index
TAM	Transit Asset Management
ULB	Useful Life Benchmark
AOI	Area of Interest

Appendix B: List of Funding Sources

Funding Source	Description
AC	Advanced Construction
AMTRAK	Amtrak Funding
ARPA	American Rescue Plan Act Of 2021
BDP	Bridge Discretionary Program
BIP	Bridge Improvement Program
COVID>200K	Coronavirus Response And Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act
DEMO	Demonstration
FBR-OFF	Off-System Bridge Replacement
FED/STATE	Federal/State Cost Share
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management
FHWA Discr.	FHWA Discretionary
FLH	Public Lands Highways (Discretionary And Non-Discretionary
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FREIGHT-HY	National Hwy Freight Program, Fast
FTA DISC	Federal Transit Authority Discretionary
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program
HSIPPEN	HSIP Section 154 And 164
LOCAL	Local Funding
LRSP	Local Road Safety Program
NFA	Non Federal Aid Funds
NFI	No Funding Identified
NHPP	National Highway Performance Program
NHS	National Highway System
OTHER	Other
PLENV	Planning - Environmental
RAIL HE	Rail & Highway Crossings Hazard Elimination
RAIL PD	Rail & Highway Crossings Protective Devices
RR	Railroad

RTP	National Recreational Trails
SR2S	Safe Routes To Schools Program
ST BONDS	State Bonds/General Obligation Bonds
ST CASH	State Transportation Trust Fund
ST GEN	State General Funds
STATE	State Funding
STP	Surface Transportation Program
STP ENH	S Enhancements
STP FLEX	STP Flexible
STP<5K	STP < 5,000 Population
STP>200K	STP > 200,000 Population
STP50-200K	STP 50K-200K Population
TAP<200K	TAP < 200,000 Population
TAP>200K	TAT > 200,000 Population
TIGER	TIGER/BUILD/RAISE Discretionary Grants
TOLLS	Toll Revenues

Appendix C: Additional Projects

In addition to the projects in the Project List section, the following projects have been identified through stakeholder input or RPC analysis. Projects listed below are pending additional information such as cost and funding program guidance, but are nonetheless considered important improvements for the South Tangipahoa MPA.

Project Name	MTP Year	Improvement	Estimated Cost
Electric Vehicle Infrastrucuture	Tiers 1-3	Eligible Activities per IIJA	TBD
Carbon Reduction Program	Tiers 1-3	Eligible Activities per IIJA	TBD
PROTECT- Resilience Improvements	Tiers 1-3	Eligible Activities per IIJA	TBD
Safe Streets for All (SS4A)	Tiers 1-3	Eligible Activities per IIJA	TBD
Reconnecting Neighborhoods	Tiers 1-3	Eligible Activities per IIJA	TBD
N. Thibodeaux Rd Widening (LA 22 to Sontheimer)	Tier 3	Widen to four lanes	$24,800,000
Harvey Lavigne Extension to Meadowwood Rd	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$4,200,000
Byers Rd Connection to EA Hoover Rd.	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$420,000
Byers Rd Connection at Crown Drive to Firetower Rd	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$3,200,000
Memory Lane Connection to Crown Drive	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$1,260,000
Larpenter Ln Connection to Harvey Lavigne Rd.	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$1,260,000
Foy Cemetery Rd to Pasqua Rd and Crown Drive	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$2,100,000
Cooper Cemetery Road Connection to April Ln	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$6,300,000
Richoux Rd Connection to Byers Rd	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$3,200,000
Richoux Rd Connection to LA 445	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$4,200,000
Richoux Rd Connection to LA 22	Tier 3	Two lane extension	$2,100,000
Bankston Rd. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Bardwell Rd Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Carlos Dr.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Conn Lane Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Crossover Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Dave Lanier Ln.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Destination Drive Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD

E. Blackcat Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
E. Peckerwood Rd. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Firetower Rd Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Fontana Lane Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Green Acres Dr.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Hen Lane/Rd. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
I-55 Frontage Rd. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Kohnke Hill Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Latino Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Market St. Ext. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Merchant Court Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
N. Bardwell Rd Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
N. Benton Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
N. I-12 Service Rd Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
N. Odell Walker Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
N. Peckerwoods Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
N. Riverdale Heights Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Old Highway 40 Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Old La. 40	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Pardo Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Roch Rd. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Rock Rd. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
S. Baptist Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
S.Billville Rd Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Shady Ln.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Shaffer Rd. Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Stateline Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Statham Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Sweet Pea Lane Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Tall Timber Rd Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD

Tuttle Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
W. Lee Hughes Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Walker Rd.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Western Acres Drive Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD
Windsor Dr.	TBD	Bridge Rehab. or Replacement	TBD
Yokum Rd Improvement	TBD	Rehabilitation or Improvement	TBD

Appendix D: Public Comments

The RPC did not receive written comments during the plan development process. Verbal comments received during public meetings have been incorporated into the plan.

Appendix E: Amendments

The page(s) below include amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan that have been approved by the Transportation Policy Committee since the plan's original approval.

Amendment approved by the Transportation Policy Committee on February 14, 2023:

MTP Amendment: South Tangipahoa Metropolitan Planning Area

2023 Safety Performance Targets

Upon approval of this amendment the following Safety Performance Targets will replace the targets listed in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the South Tangipahoa Metropolitan Planning Area:

South Tangipahoa MPA 2023 Safety Targets

	2023 Baseline (2017-2021 Avg.)	Targeted Annual Change*	2023 Target (2019-2023 Avg.)
Number of Fatalities	22.2	-1%	21.8
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	1.36	-1%	1.33
Number of Serious Injuries	40	-1%	39.2
Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	2.45	-1%	2.40
Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries	10.4	-1%	10.2

*Note: Baseline period ends two years prior to target period; targets are therefore calculated based on two years of annual reductions (i.e., (Baseline-1%)-1%).

South Tangipahoa MTP Amendment

Upon approval of this amendment the following performance targets will replace the targets listed in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the South Tangipahoa Metropolitan Planning Area:

Pavement Condition – Interstate

	Baseline Mileage	Baseline %	2-year Target Rate of Change	2-year Target Mileage	2-year Target %	4-year Target Rate of Change	4-year Target Mileage	4-year Target %
Good Condition	39	22.8%	-23.2%	30.0	17.5%	-38.6%	23.9	14.0%
Poor Condition	2.2	1.3%	23.5%	2.7	1.6%	41.2%	3.1	1.8%

Pavement Condition – Non-Interstate NHS

	Baseline Mileage	Baseline %	2-year Target Rate of Change	2-year Target Mileage	2-year Target %	4-year Target Rate of Change	4-year Target Mileage	4-year Target %
Good Condition	0.6	1.3%	-38.4%	0.4	0.8%	-64.2%	0.2	0.5%
Poor Condition	2.8	6.1%	20.2%	3.4	7.3%	33.6%	3.7	8.2%

Bridge Condition

	Baseline Bridge Deck Area	Baseline %	2-year Target Rate of Change	2-year Target Bridge Deck Area	2-year Target %	4-year Target Rate of Change	4-year Target Bridge Deck Area	4-year Target %
Good Condition	575,228.5	86.9%	-10.7%	513,650.5	77.6%	-9.4%	521,160.0	78.7%
Poor Condition	-	0.0%	-32.4%	-	0.0%	-30.9%	-	0.0%

System Performance

	Interstate LOTTR	Non-interstate NHS LOTTR	Truck TTRI
2019 Baseline	79.8%	85.7%	1.59
Annual Rate of Change	-1.30%	-0.54%	0.50%
2024 Target (2-year)	77.7%	84.8%	1.61
2026 Target (4-year)	75.7%	83.9%	1.62