

2056

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Southeast Louisiana Metropolitan Planning Area

RPC
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR THE PARISHES OF
LOUISIANA
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST · ST. TAMMANY · TANGIPAHOA · JEFFERSON · ORLEANS · PLAQUEMINES · ST. BERNARD · ST. CHARLES

2056
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Adopted October 13, 2026

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

For the New Orleans, Mandeville-Covington, Slidell, And South Tangipahoa Urbanized Areas

HOSTED AT

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

10 VETERANS BOULEVARD

NEW ORLEANS, LA 70124

PHONE: 504-483-8500

EMAIL: RPC@NORPC.ORG

www.norpc.org

Number: 26-2007

Transportation Policy Committee of the Regional Planning Commission for
JEFFERSON, ORLEANS, PLAQUEMINES, ST. BERNARD, ST. CHARLES, ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST. TAMMANY, & TANGIPAHOA PARISHES

Adoption of the 2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the Southeast Louisiana Metropolitan Planning Area

Introduced by Councilmember Tammy Houston, seconded by Councilmember Ryan Randall, on the 13th day of October, 2026.

WHEREAS, the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) of the Regional Planning Commission for Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany, and Tangipahoa Parishes (RPC), acting in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Southeast Louisiana Metropolitan Planning Area, including the Mandeville-Covington, New Orleans, Slidell, and South Tangipahoa Urbanized Areas, is responsible for carrying out a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 117-58 IIJA) and the preceding transportation bills establish requirements for the metropolitan transportation planning process, including the development of a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP); and,

WHEREAS, the 2056 MTP is a planning document which has been cooperatively developed by various federal, state, regional, and local agencies and organizations concerned with transportation planning and which describes long-range and short-range strategies that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system; and

WHEREAS, the MTP is consistent with local and state transportation plans, and meets the requirements of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 450.324; and

WHEREAS, the MPO has solicited the public and interested stakeholders in an open and transparent process as detailed by the MPO's Public Participation Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the Transportation Policy Committee hereby adopts the 2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the Southeast Louisiana Metropolitan Planning Area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the MPO staff is hereby authorized to submit the 2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan to the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development and appropriate federal agencies, and to comply with any minor revisions necessary to facilitate submission of the program.

Whereupon, after discussion, the question was called and resulted in the following:

AYES: 40 NAYS: 0 ABSTENTIONS: 0

and the Chairman declared the Resolution duly carried.

ROBBY MILLER
CHAIRMAN

CYNTHIA LEE SHENG
TREASURER

Disclaimers

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, 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.

Data 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. GIS data may have been generated using specific Artificial Intelligence (AI) or machine learning tools in GIS software. Users must independently review, validate, and fact-check all results before relying on them for decision-making, planning, or operational use.

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 an RPC function and require special accommodations, please give RPC one week's notice in advance.

Table of Contents

01 Introduction 1
1.1 About the Plan 2
1.2 About the RPC 2
1.3 The Metropolitan Planning Process 3
1.4 Outreach and Engagement Process 6
1.5 How to Navigate the Plan 16
1.6 Putting the Plan into Action 17
02 Background 18
2.1 The Metropolitan Planning Area 19
2.2 Transportation Funding 21
2.3 The Project Delivery Process 24
2.4 Title VI 27
2.5 Non-MPO Programs 28
03 Our Region 33
3.1 Regional Demographics 35
3.2 Regional Economy 52
3.3 Regional Development Patterns 59
3.4 Regional Environment 63
3.5 Vulnerable Communities 66
3.6 Summary of Regional Trends 71
04 Transportation System 72
4.1 Biking and Walking 74
4.2 Public Transportation 81
4.3 Roadways and Congestion 89
4.4 Safety 97
4.5 Inter-Regional Transportation 103
4.6 Freight 105
4.7 Emerging Technologies 111
4.8 Transportation Resilience 114
05 System Performance 116
5.1 Performance-Based Planning and Programming 117
5.2 Safety Performance 118
5.3 Road and Bridge Condition 120
5.4 System Reliability Performance 123
5.5 Transit Asset Management 125
5.6 MTP Projects Performance Review 126
06 Goals and Objectives 127
6.1 Goals 128
6.2 Objectives 136
07 Plan Implementation 138
7.1 Planning Actions 139
7.2 MTP Projects 152
Appendix A: Financial Plan and Fiscal Constraint Analysis 153
Appendix B: MTP Highway Project List 160
Appendix C: MTP Transit Project List 591
Appendix D: MTP Call for Projects Guidelines and Criteria 601
Appendix E: American Community Survey Data Tables 618
Appendix F: Stakeholder Input Results and Analysis 625
Appendix G: Federal Requirements Crosswalk 638
Appendix H: Amendments 645

List of Figures

Figure 1. Transportation Federal Planning Factors (23 USC § 134 (h)(1)) 5
Figure 2. MTP Outreach Timeline 6
Figure 3. 2056 MTP Outreach Results 14
Figure 4. Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) and Urbanized Area (UZA) Boundaries 20
Figure 5. LADOTD 6-Stage Project Delivery Process 25
Figure 6. MPA Total Population by Parish 35
Figure 7. MPA Population Density (Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates) 36
Figure 8. Parish Population Totals, 1990-2020 37
Figure 9. MPA Population Shift, 2000-2020 (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census) .. 39
Figure 10. Southshore Parishes Population Shift, 2000-2020 (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census) 40
Figure 11. River Parishes Population Shift, 2000-2020 (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census) 41
Figure 12. Northshore Parishes Population Shift, 2000-2020 (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census) 42
Figure 13. Percent Change in Population Age Composition, 2018-2023 44
Figure 14. Population Density by Race (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025) ... 46
Figure 15. Population Density by Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025) 47
Figure 16. Northshore Housing Burden (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025) .. 49
Figure 17. River Parishes Housing Burden (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025) 49
Figure 18. Southshore Housing Burden (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025) .. 50
Figure 19. Locations of Employment Centers Based on Number of Employees (Source: DatabaseUSA, 2024) 55
Figure 20. Regional Land Cover (Source: United States Geological Survey (2024), Annual National Land Cover Database (NLCD) Conterminous United States Collection 1.2 Land Cover Confidence: U.S. Geological Survey data release, https://doi.org/10.5066/P94UXNTS) 60
Figure 21. 2023 Southeast Louisiana GHG Inventory 64
Figure 22. Social Vulnerability Index Scores by Census Block Group (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates; RPC 2025) 67
Figure 23. Census Block Groups with Mobility Barriers (Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025) 69
Figure 24. Regional Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities and Shared Use Paths (Source: RPC 2026) 75
Figure 25. Northshore Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities and Shared Use Paths (Source: RPC 2026) 76
Figure 26. Lafitte Greenway Usage by Hour and Day of Week. Source: University of New Orleans Transportation Institute (2023). 77
Figure 27. Fixed-Route Transit Lines. (Sources: LADOTD,2007; JP Transit, 2024; RTA, 2024; SBURT, 2025; Tangi Transit, 2025) 81
Figure 28. Areas within ¼ mile and ½ Mile of Public Transit. (Source: RPC 2026) 85
Figure 29. Federal-Aid Network (Source: LADOTD 2026) 90
Figure 30. Regional Congestion (Source: NPMRDS 2025) 92
Figure 31. VMT, VHT, and Population Change, 2060 96
Figure 32. Traffic Fatalities, 2015-2024 98
Figure 33. Traffic SSI, 2015-2024 98
Figure 34. Non-Motorized Fatalities and Suspected Serious Injuries, 2015-2024 99
Figure 35. Fatalities on Local Versus State Roads 100
Figure 36. Passengers at LANOIA 103
Figure 37. Major Freight Facilities. Sources: Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) (2019), Intermodal Freight Facilities; LADOTD (2026), Ports of Louisiana; National Transportation Atlas Database (NTAD) (2024), North Americal Rail Network Lines; FHWA (2025), National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) 108

Figure 38. Electric Vehicle Registration in Southeast Louisiana 112
Figure 39. Simplified Example of VAST Calculation of Bridge Vulnerability to Storm Surge 114
Figure 40. Safety Performance, 2020-2024 119
Figure 41. Interstate LOTTR, 2018-2026 124
Figure 42. Non-Interstate LOTTR, 2018-2026 124
Figure 43. Truck TTRI, 2018-2016 124

List of Tables

Table 1. 2056 MTP Outreach Goals and Strategies 7
Table 2. MTP Planning Workshop Activities 10
Table 3. Total Population of Urbanized Areas in Southeast Louisiana Region 19
Table 4. 2060 Population Projections 43
Table 5. Race and Ethnicity Composition of MPA (2023) 45
Table 6. Income and Poverty by Parish 51
Table 7. Regional Employment at a Glance 52
Table 8. Top Regional Industries 53
Table 9. Industry Location Quotients 54
Table 10. Commute to Work by Mode 57
Table 11. Top 8 ZIP Codes - Location of Jobs 58
Table 12. Top 8 ZIP Codes – Location of Workforce 58
Table 13. Local Comprehensive Land Use Plans for Southeast Louisiana Jurisdictions 62
Table 14. Active Transportation Facilities in Number of Miles 74
Table 15. Transit Ridership 2022-2024 82
Table 16. Population and Households within ½ and ¼ mile of Public Transit 84
Table 17. On-Demand and Paratransit Service in the Southeast Louisiana Region 87
Table 18. Travel Demand Forecast, VMT & VHT 95
Table 19. Regional Safety Targets 118
Table 20. Pavement Condition Baselines and Targets 120
Table 21. Bridge Condition Baselines and Targets 121
Table 22. System Reliability Baselines and Targes 124
Table 23. Transit Asset Useful Life Benchmarks & Targets 125
Table 24. Percentage and Number of MTP Projects Contributing to Performance Targets 126
Table 25. 2056 MTP Objectives 136
Table 26. Consistency of MTP Goals and Objectives with 10 Federal Planning Factors 137
Table 27. Percentage and Number of MTP Projects Contributing to MTP Goals 152

Acronyms

3C	cooperative, continuous, and comprehensive planning framework
AARP	American Association of Retired Persons
ACS	American Community Survey
ADA	Americans with Disability Act
ADS	automated
AHP	above head of pass
AOI	Area of Interest
BNSF	Burlington Northern-Sante Fe Railroad
BTS	Bureau of Transportation Statistics
CARTS	Center for Analytics and Research in Transportation Safety
CAV	connected and automated vehicle
CBD	Central Business District
CCAP	Comprehensive Climate Action Plan
CDC	United States Center for Disease Control and Prevention
CEDS	Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
CFI	Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grant Program
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
CMN	Congestion Management Network
CMP	Congestion Management Program
COG	Council of Governments
CPKC	Canadian Pacific Kansas City Railroad
CPRA	Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority
CPRG	Climate Pollution Reduction Grant Program
CSX	Chessie Seaboard Railroad
CTPP	United States Census Transportation Planning Package
DRA	Delta Regional Authority
DOE	United States Department of Energy
EDA	United States Economic Development Administration
EDD	Economic Development District
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EV	electric vehicle
FFY	federal fiscal year
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Authority
GGE	gallons of gasoline equivalent
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	geographic information systems
GNOHA	Greater New Orleans Housing Alliance
HIN	High Injury Network
HMP	Hazard Mitigation Plan
HOV	high occupancy vehicle
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program
IIJA	Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

ITS	intelligent transportation system
JEDCO	Jefferson Parish Economic Development Commission
JP	Jefferson Parish
LADOTD	Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
LANOIA	Louis Armstrong New Orleans International Airport
LDC&E	Louisiana Department of Conservation and Energy
LDD	Local Development District
LDEQ	Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
LEP	limited English proficiency
LGP	Louisiana Gateway Port
LIT	Louisiana International Terminal
LNG	Liquified Natural Gas
LOTTR	Level of Travel Time Reliability
MAP	Motorist Assistance Patrol
MMUCC	Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria
MPA	Metropolitan Planning Area
MPO	metropolitan planning organization
MRT	Mississippi River Trail
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NDLC	National Land Cover Database
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHA	Northshore Housing Alliance
NHFN	National Highway Freight Network
NHPP	National Highway Performance Program
NHS	National Highway System
NHTSA	National Highway Transportation Safety Administration
NOUPT	New Orleans Union Passenger Terminal
NPMRDS	National Performance Management Research Dataset
NS	Norfolk Southern Railroad
NTAD	National Transportation Atlas Database
NTD	National Transit Database
PBPP	Performance-Based Planning and Programming
PCAP	Priority Climate Action Plan
PHFS	Primary Highway Freight System
PPP	Public Participation Plan
PROTECT	Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation Program
RAISE	Rebuilding American Infrastructure Sustainably and Equitably Grant Program
RPC	Regional Planning Commission
RPTA	River Parish Transit Authority
RTA	Regional Transit Authority
SBURT	St. Bernard Urban Rapid Transit
SHPO	Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office
SGR	state of good repair
SHSP	Strategic Highway Safety Plan
SLCFP	Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership
SOV	single occupancy vehicle
SRC	Southern Railroad Commission

SS4A	Safe Streets and Roads for All
SSI	Suspected Serious Injuries
STB	Surface Transportation Board
STBG	Surface Transportation Block Grant
STP	Surface Transportation Program
STP	Surface Transportation Program
SVI	Social Vulnerability Index
TAG	Technical Advisory Group
TAM	Transit Asset Management
TDM	Travel Demand Management
TERM	Transit Economic Requirements Model
TEU	twenty-foot equivalent unit
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMA	Transportation Management Areas
TPC	Transportation Policy Committee
TRIP	Transportation Risk and Infrastructure Plan
TSMO	Transportation Systems Management and Operations
TTRI	Travel Time Reliability Index
UA	Urban Area
ULB	useful life benchmark
UNOTI	University of New Orleans Transportation Institute
UP	Union Pacific Railroad
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
UZA	Urbanized Area
VA	United States Department of Veterans Affairs
VHT	vehicle hours traveled
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
WFH	work from home

01 Introduction

About the Plan



1.1 About the Plan

The 2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is Southeast Louisiana's long-range blueprint for transportation policy and investment. As the region's guiding transportation planning document, it establishes goals and priorities, identifies funding resources, formulates implementation strategies, and outlines a fiscally constrained program of transportation investments to both maintain and improve the region's multimodal transportation system over a 30-year planning horizon, from 2026 to 2056. This plan is developed, adopted, and maintained by the Regional Planning Commission for Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany and Tangipahoa Parishes (RPC). Every four years the RPC updates the MTP to reflect current transportation needs, trends, conditions, and updated financial forecasts. These periodic updates ensure investments and policies remain responsive to regional priorities.

This plan was developed through a collaborative process that meets federal and state planning requirements and reflects extensive coordination with local governments, transportation agencies, stakeholders, and the public. Combining robust technical analysis with comprehensive community engagement, the MTP strives to balance data-driven decision making with the priorities and values expressed by the region's residents.

1.2 About the RPC

Every metropolitan area with a population of more than 50,000 individuals must have a federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to oversee a cooperative, continuous, and comprehensive (3C) framework for making transportation investment decisions within the region.[1] The RPC serves as the MPO for the region of Southeast Louisiana, and in this capacity, is responsible for planning the metropolitan transportation system and programming the expenditure of federal transportation funds allocated to the region. The Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), which includes 52 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 RPC 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).

[1] Pursuant to 23 USC § 134 and 49 USC § 5303

1.3 The Metropolitan Planning Process

Metropolitan transportation planning is primarily guided by federal surface transportation authorizations, Titles 23 and 49 of the United States Code (USC), and Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The planning process takes a regional approach, recognizing that transportation networks cross municipal and parish boundaries and require coordinated investments and policies to support mobility and economic growth. The planning process is inherently cooperative because the responsibility for the transportation system is shared among multiple agencies, jurisdictions, and transportation providers.

While individual MPOs tailor their processes to address unique regional needs, federal law requires all MPOs to carry out the 3C planning process via the development of three major interconnected planning documents. MPOs are also responsible for a range of other federally mandated activities, including compliance with the Clean Air Act, performance-based planning and programming, and congestion management programming, but the following three core planning processes represent the primary mechanisms through which the 3C process is implemented and carried out. The first is the **Metropolitan Transportation Plan**, the region's long-range transportation policy document that establishes goals, priorities, and investment strategies over a planning horizon of at least 20 years. This 2056 MTP covers a 30-year period. The long-range plan is required to undergo a full update at least every 4 or 5 years.

The MTP also shapes the regional short-term transportation program, the **Transportation Improvement Program** (TIP), which identifies federally funded transportation projects and investments to be implemented within the region over the next four federal fiscal years (FFYs), as well as any other non-federally funded, regionally significant transportation projects planned for implementation in the same time period. The RPC develops and adopts a new TIP every four years in coordination with each MTP update to ensure consistency between long-range goals and near-term investments.

Finally, MPOs are also required to compile a **Unified Planning Work Program** (UPWP) which outlines both the annual activities of the MPO including the transportation studies it will complete using federal planning funds. Updated annually, the UPWP guides the agency's day-to-day planning efforts and ensures that transportation studies, technical analyses, and planning initiatives support the goals and priorities established in the MTP.

The ongoing reworking and coordination required of the MTP, TIP, and UPWP form the foundation of the MPO's 3C planning process, ensuring that transportation decisions remain responsive to regional needs and priorities over time.





Federal MTP Requirements

Much of the MTP planning process is dictated by federal regulations outlined in 23 CFR § 450.324. See **Appendix G** detailing the 2056 MTP's consistency with these federal requirements. 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 based on costs and revenues which can reasonably be expected to be available during the planning timeframe. See **Appendix A**. Each of these components of the plan must also be developed in coordination with existing local, state, and federal programs related to land use, environmental protection, safety, and other relevant transportation policy areas.

Title 23 of the U.S. Code also identifies **10 planning factors** that MPOs must consider when developing metropolitan transportation plans, including its projects and strategies.[2] These factors are intended to ensure transportation investments support a broad range of national, regional, and community interests. Figure 1 summarizes the 10 federal planning factors, which are further discussed in Chapter 6 of this plan in the context of the region's long-term goals and objectives.

Consultation & Coordination

The MTP considers and aligns with other planning efforts at the local and state level. To achieve this, the RPC consulted and coordinated with numerous partner agencies and reviewed existing plans to determine previously identified needs and priorities. This consultation process is referenced throughout the plan, particularly in Section 1.4, and in Chapters 3 and 4. In Chapter 7, the plan also recommends specific actions to further align future RPC efforts with those of its state and local partners. Additionally, the following agencies were invited to review and comment on the draft document, and their input is incorporated into the plan: local land use management and planning departments; the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD); the Louisiana Department of Conservation and Energy (LDC&E); the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ); and the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

[2] 23 USC § 134 (h)(1)

Figure 1. Transportation Federal Planning Factors (23 USC § 134 (h)(1))



1.4 Outreach and Engagement Process

The outreach and engagement process was a central component in the development of the 2056 MTP. As an agency, the RPC is committed to fostering a continuous and collaborative planning process that integrates community input, data analysis, and performance measurement into its decision making. The outreach polices and procedures used by the RPC to ensure meaningful and ongoing public input are detailed in the agency's **Public Participation Plan** (PPP).[3] The 2056 MTP public engagement process both met and exceeded the requirements as outlined in that document. This section documents both the MTP outreach strategies and engagement activities conducted during the development of the 2056 MTP. **Appendix F** provides a more analysis of the input received through the outreach process.

The outreach process provided extensive opportunities for participation to broaden and diversify stakeholder input, helping identify both regional priorities and community-specific transportation needs to inform the plan's goals, strategies, and investments.

Figure 2. MTP Outreach Timeline



[3] RPC (2024). Public Participation Plan. https://www.norpc.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/PPP-2024-Final.pdf

Goals and Strategies of the Outreach Process

The 2056 MTP outreach and engagement effort was guided by four primary goals designed to expand participation to ensure broad representation and capture the diverse transportation needs and priorities of communities throughout the region. Together, these goals provided a framework for developing an inclusive and equitable engagement process that elevated a wide range of voices and perspectives. The four goals are outlined in Table 1 below.

In support of the outreach goals, the RPC implemented a series of strategies to ensure the collection of meaningful and actionable input that could be analyzed and incorporated into the 2056 MTP. The input collected also helps to inform other agency planning and project development efforts.

Table 1. 2056 MTP Outreach Goals and Strategies

Goal 1: Ensure Geographic Representation Across the Region (Parishes and Municipalities)

Strategy 1: Ensure all parishes and municipalities have meaningful opportunities to participate.

Strategy 2: Use multiple outreach methods to reduce geographic barriers and expand access to the planning process.

Strategy 3: Monitor participation by location and adjust efforts to address outreach gaps.

Strategy 4: Identify the unique perspectives and planning needs of individual parishes and municipalities when incorporating outreach findings into the MTP.

Goal 2: Strive for Participation that Reflects the Region's Population Distribution

Strategy 1: Set participation targets based on jurisdiction population.

Strategy 2: Track participation by jurisdiction to assess geographic representation.

Strategy 3: Identify areas overrepresented or underrepresented in the data and conduct targeted outreach to address significant participation gaps.

Strategy 4: Apply appropriate weighting, normalization, or analytical methods when interpreting outreach results to account for differences in population and participation levels.

Goal 3: Ensure Demographic and Socioeconomic Representation

Strategy 1: Gather demographic and socioeconomic data to assess participant diversity.

Strategy 2: Compare participant data with regional demographics to identify representation gaps.

Strategy 3: Increase engagement of historically underrepresented populations.

Strategy 4: Use accessible outreach methods to reduce participation barriers.

Strategy 5: Account for varying needs and priorities when analyzing input and developing MTP decisions.

Goal 4: Gather Input on Needs and Priorities at Multiple Scales

Strategy 1: Convert qualitative input into measurable data.

Strategy 2: Use data analysis to inform regional goals and objectives.

Strategy 3: Combine technical data and public input to identify shared and diverging needs.

Strategy 4: Analyze findings at regional and local levels to to distinguish broad regional priorities from localized needs.

Strategy 5: Link outreach findings to MTP needs, goals, and objectives.

Targeted Stakeholder Groups

The 2056 MTP outreach process was designed to engage a broad range of audiences, including both government agency representatives, residents of the region, and stakeholders representing special interest groups such as housing, freight, and economic development. Engagement activities were tailored to the unique roles, perspectives, and expertise of each group, ensuring that both technical considerations and community priorities informed the planning process. Below are descriptions of the different groups targeted for specific outreach during the MTP planning process as well as details about the engagement events:

1. Parish and Municipal Governments

The RPC organized a series of 20 one-on-one meetings with parish and municipal government representatives to better understand local transportation needs, priorities, planned investments, and development trends. Discussions focused on jurisdiction-specific challenges while also identifying opportunities for coordination across local and regional transportation systems. Key topics included transportation priorities, capital improvement needs, land use and growth patterns, connectivity, safety, infrastructure constraints, and opportunities for regional collaboration.

2. Technical Advisory Group

Throughout the MTP planning process the RPC held multiple meetings with the RPC's Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to leverage its technical expertise and institutional knowledge and receive policy guidance on different elements of the plan. This collaboration focused on reviewing outreach methods and results, identifying planning implications, validating emerging themes, and evaluating how public and stakeholder input aligned with technical planning needs.

- Technical Advisory Group – November 8, 2024
- Technical Advisory Group – May 2, 2025
- Technical Advisory Group – February 6, 2026
- Technical Advisory Group – May 8, 2026

3. Transportation Agency and Planning Partner Outreach

The RPC engaged regional transportation agencies including transit operators and others responsible for the operation, maintenance, and management of the regional transportation network. This collaboration focused on defining agency priorities and needs, opportunities for system performance improvements, planned projects, operational challenges, data needs, and areas to strengthen cooperation and coordination among the region's multiple transportation agencies. Input from these partners helped ensure that the MTP was aligned with related transportation plans, programs, and investment strategies across the region.

- Coordinated Human Services Transportation Working Group – July 22, 2025
- New Orleans Regional Transportation Authority – October 29, 2025
- Coordinated Human Services Transportation Working Group – December 11, 2025
- Jefferson Parish Transit – March 26, 2026

Targeted Stakeholder Groups Cont.

4. Sector-Specific Planning Stakeholders

The RPC engaged organizations and stakeholders with expertise in transportation-related policy areas, including business and economic development, freight, transit advocacy, healthcare, community-based initiatives, and the interests of historically underserved populations.

- RPC EV Roundtable Meeting – October 16, 2025
- RPC Freight Roundtable – October 22, 2025
- Ochsner Health – November 6, 2025
- RPC Freight Roundtable – January 28, 2026
- RPC Economic Development Seminar – April 9, 2026
- Coalition for Quality Transit – May 23, 2026

5. Residents/General Public

Finally, residents throughout the metropolitan planning area were given meaningful opportunities to share their transportation experiences, identify needs, and express priorities for the future transportation system. Engagement activities were designed to maximize accessibility and participation while reaching a geographically, demographically, and socioeconomically diverse cross-section of the region. Feedback helped identify both shared regional priorities and the unique needs of different communities and population groups.





Outreach Methods and Tools Used

The MTP outreach process employed a combination of participatory planning techniques, qualitative and quantitative research methods, structured data collection, facilitated workshops, and public engagement tools. These methods were designed to generate planning inputs that could be systematically analyzed alongside technical transportation data so that public and stakeholder feedback could be meaningfully integrated into the planning process and used to inform data-driven decision making.

Standardized Local Government and Sector-Specific Stakeholder Questionnaires

The RPC used a standardized questionnaire during interviews with parish and municipal representatives to gather information on transportation conditions, needs, challenges, planned investments, and future priorities. This approach ensured consistency across jurisdictions while allowing discussion of local issues and concerns. Similar questionnaires were developed for key stakeholder groups, including economic development organizations, members of the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Working Group, and transit agencies, with questions tailored to each group's expertise and role in the transportation system. A set of core questions was included across all questionnaires to support qualitative comparisons and identify common themes among stakeholders, local government, and public outreach findings.

Transportation Planning Workshops and Partner Engagement

The RPC conducted planning workshops with several specialized working groups. Using structured facilitation techniques, these workshops gathered valuable input, helped identify key issues, and supported deeper discussions on specialized transportation planning topics. Workshops were held with the following working groups: the RPC Technical Advisory Group, Freight Round Table, Coordinate Human Services Transportation Group, and Electric Vehicle Roundtable and Working Group. The facilitated meetings involved a combination of both rapid-response planning exercises and facilitated group activities in order to gather qualitative information on both current conditions and needs. See Table 2.

Table 2. MTP Planning Workshop Activities



Rapid-Response Planning Exercises

Interactive engagement tools were employed to conduct rapid-response exercises, including one-minute planning sprints.

Participants were asked to quickly identify:

- Regional or system strengths
- Current transportation challenges
- Emerging opportunities
- Transportation and planning priorities

The rapid response format prompted participants to prioritize immediate concerns before engaging in more in-depth group discussions. The responses served as an additional data source for identifying recurring themes and areas of consensus among participants.



Facilitated Group Activities

Facilitated small-group activities helped identify key focus areas within specific transportation planning disciplines.

Participants identified:

- Existing and emerging transportation needs
- Potential future strategies
- Program or planning gaps
- Data and analytical needs
- Opportunities for regional coordination
- Areas requiring additional research or technical analysis

Facilitated activities were designed to transition the discussion from the identification of transportation challenges to the exploration of potential strategies and future planning actions.

Southeast Louisiana Regional Mobility Survey

To gather input from residents across the metropolitan planning area, the RPC conducted a regional public survey over a nine-month period. The survey was designed to better understand transportation from the user's perspective and identify how current transportation conditions affect daily travel, access to jobs, services, and destinations, as well as overall quality of life. This approach provided a more comprehensive understanding of how residents interact with the regional transportation system and helped the RPC identify where transportation conditions may create barriers to access and mobility. A copy of the public survey as well as analysis of the survey findings are presented in **Appendix F**.



The survey was administered through an online platform to support digital participation, mobile accessibility, and efficient data collection. Responses were incorporated into the broader stakeholder outreach analysis to identify regional priorities.

Survey questions focused on the following topics:

- Transportation user experience
- Access to employment, services, and other opportunities
- Access to key destinations
- Travel and mobility barriers
- Transportation challenges experienced by residents
- Community transportation priorities
- A vision for the future transportation system

Building a Scalable Survey

The public survey was designed as a repeatable and scalable data collection tool to support both the MTP as well as ongoing regional transportation planning efforts. Using a consistent set of core questions and a standardized analytical framework, the survey enables the collection of comparable data over time, allowing the RPC to track changes in transportation experiences, barriers, needs, and priorities between planning cycles and as improvements to the network are implemented.

The survey framework was also designed to be scalable in support of local and subregional planning efforts. The methodology can be applied at the parish, municipal, corridor, or community level while maintaining common core questions and data categories. This approach supports the development of a shared regional dataset that preserves local context while enabling comparisons across communities and over time. The resulting data can support regional trend analysis, localized needs assessments, and the identification of areas of alignment and divergence throughout the MPA.

Survey Deployment

The survey deployment strategy focused on meeting residents where they were by providing multiple opportunities and access points for participation, rather than relying solely on traditional public meetings or a single method of communication. One of the RPC's primary goals of the outreach process was obtaining broad and proportionate participation across all parishes in the region. Throughout the outreach period, promotion and distribution efforts were adjusted to expand geographic reach, increase participation among targeted communities, and improve response rates in underrepresented areas.

The survey was promoted through local government communication networks (social media, newsletters, email lists), RPC's digital platforms, neighborhood and community social media pages, at community events, and through partner organizations including transit agencies. RPC staff worked closely with parish and municipal public information officers and communications staff to support local distribution of the survey. In addition, community organizations with established audiences or email lists were contacted to help raise awareness and encourage survey participation. Some of the groups include:

- Tulane, Dillard, and Xavier Universities
- Lighthouse Louisiana
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
- Jefferson Parish Economic Development Commission (JEDCO)
- Ride New Orleans
- Downtown Development District of New Orleans

Flyers, brochures, and postcards containing a QR code linking to the online survey were distributed throughout the community at strategically selected locations, including transit stops, libraries, local businesses, and government facilities. The RPC prioritized distribution in areas where pop-up engagement events were not scheduled to ensure broader geographic coverage. To enhance accessibility and public understanding, printed materials incorporated strategic infographics that clearly communicated transportation planning concepts, project information, and opportunities for public participation.

Survey Results

The Southeast Louisiana Regional Mobility Survey collected a total of 725 responses. Full analysis of the responses, outreach findings, and a copy of the survey questions are provided in **Appendix F**.





Regional Pop-Up Engagement Events

In-person outreach played an important role in raising awareness of the MTP update, encouraging participation in the Southeast Louisiana Regional Mobility Survey, and building trust with residents. Rather than relying solely on traditional public meetings, the RPC's event strategy focused on meeting residents where they were and providing multiple, convenient ways to participate.

The RPC and contracted partners held pop-up events at locations that people typically visit in their daily life such as libraries, farmers markets, festivals, community events, and other gathering places throughout the region. These events, primarily held from March through May of 2026, provided opportunities to engage residents who may not otherwise participate in regional transportation planning activities. To identify event locations, the RPC analyzed demographic data and population density to support reaching target representation. The RPC also focused on parishes, municipalities, and communities that have historically had fewer opportunities to engage in the planning process or had lower participation rates through other outreach methods. The RPC set up tables and tents at these community events, distributed printed outreach materials, and initiated conversations about the plan update, transportation issues, and the RPC's role in regional planning. To encourage on-site participation in the Southeast Regional Mobility Survey, electronic tablets were available so attendees could complete the survey in real time.

A total of **19** events were held during the outreach period at the following events and places.

- **Orleans Parish**
  - Bayou Classic – November 29th, 2025
  - Morris F.X. Jeff Sr. Recreation Center – April 7th, 2026
  - Treme Recreation Center – April 14th, 2026
  - 7th Ward Festival – May 25th and May 26th, 2026
- **St. John the Baptist Parish**
  - LaPlace Farmers Market and Livestock Swap1 – March 7th, 2026
  - St. John the Baptist Parish Library – Reserve Library – May 13th, 2026
- **Tangipahoa Parish**
  - Hammond Spring Fest Farmers Market – March 21st, 2026
- **St. James Parish**
  - St. James Market Days, Vacherie – March 21st, 2026
  - St. James Market Days, Lutcher – April 11th, 2026
- **St. Charles Parish**
  - German Coast Farmers Market, West Bank – March 25th, 2026
  - German Coast Farmers Market, Eastbank – March 28th, 2026
- **St. Bernard Parish**
  - Louisiana Crawfish Fest – March 28th, 2026
- **Plaquemines Parish**
  - Belle Chasse Market in the Park – April 18th, 2026
- **Jefferson Parish**
  - Jefferson Parish Libraries – Lakeshore Branch – April 28th, 2026
  - Jefferson Parish Libraries – Terrytown Branch – April 28th, 2026
  - Jefferson Parish Libraries – Eastbank Regional – May 2nd, 2026
  - Jefferson Parish Libraries – West Bank Regional – May 2nd, 2026
  - Wilty Transit Terminal – May 5th, 2026
- **St. Tammany Parish**
  - Abita Springs Farmers Market – May 17th, 2026

Figure 3. 2056 MTP Outreach Results



Ensuring Accessibility in the Public Involvement Process

Language accessibility was integrated into the public outreach process to mitigate barriers to participation and facilitate meaningful access for individuals with limited English proficiency. The Southeast Louisiana Regional Mobility Survey and outreach flyers were disseminated in multiple languages, tailored to the linguistic needs of the region. Language accessibility considerations were also incorporated into outreach distribution, community engagement, and communication strategies to enhance participation among populations that may not otherwise engage through English-only planning materials. The survey platform was selected for its accessibility and ease of use, with a focus on clear navigation, readable content, and mobile compatibility. In addition to online participation, in-person engagement opportunities and direct comment options were provided to ensure multiple accessible ways to participate in the MTP planning process.

Using Input to Shape the MTP

To analyze the outreach input received and integrate it into the transportation priority and strategy development process of the MTP, the RPC used an integrated qualitative and quantitative research method to identify shared transportation needs, priorities, and also examine divergence across different geographies and stakeholder groups. Qualitative findings provided context and insights into the significance of specific issues to participants and how transportation needs vary across the region.

Qualitative input was reviewed and coded using a consistent framework to identify common themes and patterns and organized into the following categories:

- Main themes and subthemes
- How often issues were mentioned
- Geographic location
- Type of stakeholder or participant
- Areas of regional agreement
- Areas where needs or priorities differ

The RPC then evaluated stakeholder input alongside its analysis of current conditions to confirm identified needs, determine priority transportation issues across the region, and identify areas of alignment with long-term regional transportation goals.









1.5 How to Navigate the Plan

Chapter 2 provides essential background about the Regional Planning Commission as an agency, including details about the metropolitan planning area boundaries, transportation planning and project funding sources, the project development process, Title VI compliance, and related regional programs which complement the RPC's transportation planning objectives.

Chapter 3 presents a comprehensive profile of existing and projected regional conditions. It examines demographic characteristics, anticipated population growth and change over the next 30 years, environmental conditions and future considerations, and regional development patterns and trends. This analysis provides insight into the transportation, mobility, and accessibility needs of the region's diverse communities, both today and through the 30-year planning horizon.

Chapter 4 inventories the region's existing and planned multimodal transportation system, including transportation facilities, infrastructure, and services across all modes. It examines current travel patterns, freight movement, and transportation demand for both people and goods. It includes details about current policy and planning work, while assessing projected planning needs as well as future travel demand through the 30-year planning horizon.

Chapter 5 describes the RPC's performance-based planning and programming framework. It outlines federally required performance measures, the performance targets adopted by the RPC, and a System Performance Report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to each performance target. The chapter also demonstrates how the proposed projects included in the 2056 MTP support the achievement of established performance objectives.

Chapter 6 presents the long-term transportation goals for the region, as supported by the needs and priorities of the community, and presents RPC's planned objectives intended to achieve the long-term goals.

Chapter 7 presents the plan's implementation strategy, including the actions that the RPC and its partner agencies will undertake to advance regional transportation objectives. It also presents the RPC's program of short- and long-term transportation investments, fiscally constrained, and funding priorities designed to further the implementation of the MTP's transportation goals for the region.

The **Appendices** provide supporting technical documentation, including the financial plan, demonstration of fiscal constraint, detailed project descriptions for highway and transit projects, public engagement input analyses, and other supplemental materials that support the development of the MTP.



1.6 Putting the Plan into Action

Successful implementation of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan requires a structured and ongoing process for tracking progress, evaluating outcomes, and adapting strategies as conditions evolve. Following plan adoption, the RPC will work collaboratively with its partners to advance the planning actions notated in Chapter 7 of this plan, and work with member agencies to carry out the financial plan and program of projects. Progress will be documented through the RPC's ongoing planning activities, including the agency's annual report and its updates to the TIP and UPWP. Prior to the next plan update in four years, the RPC will conduct a review of implementation outcomes and assess its progress toward meeting the plan objectives. In this interim time period, the RPC will also conduct regular engagement with stakeholders to improve its public involvement process and provide opportunities for the public to help redefine the region's long-term transportation vision. Through these efforts, the RPC will continue to uphold a planning process that is comprehensive, continuous, and cooperative while ensuring that transportation investments remain responsive to the region's evolving needs.

The success of this plan depends on the collective efforts of the region's partners. The RPC will play a critical role in planning, coordinating, and performance monitoring, but achievement of the MTP goals outlined herein will require the active commitment and participation of local public agencies, state and federal transportation partners, and private-sector stakeholders and community members.

Amendment Procedures

The MTP may require occasional revisions as projects advance through the development process. In such instances the RPC will follow procedures permitted by RPC and LADOTD policy and consistent with federal regulation. Minor project changes, as defined by LADOTD policy, may be accomplished through an Administrative Modification approved by the RPC's Executive Director. More significant changes require an MTP amendment, and these must be approval by the TPC, including public notice and comment opportunities as described in the PPP. Amendments or modifications to the MTP will be noted in the document as appropriate.

02 Background

Agency Information and Programs



Chapter 2 provides background information and regional context pertinent to the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, including statutory requirements which inform the planning process as well as the project development process and information regarding regional programs administered by the RPC that support and complement the transportation planning process.

2.1 The Metropolitan Planning Area

Title 23 of U.S. Code requires that each Urbanized Area (UZA) with a population greater than 50,000 be served by an MPO. The area served by the MPO is referred to as the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) and is defined as "the geographic area determined by agreement between the metropolitan planning organization for the area and the Governor," and "shall encompass at least the existing urbanized area and the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within a 20-year forecast period for the transportation plan."[4]

The MPA served by the RPC, acting in its capacity as MPO, includes the entirety of nine parishes: Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Tammany, St. John the Baptist, St. James, St. Charles, and Tangipahoa. The MPA also includes a section of eight census block groups located within Livingston Parish. Within this MPA there are four UZAs: New Orleans, Mandeville-Covington, Slidell, and South Tangipahoa. Table 3 shows the total population living within each of the region's four UZAs. The UZA boundaries based on Census Bureau data 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. Further, 23 CFR § 450 designates UZAs with populations greater than 200,000, such as the New Orleans UZA, as a Transportation Management Area (TMA). Designation as a TMA carries with it greater planning autonomy but also additional requirements. These are addressed throughout this plan. Figure 4 shows a map of RPC's MPA and UZAs.

As discussed further in Chapter 4, the Southeast Louisiana MPA contains a diverse and extensive transportation network that includes highways, bridges, ports, airports, railroads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and public transit systems. These assets support the movement of people and goods at local and regional scales and, in many cases, serve critical national and international transportation, trade, and economic functions.

Table 3. Total Population of Urbanized Areas in Southeast Louisiana Region

URBANIZED AREAS (UZA) TOTAL POPULATION

UZA	Total Population
New Orleans (2020 Urbanized Area)	963,212
Mandeville-Covington (2020 Urbanized Area)	113,763
Slidell (2020 Urbanized Area)	91,587
South Tangipahoa (2020 Urbanized Area)	72,526

Source: U.S. Census Urban Area Federal Register Data published and adjusted March 9, 2023

[4] 49 USC § 5303 (b)(1) and 49 USC § 5303 (e)(2)(A)

Figure 4. Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) and Urbanized Area (UZA) Boundaries





2.2 Transportation Funding

Most federal funding for the transportation projects programmed in the MTP is authorized by the **Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act** (IIJA) of 2021. The law includes a variety of funding programs that states and MPOs may use to maintain and improve transportation infrastructure. The federal funding available to the MPA and transit operators is determined by formula outlined in the legislation, and specific amounts available are communicated to the RPC by LADOTD on a regular basis, at least once per fiscal year.

Most federal transportation funding requires a cost-share, or match, to be provided by a state or local sponsor. While the cost-share can vary by fund source, many of the funds programmed in the MTP usually require 20% of the project's total cost to be provided by the sponsor, which is typically the owner of the transportation facility affected by the project.

It should be noted that at the time of this writing the successor legislation to IIJA is under consideration by Congress. Once new federal legislation is adopted, the RPC will incorporate all necessary adjustments to planning requirements and funding programs into its planning process.

Road and Bridge Funding

Surface Transportation Block Grants (STBG) are the primary form of federal funding made available to the MPA for roadway projects through the **Surface Transportation Program** (STP). The STP funds programmed by the RPC are further delineated as those made available for the New Orleans UZA, which has a population over 200,000 (STP>200K), and for the Mandeville-Covington, Slidell, and South Tangipahoa UZAs, which have populations between 50,000 and 200,000 (STP 50-200K).[5] Under IIJA, these funds can be used for a variety of projects, including roadway maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, bridge and tunnel rehabilitation, lighting, resilience enhancements, and planning. STBG funds can also be "flexed" to public transportation, making them eligible for all the projects described in the next section.

As further described in Chapter 4, most federal road and bridge funds may only be used for projects on the **Federal Aid Network**, a subset of roadways that have been determined to be most important to regional travel. Federal Aid routes may be state or locally owned. While certain fund sources may be used for projects off of the Federal Aid Network, the majority of funds and projects programmed in the MTP are on the network.

[5] From FFY 23 through FFY 26, the region was allocated approximately $36 million per year in total STP funding.

Public Transit Funding

Federal transit funding is primarily provided through annual formula grants based on regional and system characteristics. Transit agencies use this funding to operate and maintain their systems, with investments typically falling into six categories: operating expenses, revenue vehicles, facilities, streetcar infrastructure, non-revenue vehicles, and miscellaneous expenses.

The majority of project funding is based on **Section 5307** formula funds listed annually in the Federal Register. Additional support may also come from **Section 5339** funds for both bus and bus facility replacement or rehabilitation, and **Section 5337** for fixed guideway improvements. These funds are programmed based on current or pending congressional authorizations.[6] Matching funds for transit projects come from dedicated local revenue sources, including a 1% sales tax and a percentage of the Hotel/Motel Tax in Orleans Parish, and a property tax millage in Jefferson Parish.

Other Federal Transportation Funding

Beyond STP funds, several federal programs support regional transportation projects. The **National Highway Performance Program** (NHPP) provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System, and the **Highway Safety Improvement Program** (HSIP) funds projects intended to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The IIJA also introduced the **Bridge Formula Program** which can be used to replace or rehabilitate bridges in poor condition. These funding programs are apportioned to the state rather than the MPO, but 23 CFR § 450.326(e) requires MPO approval prior to implementation. The RPC coordinates with LADOTD to ensure state-directed funding supports both regional needs and statewide priorities.

Some funding sources are non-recurring discretionary grants that fund large complex projects that serve multiple modes of travel and have regional or national significance, such as the **Rebuilding American Infrastructure Sustainably and Equitably** (RAISE) grant program. Others, such as the R**econnecting Communities Pilot Program** and **Safe Streets and Roads for All**, focus on removing community barriers and improving safety and mobility for bicyclists and walkers. The RPC monitors these opportunities and helps local governments pursue funding that aligns with regional priorities.

[6] In recent years (FFY 23-26), Section 5307 funding averaged about $23 million annually for the New Orleans UZA, $3.6 million for the St. Tammany UZAs, and $1.3 for the South Tangipahoa UZA.



Funding Challenges

The federal funding made available to the region each year is a major public investment that serves a critical role in maintaining and improving the transportation system. Despite this important resource, funding challenges can delay or prevent many projects and priorities from being implemented.

Since most federal funding sources do not cover 100% of project costs, the availability of state or local matching funds can significantly impact project implementation. Many of RPC's partners, including LADOTD, have faced budget shortages in recent years. When funds are limited, agencies may be forced to choose between matching federal funds or directing those resources to other priorities. In fact, the availability of matching funds is one of the RPC's primary considerations when programming projects into the MTP. If a project sponsor cannot provide matching funds in the near future, the project must be programmed in a later fiscal year even if it is otherwise ready for implementation.

The RPC and its partners must also make choices about which projects to fund with limited federal funding in any given year. Though the resources allocated to the region are significant, they are finite and cannot fund all priorities at once. This limitation requires tradeoffs between immediate needs and more aspirational improvements, and ensuring resources are equitably distributed across the region's many communities. The RPC continually coordinates with state and local agencies to balance competing needs and most effectively program federal funds in the future.

Finally, many priorities and projects require more resources than are available to the region through its regular federal funding sources. Complex, large-scale projects can have costs that far exceed the region's annual highway and transit allocations. Despite their potential benefits to the region, such projects may not be implemented without additional financing arrangements. In some cases, discretionary federal grants may cover the funding gap. In other instances, other mechanisms such as public-private partnerships or an increased local match may be necessary. Funding high-cost projects requires the RPC to closely monitor new and upcoming funding programs and to collaborate with public and private partners to identify innovative solutions.



2.3 The Project Delivery 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 summarized in the following steps, which also coincide with the LADOTD's project delivery stages as shown in Figure 5 on the following page:

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 input from local public officials, LADOTD, transit operators, and RPC's planning programs, outreach and data analyses.
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 evaluating solutions depends on the complexity of the issue and its potential impacts on the community. Relatively straightforward needs such as maintenance or repair may only entail internal review by RPC staff, while more complex issues require substantial analysis that relies on the participation and input of relevant stakeholders such as LADOTD, transit operators, and local governments.
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. It should be noted that there is no single list of potential projects developed at one point in time from which the RPC chooses projects to be included in the MTP. Rather, projects are developed on an ongoing basis using a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) process which acknowledges that individual projects and their sponsors require differing timelines and development tasks to reach implementation readiness.
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. Importantly, the program of projects in the MTP must be fiscally constrained. In other words, projects may not be included in the plan unless there is a reasonable expectation that funds will be available for their implementation. Fiscal constraint is further described in this chapter below and in the financial plan in **Appendix A**.

Throughout the project development process, the RPC evaluates projects against the goals, objectives, and strategies established in the MTP to ensure that investments advance the region's long-term transportation priorities. In addition to the MTP, two key documents guide the agency's planning and implementation activities. 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. As described in Chapter 7, the projects listed in the TIP constitute Tier I of the MTP. Taken together, the UPWP, TIP, MTP, and the RPC's planning programs give structure to the project development and prioritization process.

Figure 5. LADOTD 6-Stage Project Delivery Process



The MTP Call for Projects

As part of the development of this plan, the RPC issued a formal MTP Call for Projects in order to identify potential investments from agencies and jurisdictions across the region. The solicitation focused on projects anticipated for development within the next 10 to 20 years, helping to create a more comprehensive universe of transportation projects and establish a pipeline of medium- and long-term improvements that the RPC and its partners can prepare for implementation and eventual consideration in the region's short-range program. The MTP Call for Projects is not a replacement for the project development process described previously; rather, it provides project sponsors with an additional mechanism or outlet for having their needs considered for inclusion in the MTP. By expanding participation in the planning process, the solicitation enabled a broader range of local governments, transportation providers, and public agencies to contribute to the development of the plan and helped identify projects that might not otherwise have come to the RPC's attention. In total, over 30 projects in the MTP were submitted via the MTP Call for Projects process.

Project Evaluation

All projects in the MTP must contribute to the advancement of RPC's federally-required performance measures and contribute to the MTP's stated goals. See Chapters 5 and 7 for more information. To ensure that the plan meets these requirements, all projects have been evaluated to assess their relationship to the performances measures and goals. The specific evaluation criteria used for the 2056 MTP Call for Projects can be found in **Appendix D**.

Financial Plan & Fiscal Constraint

Federal regulation requires that the MTP include a fiscally constrained financial plan.[7] The financial plan, detailed in **Appendix A**, outlines the estimated funding attributable to the MPO over the MTP's 30-year horizon and compares these revenues to the estimated costs of operating and maintaining Federal Aid roadways and public transportation in the MPA. The plan does not include revenue that cannot be reasonable expected to be available, thereby ensuring fiscal constraint. The projects proposed to be funded by these revenues are further described in Chapter 7 and listed individually, with estimated costs and anticipated funding sources, in **Appendix B** and **C**.





[7] 23 CFR Part 450



2.4 Title VI

Under 23 CFR Part 200, 49 CFR Part 21, and related U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) directives, MPOs must ensure that their transportation planning activities comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related nondiscrimination laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Together, these laws require MPOs to:

- Prevent discrimination in the allocation of benefits and burdens of transportation projects.
- Ensure meaningful public participation, especially from historically underserved and vulnerable populations.
- Monitor demographic trends and access to transportation opportunities across all population groups.

Title VI compliance is embedded throughout the RPC's core functions, and in development of the MTP, the RPC has followed its agency's adopted Title VI plan. The long-range plan assesses community needs, including accessibility and mobility needs of Title VI populations. In development of the MTP program of projects, the RPC evaluated projects to confirm that minority and low-income populations are not disproportionately burdened and have equitable access to transportation benefits. While conducting outreach and engagement for the MTP, RPC followed its Public Participation Plan and utilized strategies to engage Title VI communities including communities of color, populations with limited English proficiency, and low-income households through accessible, culturally appropriate outreach methods. More information about the engagement methods and results is presented in Chapter 1 and **Appendix F.**

The RPC assures that no person shall be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity on the basis of race, color, or national origin, and disability. The RPC is committed to providing equal access to services for individuals with limited English proficiency and individuals with disabilities.

2.5 Non-MPO Programs

In addition to its role as the region's MPO, the RPC administers several programs that provide important benefits to communities throughout Southeast Louisiana. The geographic areas served by these programs do not always align with the MPA boundaries, and each program operates under its own funding sources, regulatory requirements, and governing authorities. Nevertheless, these programs complement the RPC's transportation planning activities and contribute to broader regional goals. The programs are summarized below, along with their connections to the long-range goals of this Metropolitan Transportation Plan and opportunities for integration with the transportation planning process.

Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program

The Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program provides an important environmental planning and restoration framework for much of Southeast Louisiana. The program was established under the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Act of 2000, which directed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to support the restoration of the basin's ecological health. Program activities include the development and funding of restoration projects, scientific research, water quality improvements, and public education initiatives intended to reduce pollution and restore natural systems.

The RPC serves as a member of the program's Executive Committee. Committee actions are reviewed by the EPA in a manner consistent with Section 320 of the Clean Water Act. The broader Lake Pontchartrain Basin watershed encompasses 16 Louisiana parishes and four Mississippi counties, demonstrating the interstate and interjurisdictional nature of the region's water systems.

Wetlands, floodplains, waterways, and natural drainage systems provide both ecological value and flood risk reduction benefits for the region. Supporting the basin restoration program aligns with the RPC's transportation resilience goals and programming. Protecting and restoring these systems can also improve water quality, increase flood storage, reduce runoff, support habitat, and strengthen the overall resilience of communities throughout the region.



Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuels 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 and Communities 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. Recent SLCFP Programming includes establishing the EV Readiness Roundtable, conducting outreach on alternative fuel vehicle and infrastructure grants and helping the region secure funding, and continuing to work 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 worked with local partners to develop plans to expand alternative fuel infrastructure through new programs introduced in the IIJA. The region has since successfully secured funding through programs such as FTA's Low or No Emissions Grant Program to purchase alternative fuel transit buses, EPA's Clean School Bus Funding to purchase a fleet of electric School Buses, and the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure (CFI) Grant Program to install community EV charging among others.

The SLCFP directly contributes to the MTP's Sustainability & Resilience Goal by seeking ways to reduce harmful transportation-related emissions. In its 2024 annual report the SLCFP estimates that the region's various alternative fuel programs reduced over 2.1 million 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 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.





Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership

Clean Cities and Communities

Climate Action

The RPC developed both a Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP) and a Comprehensive Climate Action Plan (CCAP) in 2024 and 2025, respectively. These efforts were funded through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (CPRG) program in an effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and harmful air pollution. The CCAP covers the entire nine-parish region and outlines a coordinated regional framework to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, strengthen community resilience, and sustain economic prosperity. It serves as a roadmap for aligning investments, policies, and actions across multiple sectors, including transportation, buildings and energy, industry, natural systems and water resources, waste and materials management, and community well-being. Across these sectors, the Plan results in a set of priority action strategies based on community priorities.

The CCAP identifies a series of priority strategies and actions based on regional data analysis, stakeholder input, and community priorities. The RPC is currently advancing implementation of these strategies through a phased approach extending through 2030. The recommended actions reflect both community priorities and established best practices in climate and sustainability planning, while building upon ongoing local and regional initiatives.

Many of the plan's goals closely align with the region's transportation planning objectives. Strategies to reduce vehicle miles traveled, expand transit access, improve walking and bicycling infrastructure, and support more efficient land use patterns can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions while also improving mobility, reducing congestion, enhancing public health, and expanding access to opportunity. In drafting the CCAP, the RPC worked to integrate climate strategies with core MPO planning activities, leveraging existing programs and resources to maximize the impact of public investments.

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA
CLIMATE ACTION PLANNING
BUILDING A STRONGER,
SAFER FUTURE



Brownfield Redevelopment Program

Brownfield sites are defined by the 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 and as well as the financial and regulatory requirements 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 in navigating the environmental process from investigation to cleanup. The program serves Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Tammany and Tangipahoa parishes.

The RPC Brownfield Redevelopment Program is funded through grants from the EPA. Recent projects include Phase I and II environmental site assessments (ESAs) at the future site of the Louisiana International Terminal (LIT), Municipal Yacht Harbor in New Orleans, and the former Navel Support Activity site in the Bywater neighborhood of New Orleans. Recent redevelopment success stories from RPC's Brownfield Program include environmental assessments performed at the former McDonogh No. 19 School which helped pave the way for its transformation into the Tate, Etienne, & Prevost Center in 2022, and the former Giordano Warehouse in New Orleans' Bywater neighborhood which has since been transformed into a community center and den for the Krewe of Red Beans in 2021. To lay the groundwork for future brownfield redevelopment work, the RPC Brownfield Program is partnering with Plaquemines Parish, the Port of New Orleans, and the City of Slidell on an FY27 brownfield assessment application to ensure funding remains available in our region to continue supporting the redevelopment of blighted properties.

The Brownfield program directly addresses several of the goals identified in the MTP, including Sustainability & Resilience, Community Benefits, 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 into these redevelopment opportunities. The U.S. EPA's Climate Smart Brownfields Manual (2021) acknowledges 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."[8] The report also finds that children and the elderly are among the most sensitive to changes in water and air quality and 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 climatic 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.

The goal of the RPC's program is to link developers with resources that enable them to take these climate considerations into account during the redevelopment process and enhance both economic, social, and environmental resiliency for the region. It serves as a key resource for the RPC member parishes to consider as part of their toolkit for resiliency planning.

[8] U.S. EPA, Climate Smart Brownfields Manual, June 2021, https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2021-06/documents/final_climate_smart_brownfields_manual_6-10-21_508_complaint.pdf

Economic Development

The RPC serves as the U.S Economic Development Administration (EDA) designated economic development district (EDD) for Jefferson, Orleans. Plaquemines, St. Bernard, and St. Tammany parishes, and leads the region's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) process. In addition, the RPC educates local governments, nonprofits, and other eligible entities about various grant funding sources, assists applicants in developing competitive proposals, and provides technical and administrative assistance once a grant has been awarded. The region has benefited from a strong relationship with the EDA which has funded many projects that have had a significant impact on the growth, diversification, and competitiveness of the economy, helping to build capacity for the region's industry clusters in innovation, health sciences, energy, arts and culture, and entrepreneurship.

As part of the EDA's current investment priorities, grants are focused on contributing to local efforts to build, improve, or better leverage economic assets that allow businesses to succeed and regional economies to prosper and become more resilient. The RPC has supported grant applications from The Ernest N. Morial Convention Center, Louis Armstrong New Orleans International Airport, the City of Slidell, and a regional collaborative effort led by the Greater New Orleans Foundation and Louisiana Economic Development.

In FY 2025, the EDA Disaster Supplemental Grant Program allocated $1.45 billion for economic recovery in areas affected by major disasters in 2023 and 2024. The New Orleans region is eligible due to Hurricane Francine, which struck Louisiana in September 2024. The RPC's role is to ensure grant proposals align with regional CEDS priorities and to advocate for applicants. Although the EDA has not announced its next funding round, recent initiatives indicate a growing emphasis on workforce development programs that support effective adoption of artificial intelligence technologies.

As the region's EDD, the RPC develops and updates the CEDS in coordination with parish economic development organizations and with input from business and civic stakeholders. The CEDS guides projects eligible for EDA and DRA funding, assesses regional economic conditions, and identifies strategies to strengthen global competitiveness, enhance economic diversification, spur job creation, and build resilience and economic equity across the region. It's objectives are closely tied with those in the MTP. The most recent CEDS (2024-2028), adopted in November 2023, was shaped through extensive stakeholder engagement and established three regional priorities: Economic Growth & Diversification, Community Well-Being, and Resiliency. Data collection and stakeholder outreach for the 2029-2033 CEDS document will begin in 2027, with adoption anticipated in late 2028. Staff expect the planning process to explore the growing role of artificial intelligence, data centers, and other emerging trends influencing regional economies in Louisiana.

The RPC also serves as the region's Local Development District (LDD), coordinating with the Delta Regional Authority (DRA), a federal-state partnership that supports economic development across the Mississippi River Delta region. Within the RPC area, DRA funding has recently supported infrastructure and workforce projects in Orleans, Jefferson, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines parishes, including drainage, wastewater, and workforce training improvements.

The RPC's roles as both an EDD and LDD help leverage partnerships and funding to support workforce development, infrastructure investment, and the MTP's Sustainability & Resilience, Community Benefits, and Economic Opportunity goals. The CEDS is specifically designed to identify strategies that help the region's population prepare for and acquire better employment opportunities while identifying needed infrastructure investments to ensure the region's businesses are prepared for that workforce. The EDD and LDD promote sustainability through investments in resilient infrastructure, environmentally sustainable practices, and workforce training for emerging industries that reduce reliance on fossil fuels and lower greenhouse gas emissions.

03 Our Region

Current Regional Conditions and Trends



In this chapter the RPC uses quantitative indicators to assess population growth, housing trends, industry expansion, socioeconomic conditions, and broader development and land use patterns in order to anticipate future transportation needs.[9] *Understanding current demographic, economic, environmental, and regional development conditions is essential for effective transportation planning, as it clarifies community needs and informs strategic investment decisions as well as allows for the forecasting of potential future conditions. Identifying trends enables community leaders and planners to better anticipate and prepare for the future needs of residents. In addition, the density and distribution of population and housing development are critical inputs for accurately modeling travel demand. This chapter offers a current profile of the region, examining population characteristics, economic drivers, and environmental conditions unique to Southeastern Louisiana. It also includes a regional population forecast, projected out 30 years to 2056.*

[9] The most important source of data on population distribution and housing density is the U.S. Census, with full enumerations of U.S. residents and housing units collected every 10 years through the Decennial Census and annual rolling estimates made available through the American Community Survey. For the MTP, the RPC has primarily relied on the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates (2019-2023) to assess existing demographic and socioeconomic conditions and different years of the Decennial Census to assess change and trends. When using ACS for assessment of change, the RPC used non-overlapping time periods. For economic conditions, the RPC primarily relied on the Bureau of Labor Statistic's Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages accessed via Lightcast. Where RPC could not isolate the 8 block groups in Livingston Parish in a particular dataset, the 9-parish regional boundaries were used to evaluate regional characteristics.

Demographic Data Citations:

Data compiled from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Summary File (2019 – 2023) published December 2024 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 RPC, Lynn Dupont, GIS Manager.

U.S. Census Bureau, "population and housing block level data,": (1) Census 2020, la2020.pl.zip; https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/data/01-Redistricting_File--PL_94-171/Louisiana/ accessed August 12, 2021, DECENNIALDHC2020.P1_2024-05-08T150009_totalpop, DECENNIALDHC2020.H12_2024-05-08T152449 -HHdensitytenure; https://data.census.gov/table/ , accessed on May 14, 2024 (2) Census 2010; la2010.pl https://www2.census.gov/census_2010/01-Redistricting_File--PL_94-171/; tabblock2010_22_pophu.shp accessed on 4/1/2011 https://data.census.gov/table: DECENNIALPL2010.P1_2026-02-18T161801_BlockRacePL, DECENNIALSF12010.P1_2026-02-18T154046_BlockTotPopSF1, DECENNIALSF12010.P9_2026-02-18T155358_BlockHispLatSF1 (3) Census 2000 block demographics and housing accessed on April 14, 2004 via old ftp (4) Census 1990 block demographics and housing accessed in the 1990s

3.1 Regional Demographics

Total Population

Per the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates (2019-2023), the RPC's metropolitan planning area, includes 1,405,577 residents and accounts for just over a third of the state of Louisiana's total population. Over half, approximately 58%, of the population of the region is concentrated in Jefferson and Orleans parishes, comprising an estimated 808,519 residents. The parishes on the Northshore of Lake Pontchartrain, St. Tammany and Tangipahoa parishes contain almost a third (29%) of the regional population, while the parishes along the Mississippi River, including St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Charles, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines parishes comprise approximately 13% of the total regional population. A portion of the MPA boundary extends into Livingston Parish and covers eight Census block groups. The population within these block groups includes 12,265 residents, just under 1% of the total regional population. Figure 6 shows the percentage of population share within each parish of the region while Figure 7 shows the distribution of population across the MPA.

Figure 6. MPA Total Population by Parish



Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2019-2023

Figure 7. MPA Population Density *(Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates)*



Population Change Over Time

The RPC analyzed population change across the nine-parish region using U.S. Census data from 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020. While overall population has remained relatively stable, significant shifts have occurred within neighborhoods and subregions. These micro-level shifts reflect changing development pressures rather than a standard net population growth or decline. Examining these finer-scale shifts among communities provides important insight into evolving demographic patterns and enables the RPC to more accurately evaluate infrastructure and resource allocation needs. Hurricane Katrina caused major population losses in Orleans and St. Bernard parishes, and although both have recovered since 2005, their 2020 populations remained 21% and 35% below 2000 levels, respectively. Climate change and future storm impacts underscore the importance of continued resilience planning and investment.

From 1990 to 2020, the region's average annual population growth rate was approximately 0.08%, while St. Tammany and Tangipahoa parishes experienced much stronger growth at about 2.3% annually. The nine-parish region grew by roughly 7% between 2010 and 2020 but remained about 2% below its 2000 population. Drivers of relocation are diverse and complex; however, factors such as housing and insurance costs, educational quality, and job availability are expected to continue influencing population shifts across the region. To support future changes, transportation planning must be closely integrated with land use changes and economic development efforts.

Figure 8. Parish Population Totals, 1990-2020



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census

Population Shift

Parish-level population data show rapid growth on the Northshore, continued recovery in the Southshore parishes most affected by the 2005 hurricanes—particularly Orleans and St. Bernard—and relative stability across the rest of the region. These trends indicate that the regional population dynamic is not simply one of overall growth or decline, but of reallocation. For transportation planning purposes, it is therefore critical to pinpoint where growth is occurring, where people are resettling, and which new areas are being developed. Likewise, within historic urban areas such as Orleans Parish, it is important to distinguish neighborhoods that have fully recovered since 2005 from those that continue to recover.

To conduct this level of analysis, the RPC developed a 10-acre grid to specify areas of growth and areas of loss over a 30-year period from 1990 to 2020. Gridding population data across the decades into regular, fixed-size cells is a fundamental step toward spatial normalization due to the fact that Census geography changes with each decade. This GIS analysis produced several findings which can be explored further in other applications of transportation planning.

Population growth appears to be concentrated in more suburban and exurban areas, particularly on the Northshore. It should be noted that some areas of loss in the region are indicative of a land use change from residential to commercial, a symptom of rising real estate prices and taxes.

Specific areas on the Northshore include western St. Tammany Parish and areas along the I-12 corridor in Tangipahoa where several suburban-style residential developments are being constructed. In the more northern areas of Tangipahoa population growth appears to be in scattered locations as opposed to clustered, indicating potential large-lot residential development in rural areas.

On the Southshore, in Jefferson Parish, population gains are apparent on the West Bank, particularly in the communities of Harvey and Estelle, while other areas show relative population stability. St. Charles Parish exhibits similar West Bank-oriented growth, with expansion occurring south of Highway 90. On the East Bank of St. Charles Parish, significant population loss since 1990 is apparent in the Norco community. St. John the Baptist Parish shows some clustered growth in LaPlace. In Orleans Parish, within historically African American neighborhoods, population losses are also reflected in declining density. Population loss has been especially pronounced in areas such as Central City, the 7th Ward, and in the Lower Ninth Ward. Some of these neighborhoods are characterized by a prevalence of vacant lots and vacant housing stock that have not been redeveloped, limiting their ability to retain or attract residents. These trends may be partly attributable to post-disaster redevelopment patterns that replaced formerly dense housing—such as large public housing complexes—with lower-density, mixed-income developments. These patterns reveal ongoing disparities in recovery and reinvestment shaping neighborhood outcomes in Orleans Parish. The majority of the neighborhoods in St. Bernard Parish show losses, though this is expected due to the extreme destruction the entire parish experienced in 2005. However, there appears to be some growth in areas of Chalmette and further downriver in St. Bernard. In Plaquemines Parish, population growth is apparent in the upriver portion of Belle Chasse off of Woodland Highway.

Taken together, these trends have important implications for land use, infrastructure investment, and transportation planning, emphasizing the need to balance accommodating outward growth with strategies that support reinvestment and recovery in established communities.

Figure 9. MPA Population Shift, 2000-2020 *(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census)*



Figure 10. Southshore Parishes Population Shift, 2000-2020 *(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census)*



Figure 11. River Parishes Population Shift, 2000-2020 *(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census)*



Figure 12. Northshore Parishes Population Shift, 2000-2020 *(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2010, and 2020 Decennial Census)*



Future Population Projections

The RPC's population projections suggest that regional growth will outpace the state as a whole through 2060. Overall, the nine-parish region's population is projected to increase by 33%, as compared to statewide population growth of 17%. However, the rate of growth varies substantially between the region's parishes. The populations of St. Tammany and Tangipahoa parishes are projected to grow by 126% and 72%, respectively, while most of the parishes south of Lake Pontchartrain are expected to experience more moderate growth rates of 10% or less.

The differing rates of expected population growth among the region's parishes have important implications for long-term transportation planning. Those communities that may experience significant growth will likely require investments that expand the transportation network through enhanced network connectivity, new multimodal options, and potential roadway capacity increases. Transportation planning in these locations will also need to be closely coordinated with anticipated land use changes to maintain mobility and accessibility in developing areas and to encourage land use patterns that are both sustainable and desirable to the community. In parishes with more stable growth projections, planning may focus more on maintaining the existing system, improving operational efficiencies, and enhancing multimodal options. Such locations also introduce opportunities to adapt the existing transportation system to better serve future needs, such as incorporating resilience features or modifying infrastructure to provide dedicated facilities for walking, biking, or public transit.

Table 4. 2060 Population Projections

POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2020-2060)

Southeast Louisiana Region

PARISH	2020 POPULTION	2060 POPULATION	CHANGE (2020-2060)	PERCENT CHANGE
Jefferson	440,781	458,206	17,425	4.0%
Orleans	383,997	384,225	228	0.1%
Plaquemines	23,515	24,727	1,212	5.2%
St. Bernard	43,764	48,035	4,271	9.8%
St. Charles	52,549	67,929	15,380	29.3%
St. James	20,192	18,026	(2,166)	-10.7%
St. John the Baptist	42,477	43,390	913	2.1%
St. Tammany	264,570	598,801	334,231	126.3%
Tangipahoa	133,157	228,409	95,252	71.5%
9-parish Region	**1,405,002**	**1,871,748**	**466,746**	**33.2%**
Louisiana	4,657,757	5,448,144	790,387	17.0%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2020 Decennial Census, RPC (2026) 2060 Population Projections

Age

Different age cohorts have distinct mobility needs, carrying important implications for transportation planning. While the working-age population (ages 18–64) remains the largest share of regional residents, data indicate that the overall population is aging. When comparing 2018 to 2023, all age cohorts experienced slight declines in their share of the total population except for residents ages 65 and older, whose share has increased by 2.13%. See Figure 13. This continuing trend is consistent with findings from the previous analysis conducted for the 2052 MTP covering the previous 5-year period.

The growing share of older adults highlights an increasing need for transportation policies that prioritize accessibility and address age-related mobility challenges, particularly given the high prevalence of disabilities within this group. At the same time, it is important to consider the needs of families with children under age 18, including access to safe bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in residential neighborhoods and around schools. Approximately 29% of households in the region include children under the age of 18. Additional information on families and households is provided in **Appendix E**.

Figure 13. Percent Change in Population Age Composition, 2018-2023



Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2019-2023 and 2014-2018

Race and Ethnicity

Table 5 below shows the ethnic and racial composition of the metropolitan planning area. Most recent estimates show a diverse region where the minority population comprises almost half of the total regional population at 47%. Orleans and St. John the Baptist parishes are both minority-majority parishes where minority populations comprise 68% of each parishes' total population. The region also has experienced a growing Hispanic population, comprising 11% of the total population today, compared to only 4% in 2000. The following pages include Figure 14, which illustrates the geographic distribution of racial demographics across the region, and Figure 15, showing the distribution of Hispanic and non-Hispanic populations.

Table 5. Race and Ethnicity Composition of MPA (2023)

Race and Ethnicity Composition of MPA (2023)

American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimate (2019-2023): Demographics by Parish

Parish	Total Population	White	*[1]Minority	Black	Native American	Asian	Hispanic/ Latino	Non-Hisp/Lat
Jefferson	432,484	227,711	204,773	112,620	3,134	18,113	78,562	353,922
Orleans	376,035	118,979	257,056	207,633	1,002	10,463	29,855	346,180
Plaquemines	23,070	14,254	8,816	5,157	299	927	2,193	20,877
St. Bernard	44,172	27,206	16,966	10,533	318	939	5,988	38,184
St. Charles	51,863	33,706	18,157	11,881	549	432	4,134	47,729
St. James	19,797	9,834	9,963	9,572	21	6	372	19,425
St. John the Baptist	41,342	13,358	27,984	23,233	150	473	3,449	37,893
St. Tammany	269,331	201,888	67,443	32,914	2,016	3,514	21,369	247,962
Tangipahoa	135,218	83,835	51,383	40,430	98	1,029	7,511	127,707
***[2]Livingston (MPA Region Only)**	12,265	10,425	1,840	716	8	16	897	11,368
****[3]RPC MPA Region**	1,405,577	741,196	664,381	454,689	7,595	35,912	154,330	1,251,247

*[1]Minority = All single races other than White; Hispanic is not a race, but an ethnicity and therefore calculated separately with Non-Hispanic for Title VI purposes. Hispanic/Latino population may also be represented in the other racial categories. Single race Non-Hispanic/Latino tables are also available.

**2RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.

*3RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa and 8BG in Livingston Parishes

Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2019-2023

Figure 14. Population Density by Race *(Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025)*



Figure 15. Population Density by Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity *(Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025)*



Housing and Affordability

According to the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates for 2019–2023, the region has approximately 554,846 occupied housing units. About 65% are owner-occupied, while 35% are renter-occupied. In all parishes except Orleans, owner-occupied units make up the majority of housing. In New Orleans, however, the distribution is evenly split, with roughly half of housing units owner-occupied and half renter-occupied.

Housing affordability has become an increasing concern across the region for both residents and local and state policymakers seeking solutions to curb rising costs and expand the supply of affordable housing. Over the past five years, rising construction costs and elevated interest rates nationwide, and increasing insurance premiums statewide due largely to increased hurricane activity have all contributed to this growing concern. A household is considered cost-burdened when it spends more than 30% of its income on housing expenses, including rent or mortgage payments, utilities, insurance, and property taxes. Nearly one-third of the region's households, both renters and homeowners, are classified as cost-burdened.

The most populous parishes have the highest number of cost-burdened households. In Orleans Parish, 40% of households are cost-burdened, while in Jefferson Parish, the figure is 31%. Figure X highlights block groups with the highest shares of households experiencing housing cost burdens. While more densely populated urban areas show significant levels of cost burden, notable concentrations also appear in lower Jefferson Parish outside the floodwall protection, the West Bank of St. Charles Parish, coastal St. Tammany Parish, and southern Tangipahoa Parish near the lakes. In these areas, housing cost burdens may be more closely tied to higher flood insurance costs.

Rising costs also affect residential housing choice and residential displacement. As mentioned previously in Section X, there is a growing trend of population movement to suburban and exurban areas of the region where housing costs are lower. However, these savings may come with reduced transportation accessibility, making it more difficult for residents to reach employment centers and other key destinations due to longer commutes, less walkable infrastructure, or limited transit options. Monitoring these trends is essential for transportation planning, as it can inform targeted investments that maintain connectivity and ensure equitable access across the region.

HousingLOUISIANA is a statewide network of regional housing alliances to ensure better collaboration across the state. In the RPC's region, the two regional housing alliances are the Greater New Orleans Housing Alliance (GNOHA) and the Northshore Housing Alliance (NHA). In 2025, GNOHA adopted its 10 year investment plan entitled Housing for All which details strategies to expand the total supply of affordable housing, prevent future displacement, support sustainable design and infrastructure, and increase affordability particularly for vulnerable populations.



Figure 16. Northshore Housing Burden (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025)



Figure 17. River Parishes Housing Burden (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025)



Figure 18. Southshore Housing Burden (Sources: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025)



Income and Poverty

Median household income of the region's parishes is $68,678, which is approximately 13% below the national median but 14% above the median for the state of Louisiana. Table X shows a breakdown of median income by parish as well as population, households, and families in poverty by parish. It should be noted that there are significant racial and geographic disparities in household incomes by location and race across the region, with block groups having a larger percentage of minority residents generally having much lower household incomes than block groups that are predominantly white. Approximately 17% of the regional population lives in poverty, with the majority (64%) of residents experiencing poverty concentrated in Orleans and Jefferson parishes. Addressing the needs of the region's low-income and impoverished populations is essential to improving economic mobility, enhancing quality of life, and reducing longstanding systemic barriers to opportunity.

Table 6. Income and Poverty by Parish

POVERTY AND MEDIAN INCOME

Southeast Louisiana Parishes

Parish	Population in Poverty		Households in Poverty		Families in Poverty		Household Income
	Total Poverty Population*3	% Population in Poverty	Total Households (HH)	% of HH in Poverty	Total Families	% of Families in Poverty	Median HH Income 2023 Dollars
Jefferson	428,843	16.28%	176,986	15.81%	107,961	12.80%	$65,246
Orleans	363,814	22.63%	155,060	23.35%	73,585	16.33%	$55,339
Plaquemines	22,629	13.36%	8,200	14.48%	6,127	10.17%	$82,874
St. Bernard	43,805	22.61%	15,803	21.75%	10,394	18.47%	$57,638
St. Charles	51,317	9.83%	18,622	10.94%	13,865	7.50%	$82,172
St. James	19,615	10.49%	7,436	11.96%	5,409	6.95%	$64,536
St. John the Baptist	40,904	12.58%	14,922	13.01%	10,322	8.18%	$67,418
St. Tammany	266,028	12.18%	103,286	11.50%	72,626	9.47%	$79,277
Tangipahoa	131,063	19.43%	50,191	18.91%	32,782	13.68%	$57,256
Livingston*1 (MPA Region Only)	12,229	12.87%	4,340	15.62%	3,453	9.04%	$75,028
RPC MPA Region*2	**1,380,247**	**17.16%**	**554,846**	**17.25%**	**336,524**	**12.57%**	**$68,678**
Louisiana	4,494,539	18.88%	1,783,168	18.88%	1,127,294	14.15%	$60,023

*1RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8BG in Livingston Parish

*2RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area. RPC Regional median household income (grey) values are averaged.

*3Poverty population includes individuals in housing units and non-institutional group quarters. The poverty universe excludes children under the age of 15 who are not related to the householder, people living in institutional group quarters (e.g., nursing homes or correctional facilities), and people living in college dormitories or military barracks. All data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates (2019-2023).

Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2019-2023 (Population in Poverty: B17021, Households in Poverty: B17017, Families in Poverty: B17010, Household Income: B19013)

3.2 Regional Economy

Overview

Southeastern Louisiana is one of the most diverse regional economies in the Gulf South. Due to its position along the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico[JR52.1], the region serves as a major center for trade, logistics, energy, and tourism. The area's growing healthcare, education, and cultural sectors contribute to a dynamic economy while the Port of New Orleans, Port of South Louisiana, and related maritime industries employ thousands of workers. Tourism and hospitality are also vital to the regional economy, drawing millions of visitors to the region annually.

Despite experiencing job losses during the height of the COVID pandemic as well as disruptions to the economy from several natural disasters in 2020 and 2021, the region has shown an increase in jobs by 7% from 2020 to 2025. Over the next decade, major economic initiatives such as the development Louisiana International Terminal (LIT) and the region's "all-of-the-above" energy strategy are expected to deliver substantial economic benefits, including job creation and increased investment. However, these same initiatives will also place added demands on the transportation system, underscoring the need for strategic planning to ensure the network can efficiently support continued growth.

Table 7. Regional Employment at a Glance

TOTAL REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT & EARNINGS

Total Regional Employment (2025)*	Average Earnings per Job (2025)
679,362	$75,900

Jobs increased by 7.0% from 2020 to 2025.

Regional avg earnings per job are $12.6K below the national avg. earnings of $88.5K per job.

Source: Lightcast, Q1 2026 Data Set, Economy Overview

*Total regional employment for 9 parishes, excluding section of MPA in Livingston Parish



Major Industries

Table X below summarizes key industry characteristics within the region, including the three largest industries by total employment, industries experiencing the greatest percentage job growth, the highest-paying sectors, and industries in which the region exhibits above-average employment concentration relative to the nation. While tourism plays a substantial role in shaping the regional economy, the healthcare sector accounts for the largest share of regional employment and continues to expand. The region also demonstrates a competitive advantage in educational services, supported by a concentration of universities and research institutions. Additionally, the oil and gas sector comprises the region's highest-paying industries, though these jobs make up a small percentage of the total regional jobs.

Table 8. Top Regional Industries

TOP INDUSTRIES IN THE REGION (2025)	
Top 3 Largest Industries by Number of Jobs	**Number of Jobs**
Healthcare & Social Assistance	91,499
Government	89,738
Accommodation & Food Services	78,615
Top 3 Largest Industries in Terms of Job Growth (2020-2025)	**Job Growth**
Accommodation & Food Services	+16,093
Healthcare & Social Assistance	+10,987
Construction	+4,170
Top 3 Largest Industries (Earnings per Worker)	**Earnings Per Worker**
Mining, Quarrying, & Oil and Gas Extraction	$240,092
Utilities	$173,312
Utilities	$152,412

Source: Lightcast, Q1 2026 Data Set, Economy Overview

Competitive Advantage

Competitive advantage refers to a region's unique economic strengths which give it an edge over competing regions. The Regional Planning Commission's 2024 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy identified several competitive advantages in Southeast Louisiana. They include strong energy, healthcare, and higher education industries, world-class tourism destinations, and transportation resources including major ports, freight rail, and passenger rail. As seen in Table X, these industries also have higher location quotients when compared to national concentrations.

Table 9. Industry Location Quotients

REGIONAL COMPETETIVE ADVANTAGE		
	Top 6 Industries of Higher Concentration than National Average	**Location Quotient**
	Educational Services	1.88
	Accommodation & Food Services	1.40
	Educational Services	1.29
	Arts, Entertainment, & Recreation	1.12
	Transportation & Warehousing	1.12
	Mining, Quarrying, & Oil and Gas Extraction	1.06
	Retail Trade	1.05

Source: Lightcast, Q1 2026 Data Set, Economy Overview

Employment Centers

Figure 19 shows the distribution of employment centers within the region, based on number of jobs.[10] The map highlights a clear relationship between employment density and the regional transportation network, with many workplaces clustered along major arterial roadways and key transportation corridors. Major employment hubs in the region include the New Orleans CBD; the LA 21 and U.S. Highway 190 corridors in Covington and unincorporated parts of St. Tammany Parish; the Causeway Boulevard corridor in Metairie, extending from Interstate 10 to Lake Pontchartrain; the Elmwood and Harahan areas along the Mississippi River; the Clearview Parkway corridor in Metairie, from Interstate 10 to West Esplanade Avenue; the Tulane and Loyola University area in Uptown New Orleans; and the LSU Health, Tulane School of Medicine, University Medical Center, and VA Medical Center corridor, which extends along Tulane Avenue from the CBD into the Mid-City neighborhood.

[10] Data Source: DatabaseUSA (2024)

Figure 19. Locations of Employment Centers Based on Number of Employees (Source: DatabaseUSA, 2024)



Tourism & Transportation

Tourism is one of the most significant drivers of the Southeast Louisiana economy, attracting more than 19 million visitors annually and generating over $10 billion in spending.[11] Major events such as Mardi Gras, Jazz Fest, Essence Festival, and large conventions routinely fill more than 25,000 Downtown New Orleans hotel rooms and draw hundreds of thousands of visitors into the region within short time frames. This influx places substantial demands on the regional transportation system, creating peak traffic congestion, increasing transit ridership, and intensifying the need for efficient connections between the airport, downtown, and other key destinations.

For example, approximately one million revelers descend upon downtown New Orleans during the height of Carnival season, nearly the equivalent of packing the entire regional population into just a few historic neighborhoods. During this time, every mode of travel is in high demand, from streetcars and rideshare services to bikes and walking, creating a strain on the city's transportation network.

Lastly, while some ground-transport options to Louis Armstrong International Airport exist, there is consensus that they are sub-optimal in terms of convenience, travel time, and reliability for residents, airport workers, and visitors alike.

Hospitality Workers and Regional Transportation

The service workers who support the tourism economy face transportation challenges which are often different from those who work more traditional 9-5 schedules. A 2025 survey of New Orleans hotel workers found that nearly half of tourism workers regularly rely on public transportation to get to work, yet these workers endure longer and less predictable commutes than those who drive alone. The region's tourism workforce depends on reliable, regional transit options, because many hospitality jobs are concentrated in downtown New Orleans, yet many service workers live in Jefferson Parish, New Orleans East, Algiers, and St. Bernard Parish.

The transportation challenges faced by hospitality workers are compounded by the irregular hours of hospitality shift work, which often include nights, holidays, and weekends—when public transit is often least reliable. The survey found that more than two-thirds of transit-riding hotel workers had been late to work at least once in the past month due to unreliable transit, and many reported having to pay for an Uber or Lyft ride when buses ran late or did not arrive at all.

[11] New Orleans & Company May CEO Update, May 2026

Means of Transportation to Work

Work-related trips represent the most significant category of mandatory travel within an urbanized area, serving as a key driver of daily transportation demand. Per the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, the vast majority of workers in the Southeast Louisiana region commute by driving alone, accounting for 74.7% of all work trips. See Table X. Public transit plays a relatively limited role in regional commuting, with just over 1.5% of workers using transit to reach their jobs. However, transit usage is notably higher in Orleans Parish, where approximately 4.5% of commuters use public transportation. Active transportation modes account for a small share of regional commuting, with 0.66% of workers bicycling and 2.47% walking to work. Remote work has become an increasingly important component of the region's commute profile, with nearly 10% of workers working from home. This share is even higher in Orleans Parish and St. Tammany Parish, where 13.67% and 12.4% of workers, respectively, work remotely.

Table 10. Commute to Work by Mode

COMMUTE TO WORK BY MODE

SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA MPA

Parish	Total Workers 16UP	Car/Truck/Van (CTV) Alone	CTV Carpool	Public Transit	Taxi/ Motorcycle/ Other Means	Bike/Walk	WFH
Jefferson Parish	201,372	77.31%	11.25%	0.85%	1.29%	1.90%	7.40%
Orleans Parish	171,094	63.19%	8.73%	4.51%	2.31%	7.58%	13.67%
Plaquemines Parish	10,678	82.80%	10.39%	0.00%	0.78%	2.95%	3.09%
St. Bernard Parish	18,277	80.49%	9.47%	0.64%	1.46%	1.67%	6.26%
St. Charles Parish	24,277	83.69%	5.80%	0.23%	1.61%	0.98%	7.69%
St. James Parish	8,574	84.08%	6.90%	0.30%	1.06%	1.31%	6.34%
St. John the Baptist Parish	17,590	84.72%	7.72%	0.19%	1.32%	0.44%	5.61%
St. Tammany Parish	123,646	77.43%	7.63%	0.12%	1.48%	0.93%	12.40%
Tangipahoa Parish	57,218	81.73%	8.58%	0.20%	1.55%	1.66%	6.28%
Livingston *1 (MPA Region Only)	5,044	84.77%	11.70%	0.63%	0.00%	0.50%	2.40%
RPC MPA Region *2	637,770	74.73%	9.21%	1.56%	1.62%	3.13%	9.75%
Louisiana	1,989,634	79.38%	8.65%	0.91%	1.57%	2.25%	7.23%

*1RPC Livingston- Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.

*2RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8BG in Livingston Parish

Workers 16 and Up Commute by Mode ACS 5- year estimates (2019- 2023) block group estimates coinciding with RPC GIS geographic mapping summed by parish

Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2019-2023

Regional Workforce and Commuting Patterns

Tables 11 and 12 illustrate the relationship between jobs and resident workers, highlighting regional commuting patterns. As the metropolitan area's primary urban core, the New Orleans CBD attracts the largest net inflow of commuters, with approximately 26,000 workers traveling into the area. The LSU/Tulane medical district shows a similar pattern, drawing roughly 18,635 net commuters.

The largest concentrations of the region's resident workforce are located in Marrero, Kenner, Slidell, Covington, Metairie, and Gentilly. Covington serves as both a major employment and residential center yet still records a net inflow of about 13,700 commuters. Metairie, despite its large employment base and workforce, has a relatively modest net inflow of 5,263 commuters, suggesting many residents live and work locally. In contrast, Marrero experiences the region's largest net outflow, with approximately 9,856 residents commuting elsewhere for work, indicating that a substantial share of its workforce relies on jobs outside the community.

Table 11. Top 8 ZIP Codes - Location of Jobs

LOCATION OF JOBS

ZIP	Location	# Jobs Performed	# Resident Workers	# Net Commuters
70130	**New Orleans (CBD & Lower Garden District)**	35,258	9,257	26,001
70433	**Covington**	33,065	19,358	13,707
70002	**Metairie**	24,874	10,134	14,740
70001	**Metairie**	24,035	18,772	5,263
70118	**New Orleans (Uptown)**	23,950	14,231	9,719
70123	**Elmwood**	23,680	13,825	9,855
70112	**New Orleans (CBD & Tulane Gravier)**	21,900	3,265	18,635
70119	**New Orleans (Mid-City)**	20,534	18,006	2,582

Source: Lightcast, Q1 2026 Data Set, Economy Overview

Table 12. Top 8 ZIP Codes – Location of Workforce

LOCATION OF WORKERS

ZIP	Location	# Jobs Performed	# Resident Workers	# Net Commuters
70072	**Marrero**	15,853	25,709	-9,856
70065	**Kenner**	13,025	21,053	-8,028
70433	**Covington**	33,065	19,358	13,707
70458	**Slidell**	18,704	18,971	-267
70001	**Metairie**	24,035	18,772	5,263
70122	**New Orleans (Gentilly)**	11,369	18,576	-7,207
70119	**New Orleans (Mid-City)**	20,534	18,006	2,528
70058	**Harvey**	16,039	17,976	-1,937

Source: Lightcast, Q1 2026 Data Set, Economy Overview



3.3 Regional Development Patterns

Land Cover

The Southeast Louisiana region's geography is one defined by water. Over centuries, alluvial deposits from the Mississippi River have built the region's soils, forming an intricate landscape of swamps, marshes, and barrier islands. The broader coastal area contains about 4,000 square miles of land and 4,700 square miles of water. Of the total land area, only about 1,000 square miles consist of relatively stable ground suitable for development; the remainder is largely composed of wetlands, marshes, swamps, and floodplains. These natural landscapes are considered a paradise for fishing, hunting, and bird watching; the region contains five national wildlife refuges, including the Big Branch Marsh, Bayou Sauvage, Delta, Breton, and Bogue Chitto.

Figure 20 presents National Land Cover Database (NDLC) classifications, highlighting regional land cover patterns and showing that the more densely developed urban areas of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard parishes contain larger concentrations of impervious surfaces and developed open space. Developed areas also extend along the levees of the Mississippi River through the River Parishes (such as Destrehan, Luling, LaPlace, and Reserve) and within Plaquemines Parish (such as Belle Chase, Live Oak, and Port Sulfur). Much of the remaining land in these parishes, outside of the developed towns, is dominated by cultivated farmland along the elevated land adjacent to the river, and forested and emergent wetlands in the lower elevated back swamps furthest from the river levee.

On the Northshore, a mix of emergent and forested wetlands and marshes flank Lake Pontchartrain, Lake Maurepas, and bayous and tributaries, particularly in the northern reaches. The inland landscape is defined by evergreen forests and deciduous forests. Urban development is concentrated on the southern end of Tangipahoa Parish in and around Hammond and Ponchatoula. The northern areas are more rural, containing more scattered cultivated lands and pastures. A similar pattern is evident in St. Tammany Parish, with development largely concentrated along the parish's southern edge, including Slidell and the Mandeville–Covington area. In recent years, suburban-style residential and commercial development has increasingly expanded into unincorporated parts of St. Tammany Parish.

Figure 20. Regional Land Cover (Source: United States Geological Survey (2024), Annual National Land Cover Database (NLCD) Conterminous United States Collection 1.2 Land Cover Confidence: U.S. Geological Survey data release, https://doi.org/10.5066/P94UXNTS)





Development Patterns

The region does not follow a single, uniform metropolitan pattern; instead, it includes a mix of dense urban areas, growing suburbs, and rural and coastal communities, each with distinct characteristics and transportation needs. Shaped by historical settlement patterns, these development forms will continue to evolve, particularly as climate conditions change. For transportation planning, it is essential to understand how these varied areas connect within the broader regional network to support efficient movement of people and goods within the region and beyond.

At the center of the region is the urban core of New Orleans, where development is defined by higher densities, compact neighborhoods, and a mix of residential, commercial, and institutional uses. The built environment is closely spaced and interconnected, with a street network that supports multiple modes of travel and a concentration of cultural, economic, and civic activity. This area represents the historic and functional heart of the region.

Surrounding the core are inner-ring suburban areas, particularly in Jefferson Parish, including communities such as Metairie. These areas developed largely during the mid- to late-20th century and are characterized by moderate densities, commercial corridors, and auto-oriented land use patterns. They serve as major residential and employment centers, with established infrastructure systems and strong connections to the urban core.

Beyond these areas, the region transitions into outer suburban and exurban communities, especially on the Northshore in St. Tammany and Tangipahoa parishes. The cities of Mandeville and Hammond exemplify this pattern, with continued residential growth, expanding subdivisions, and increasing demand for services and infrastructure. These areas are often characterized by lower densities than the urban core and greater reliance on personal vehicles for daily travel.

In contrast, rural and coastal areas, including parts of Plaquemines and St. Bernard parishes, exhibit low-density, dispersed, and often linear development patterns that follow major roadways and waterways. Communities in these areas are typically smaller and more isolated, with fewer services and limited multi-modal connectivity compared to more urbanized parts of the region. Development is shaped by both physical geography and access to transportation routes; however, improving pedestrian and bicycling connectivity have been a recent priority of these communities. The river parishes of St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, and St. James present a distinct pattern that combines industrial development, small towns, and rural residential areas along the Mississippi River corridor. These areas play a significant role in the regional economy, particularly in energy and manufacturing, while also supporting established communities with long-standing local identities.

Local Land Use and Comprehensive Planning

The region encompasses portions of 10 parishes and multiple incorporated jurisdictions, each with its own independent land use planning authority and policies. Most local jurisdictions have adopted comprehensive or master plans to guide future development and land use decisions. Many—particularly those parishes and municipalities experiencing population growth—are currently updating or have recently adopted new master plans. These plans address emerging development pressures, including shifting demographics, increasing flood risk, and the impacts of inflation and rising costs of living.

Unlike some regional planning organizations and MPOs, which serve as Councils of Government (COGs) for local coordination on land use planning decisions, the RPC has a very limited role in regional land use coordination beyond providing planning and technical support as part of the coordinated transportation planning process. Nevertheless, land use decision making at the local level significantly impacts transportation patterns and needs in our region, and the RPC works to incorporate information on existing and future land use conditions within each parish and jurisdiction into the baseline assessment used to model transportation demand.

Table 13. Local Comprehensive Land Use Plans for Southeast Louisiana Jurisdictions

LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLANS

Southeast Louisiana Municipalities & Parishes

Jurisdiction	Link to Plan
Jefferson Parish	Envision Jefferson 2040
City of Kenner	Kenner 2030
City of Gretna	Gretna Comprehensive Plan
Livingston Parish	Envision Livingston
Orleans Parish	Plan for the 21st Century
St. Bernard Parish	St. Bernard Parish Comprehensive Plan
St. James Parish	St. James Parish 2045 Growing Together (Under Development)
St. John the Baptist Parish	St. John the Baptist Comprehensive Land Use Plan, One Parish, One Future
St. Charles Parish	St. Charles Parish 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update
Plaquemines Parish	Plaquemines Parish Comprehensive Plan 2037 (Under Development)
St. Tammany Parish	New Directions 2040
City of Covington	Covington Comprehensive Plan 2030
City of Mandeville	Mandeville Thrives 2045 Comprehensive Plan
City of Slidell	Slidell 2040 Comprehensive Plan
Tangipahoa Parish	2045 Tangipahoa Comprehensive Plan
City of Hammond	Hammond Comprehensive Master Plan

3.4 Regional Environment

The Southeast Louisiana region is closely tied to its surrounding water bodies—its multiple lakes, rivers, streams, and the Gulf of America—which have shaped development patterns, the economy, and cultural identities. While this connection has historically been a resource, it presents a current challenge as the region is exposed to growing environmental risks from climate change, including more extreme storms, sea level rise, and extreme heat. In the last century, significant land loss has occurred in the region as a result of both natural and manmade processes, which have altered the region's natural systems. According to Louisiana's Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA), the state has lost nearly 2,000 square miles of land since the 1930's and could lose up to 3,000 square miles over the next 30 years.[12] These factors weaken wetlands and barrier islands, reducing their ability to recover and increase vulnerability to flooding and other hazards. Addressing these challenges is essential. Future transportation investments must be designed to help communities adapt to changing environmental conditions and support long-term resilience.

Natural Hazards

The region identifies flooding as its greatest natural hazard risk, both through interviews with stakeholders and as cited in local hazard mitigation plans. Hurricanes cause seasonal flood risk with increased precipitation and storm surge, while changes in weather patterns create a routine and chronic flood risk with increased precipitation throughout the year. Many communities rely on both natural mechanisms (like wetlands) and engineered solutions (such as levees or forced drainage) to control these waters and protect people and assets. Controlling and living with the surrounding water poses a delicate balance for the region. It shapes regional land use, infrastructure, and how individuals respond to natural disasters and future risks.

While flooding poses the greatest overall risk, many hazards threaten the region. Hurricanes produce high winds that damage infrastructure, as well as routine thunderstorms and tornadoes. Extreme temperatures, namely heat, stress the region and surrounding transportation infrastructure. Increases in high temperatures are predicted to increase in frequency, both with record highs and the number of days with recorded highs. These trends further threaten the region with predicted increase in sea level rise, extreme temperatures, and additional future weather conditions.

Air Quality

With the exception of sulfur dioxide (SO_2), the region is in full attainment of all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the criteria pollutants defined in the Clean Air Act. The SO_2 exceedance is attributed to point-source (i.e., non-transportation) polluters. The remaining criteria pollutants – ozone, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, and lead – are more closely tied to transportation-related emissions and therefore more directly influenced by the RPC's planning efforts. While the region remains in attainment for these pollutants, continued VMT growth and associated emissions could change that status in the future. Projects and strategies proposed in this plan focus on maintaining or improving this status by continuing efforts to reduce VMT, congestion, and promoting alternative fuels.

[12] Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, 2026, https://coastal.la.gov/whats-at-stake/a-changing-landscape/

Current Environmental Planning Efforts

In response to increasing natural hazards and changing weather patterns, the RPC has expanded its environmental programming to include a more comprehensive resilience initiative encompassing both climate mitigation and adaptation. This work seeks to reduce local emissions while strengthening infrastructure to better withstand and recover from existing hazards and future climate impacts. Climate mitigation includes actions to reduce the drivers of climate change by lowering greenhouse gas (GHG) and other harmful emissions, while climate adaptation focuses on ensuring that communities and assets can adjust to a changing environment. At the time of the writing of this plan, the RPC is finalizing the region's first transportation resilience plan, the Transportation Risk and Infrastructure Protection Plan (TRIP), detailed in Chapter 4. The RPC also partners with the state to support the implementation of the Louisiana Coastal Master Plan which is the state's principal strategy for coastal restoration, structural protection, and risk reduction. Meanwhile, efforts to reduce harmful emissions through ongoing transportation planning are becoming an integral component of the RPC's transportation program.

Climate Action Plan

Recognizing the importance of maintaining air quality and reducing harmful emissions, both criteria pollutants and GHG emissions, the RPC has worked on reducing both types through several programs. The RPC published a Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP) in 2023 and a more Comprehensive Climate Action Plan (CCAP) in 2025. Both plans outline reduction measures based on stakeholder feedback and anticipated implementation goals for the region. As a regional convener on many of the identified strategies of the plan, the RPC will continue to facilitate the implementation of these strategies and consider the GHG reduction benefit of projects in other aspects of transportation planning. Both plans give the region a better understanding of its GHG emissions and a forthcoming 2027 status report will help RPC continue progress to implement strategies through 2030.

GHG Emissions in Southeast Louisiana

While industrial emissions account for the largest contributor of GHG in the region, on-road transportation emissions account for the second largest sector (12.2%). The RPC will continue to work on the EPA CPRG grant to help implement the emissions reduction strategies with transportation policies and projects comprising many of the next immediate steps.

Figure 21. 2023 Southeast Louisiana GHG Inventory



Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership

The RPC also hosts a Department of Energy (DOE) designated Clean Cities Coalition. The Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuel Partnership (SLCFP) is a coalition of regional stakeholders that together work to reduce transportation emissions by supporting alternative fuels and transportation-related energy savings. The RPC tracks emissions reduced by local stakeholders and works with these stakeholders to provide programming tailored to their needs. An ongoing working group, the Regional EV Readiness Roundtable grew from the need to start planning for increased EVs with increased federal policies and funding. This group meets throughout the year to address various topics centered around increasing EV adoption and EV infrastructure. EV adoption continues to grow in the region along with charging infrastructure. With the increasing growth of EV use, a regional EV Readiness plan is needed to determine the overall need for public charging and where to best place chargers.

Environmental Needs

The region aims to prioritize transportation and infrastructure investments that will strengthen resilience to climate-related hazards, while also focusing on reducing GHG pollution and other criteria air pollutants. Reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through expanded multimodal options, improving land use coordination, and enhancing transit accessibility will be critical to achieving these goals. In addition, the RPC explores opportunities to partner with the state and local industry stakeholders, building a strategy to reduce industrial GHG emissions without sacrificing economic prosperity.

To sustain our communities and quality of life, the region must also reduce flood vulnerability. Reduction strategies include improving drainage capacity, elevating and hardening critical transportation infrastructure, preserving and restoring natural flood storage areas, incorporating green infrastructure, and integrating flood risk data into project design and siting decisions. Protecting regional transportation assets and ensuring long-term mobility is essential, particularly during future extreme weather events. Equally important is ensuring that vulnerable populations do not disproportionately bear the harmful effects of climate change, including exposure to flooding, extreme heat, and poor air quality. This will require finding additional funding sources and leveraging new opportunities to advance resilience projects and initiatives and to further implement strategies and measures outlined in the regional climate action plan.

The RPC will continue to implement regional resilience and climate planning by convening stakeholders, ensuring coordination across jurisdictions, and facilitating collaboration among local, state, and federal partners. Through ongoing plans, studies, and technical analyses, the RPC will work with regional agencies to identify, prioritize, and advance projects that strengthen resilience and address climate-related risks in an equitable manner.





3.5 Vulnerable Communities

The RPC recognizes that past transportation planning, investment decisions, and discriminatory policies contributed to systemic inequities and limited opportunities for certain populations. The agency also acknowledges that certain communities may be disproportionately affected by future transportation decisions due to factors such as income, race, ethnicity, age, or disability. In response, the RPC has adopted policies and planning practices consistent with federal requirements to identify and address potential inequities, reduce adverse impacts on disadvantaged communities, and ensure that transportation investments contribute to broader community well-being. The RPC utilizes the following tools and agency practices to identify vulnerable communities and guide efforts to reduce transportation-related mobility barriers.

Social Vulnerability Index

Vulnerable communities are those that may be more at risk to external stressors such as natural disasters, economic downturns, and disease outbreaks due to socioeconomic or demographic factors which inhibit the ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from change. These vulnerabilities often have direct implications for the transportation system. Individuals in socially vulnerable communities may be more likely to depend on public transit, lack access to a personal vehicle, face physical or financial barriers to mobility, or live in areas with limited transportation options. During major disruptions, these challenges can make it harder to reach essential destinations that support recovery and resilience.

Understanding the geographic distribution of social vulnerability helps inform transportation decisions by highlighting where mobility barriers are greatest and where investments can have the most significant impact on quality of life and community resilience.

The RPC has developed a method of identifying communities that are more socially vulnerable than others by adapting the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) framework. As illustrated in Figure X, the RPC's SVI consists of 16 variables extracted from the 2019-2023 ACS Block Group data and organized into four thematic categories: Socioeconomic Status; Household Characteristics; Racial and Ethnic Minority Status; and Housing and Transportation. Together, these indicators compare the social vulnerability of different communities in the region at the block group geographic level. The SVI can be adapted to produce specific vulnerability analyses at both small- and large-scale areas. The RPC applies the SVI in localized project development studies, in the development of regional and subarea plans, and in formulating outreach and engagement strategies.

As seen in Figure 22, the block groups highlighted in yellow, orange and red are more vulnerable compared to other areas in the region, with cumulative vulnerability scores exceeding 0.4. There is no predominant geographical pattern of vulnerability in the region; rather, vulnerable communities exist in all of the nine parishes, in urban, suburban, and rural areas alike. Many of these communities live in neighborhoods that have experienced historic disinvestment. Within the region's more developed urban core, particularly in Orleans and Jefferson parishes, many of the most vulnerable block groups are concentrated in suburban and exurban areas situated near heavy industrial activity.

Figure 22. Social Vulnerability Index Scores by Census Block Group (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates; RPC 2025)





Transportation Mobility Barriers

Individuals without access to a personal vehicle are particularly vulnerable within the region's transportation system. Without a vehicle, transportation options are limited, resulting in reduced mobility and fewer opportunities to reach essential destinations. These challenges affect daily life by making it more difficult to access employment or other necessary services. Limited vehicle access also poses significant risk during emergencies, such as mandatory hurricane evacuations or other natural disasters. Having access to reliable transportation can be a determining factor in reaching safety. To better understand and address this challenge, the RPC has created a "transportation mobility barriers" mapping layer for use in project and policy analyses. The transportation mobility barriers layer identifies households with both no vehicle access and in poverty per U.S. Census definitions. Figure 23 highlights block groups within the region having more households in poverty with no vehicle access above the MPA threshold, indicating where residents may be more transit-dependent and face more barriers in accessing jobs, education, services, or essential destinations.

RPC Area of Interest Policy

The RPC's Area of Interest (AOI) policy is a key component of the RPC's Title VI program and part of the agency's commitment to ensure that all persons, including minority and low-income populations and those with disability or language barriers, have meaningful opportunities to participate in RPC transportation planning and decision-making processes. The AOI policy is primarily used during the Stage 0 process of the LADOTD's six-stage transportation project development process, though it is also utilized in the development of supplementary modal plans.

The AOI process involves two steps. The first is to map nearby populations who may be impacted by a specific transportation project. The process is looking at the demographic and socioeconomic profile of communities within the vicinity of the project limits and flagging block groups (or the most granular level of data available) for Title VI populations, socially vulnerable populations according to RPC's SVI index, and where these populations intersect with households in poverty.

Following this identification process, the second step involves the RPC's Title VI Coordinator working closely with project managers to determine appropriate measures to be taken to ensure compliance with federal civil rights requirements, equitable representation, and meaningful public involvement during the planning or project development process. This may include targeted public engagement, language assistance services, coordination with community organizations, additional impact analysis, and modifications of project recommendations to avoid or minimize adverse effects on vulnerable populations.

Figure 23. Census Block Groups with Mobility Barriers *(Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2019-2023 5-Year Estimates, RPC 2025)*



Vulnerable Populations Needs

To address accessibility and mobility gaps and improve the quality of life for the most vulnerable in the region, the RPC seeks to further develop its planning tools and analytical capabilities to better target investments in these communities. The RPC also plans to align these updates with evolving state and federal guidance.

First, the RPC seeks to update its assessments of transit dependency and work collaboratively with transit agencies across the region to do more in-depth transit mobility mapping. These efforts would examine factors such as job access, service coverage, frequency, reliability, and first- and last-mile connectivity. Identifying opportunities for transit service enhancements and expansions that improve mobility and access to essential destinations is the goal. The RPC also seeks to integrate this analysis with its transportation resilience initiatives, identifying strategies to maintain and improve mobility under changing climatic conditions while strengthening evacuation planning and transportation options for the region's transit-dependent communities.

The RPC also intends to strengthen its Title VI Program through more comprehensive community impact assessments that better evaluate how transportation investments affect low-income, minority, and other disadvantaged populations. This includes exploring methodologies to further quantify and compare the benefits or burdens of transportation projects across different population groups, helping to ensure investments advance equitable outcomes. In addition, the agency seeks to expand staff training in community engagement practices and culturally appropriate outreach methods. This helps to foster more meaningful participation by historically underrepresented communities.

Finally, the RPC aims to deepen its understanding of the relationship between transportation access and economic opportunity by examining the spatial mismatch between employment centers and low-income and minority neighborhoods. This will also help the agency identify transportation mobility barriers and prioritize investments that connect residents to jobs, services, and other opportunities.





3.6 Summary of Regional Trends

The demographic, economic, and environmental analyses presented in this chapter highlight the transportation needs and challenges that should help shape and inform regional planning and investment priorities over the next 30 years.

Although the region's population is expected to remain relatively stable overall, growth is occurring unevenly. Some historically dense urban neighborhoods may experience low population growth and even decline, while suburban and exurban communities, particularly in St. Tammany and Tangipahoa parishes, are experiencing significant growth and development pressure. These shifts are increasing travel distances and creating new demands for transportation infrastructure and services, including public transit. The region will need to be strategic in its policies related to population shift by working with local governments on coordinated land use and transportation planning to ensure sustainable growth, while also ensuring that stable populations receive adequate transportation services and access to essential destinations.

The region's aging population also presents transportation challenges. As the share of residents age 65 and older continues to grow, the transportation system must become more accessible, safe, and accommodating for individuals with age-related mobility limitations and disabilities. Investments in pedestrian infrastructure, enhanced transit services, Complete Streets, safety, and security investments will help support independent mobility for older adults, individuals with disabilities, and residents without access to a personal vehicle.

Housing affordability is another factor shaping transportation needs across the region. Rising housing costs, particularly in the historic urban core, are encouraging many households to relocate to areas where housing may be more affordable, but transportation options are more limited. While these households may benefit from lower housing costs, they often face increased transportation costs and longer commutes due to greater reliance on personal vehicles. It will be important to ensure that transportation costs are stabilized, and mobility options are increased, especially in areas of growth. It will also be important to examine where transit services can be expanded to help the workforce reach major employment hubs. The region's economic competitiveness depends on its ability to efficiently connect residents to employment opportunities.

Finally, all future transportation investments should be made with resilience as a core consideration. Southeast Louisiana faces acute risks from flooding, hurricanes, extreme heat, sea level rise, subsidence, and land loss. Transportation infrastructure must be designed and maintained to withstand these hazards and continue functioning during and after disruptive events. This includes incorporating resilience measures into roadway, bridge, transit, and active transportation projects, as well as leveraging natural and nature-based infrastructure where appropriate. It will also be important to consider resilience investments where they can assist the most socially vulnerable of our community, ensuring that resilience investment benefits are distributed equitably.

04 Transportation System

Assessing Existing Transportation Facilities and Future Needs



This chapter provides an overview of the existing multimodal transportation network in the Southeast Louisiana region, looking at the movement of both people and goods. It assesses the condition of current facilities and systems and incorporates insights into transportation needs based on most recent data and gathered through public outreach, including survey responses and stakeholder workshops. The chapter also examines projected travel demand, key safety considerations, existing planning practices, and identifies areas for future planning and investment.

This assessment relies on multiple data sources that the RPC collects and maintains, and lays the foundation for the following MPO planning activities, including but not limited to:

- *Tracking changes in overall transportation usage and trends over time.*
- *Understanding travel demand for different locations, modes and trip purposes.*
- *Making data-driven decisions about where (and which) new transportation investments to make.*
- *To evaluate the impacts of existing investments.*
- *Managing congestion and safety needs during periods of peak travel demand, such as the traditional morning and evening rush hours.*

4.1 Biking and Walking

While walking and biking trips typically occur on a local scale, active transportation is an essential component of the regional transportation system. Active transportation increases mobility options, especially for households with low-vehicle ownership, and expands multimodal access to employment centers, schools, transit hubs, medical services, and commercial centers. Trips taken on foot or bike often replace motorized trips, which reduce congestion on roadways. Transportation networks designed for all modes increase roadway safety by reducing conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users. Active transportation also creates opportunities for recreation, health and wellness, tourism, and conservation by connecting communities to open space and natural areas.

Facilities

As of fall 2025, the region includes approximately 524 combined miles of shared-use and on-street bicycle facilities. Protected facilities account for about 40% of the regional active transportation network with 189 miles of shared-use paths and 25 miles of protected bike lanes. On the Southshore, the network features an extensive system of shared-use paths, protected bike lanes, and on-street bicycle facilities that link neighborhoods with major employment centers, universities, and transit hubs. On the Northshore, active transportation infrastructure is shaped by long-distance regional trails, side paths, and strategic connections between downtowns, schools, and key recreational destinations.

Table 14 shows the current, as of 2025, number of active transportation facilities in the region based on facility type, and Figures 24 and 25 show locations of the existing and proposed bicycle facilities and shared use paths throughout the region.

Table 14. Active Transportation Facilities in Number of Miles

REGIONAL MILES OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Parish	Shared Use Paths	Protected Bike Lanes	Bike Lanes	Shared Lanes	PROTECTED TOTAL	TOTAL
Jefferson	60.4	3.4	0.9	5.8	**63.8**	**134.3**
Orleans	33.0	25.1	90.9	78.4	**58.1**	**285.5**
Plaquemines	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	**0.0**	**1.4**
St. Bernard	13.9	0.0	8.4	44.1	**13.9**	**80.3**
St. Charles	28.4	0.0	6.4	0.2	**28.4**	**63.4**
St. James	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	**0.0**	**0.0**
St. John the Baptist	16.3	0.0	0.3	4.1	**16.3**	**37.0**
St. Tammany	44.1	2.0	8.2	0.4	**46.1**	**100.8**
Tangipahoa	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	**1.6**	**3.2**
9-PARISH TOTAL	**197.7**	**30.5**	**116.5**	**133.0**	**228.2**	**705.9**

Source: Regional Planning Commission 2026

Figure 24. Regional Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities and Shared Use Paths (Source: RPC 2026)



Figure 25. Northshore Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities and Shared Use Paths (Source: RPC 2026)



Active Transportation Travel Patterns

Compared to statewide trends, walking and bicycling make up a higher proportion of overall commuting in the MPA. Based on the ACS 5-year Estimates (2019–2023), 0.7% of the RPC nine-parish region's population commutes by bicycle and 2.5% by walking, with notable differences among parishes. Orleans Parish has the highest percentage of bicycle and pedestrian commuters, 1.9% and 5.7%, respectively, while fewer than 3% of residents walk or bike to work in other parishes.

In areas that have higher proportions of walking and biking commutes(such as parts of New Orleans and Jefferson Parish), patterns illustrate the importance of non-motorized facilities and adjacent land uses, encouraging these modes. Walking and biking commute trips are heavily concentrated in neighborhoods located near major employment centers and commercial corridors. In the block group that includes a majority of the New Orleans CBD, more than 75% of residents walk to work, and in the French Quarter 38% of residents commute on foot. Outside of Orleans Parish, walking commute share is similarly clustered in areas near major job centers and higher education institutions. In Jefferson Parish, fewer than 2% of residents walk to work overall, yet some block groups near key employment nodes, such as those along Jefferson Highway and within the Metairie CBD near Causeway Boulevard exceed 12%. Additional clusters of walking commuters appear in other communities in the region including central Chalmette, Gretna, and LaPlace.

Active Transportation Travel Patterns Cont.

Bicycle commuting also correlates strongly with proximity to employment centers. While 1.9% of Orleans Parish residents bike to work, many block groups located within a three-mile biking distance of the CBD and French Quarter report bicycle commute rates above 10%. Along the St. Claude corridor, approximately 11% of residents commute by bike. In the neighborhoods surrounding Tulane and Loyola Universities, roughly 5% of residents bike to work. Near the University and Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers, 7% of residents bike to work. Block groups directly adjacent to the Lafitte Greenway report bicycle commute rates of 12%.

Regional Trails

Regional trails, such as the Mississippi River Trail (MRT) and the Tammany Trace provide safe, continuous routes that connect communities, parks, schools, and major destinations, functioning as both high-quality recreational amenities and essential transportation corridors. By serving these dual roles, regional trails expand mobility choices, support sustainability through green infrastructure, enhance economic vitality, and help build more resilient and active communities.

Building on regional efforts to connect communities, the Louisiana Bootlace Trail Network envisions a continuous, integrated trail system around Lake Pontchartrain linking neighborhoods, parks, and waterways across parish boundaries that would stretch more than 100 miles between New Orleans to Baton Rouge. By weaving together existing and future trails, project partners aim to expand the region's active transportation network and boost tourism and economic growth. The RPC continues to support this collaborative initiative by advancing regional trail planning since completing the Pontchartrain Trace Master Plan in 1997.

While comprehensive data on recreational bicycle and pedestrian travel demand remains limited, the RPC collects count data through its own studies and integrates additional datasets from the University of New Orleans Transportation Institute (UNOTI) into the planning process. These data help identify high-use, non-motorized travel corridors and reveal patterns in how people move. Along many of these corridors, counts show substantial activity occurring outside traditional peak commuting hours. For example, average hourly and daily bicycle and pedestrian counts along the Lafitte Greenway collected from October 2022 through September 2023 illustrate that weekday and weekend travel volumes on the greenway are closely aligned, suggesting comparable levels of both recreational and utilitarian use.

Figure 26. Lafitte Greenway Usage by Hour and Day of Week. Source: University of New Orleans Transportation Institute (2023).



Micromobility

Micromobility options such as e-bikes, e-scooters, and bike share are increasingly prevalent in urban environments. They help support short-trip travel as well as address first and last mile connections to bridge transit network gaps. The City of New Orleans' Blue Bikes bikeshare program demonstrates the growing role of these options in expanding mobility and alternatives to car travel. During its first four years of operation from 2021 to 2025, Blue Bikes averaged roughly 20,000 trips per year. As these modes evolve, transportation agencies are adapting street design standards, local policies and regulations, and developing funding strategies to safely and feasibly integrate them.





Integration with Transit

ACS data on pedestrian and bicycle commuting includes only those residents who report walking and biking as their primary mode of travel. It does not capture commuters who use multiple modes, such as walking or biking combined with transit. This is an important limitation when assessing the demand for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in transit-served areas. Public transit effectively functions as an extension of the active transportation network, enabling people without access to a car to reach destinations too far or unsafe to directly travel on foot or bike.

Acknowledging the evolving linkages between micromobility, public transit, and active transportation will influence long-range transportation planning by enhancing network connectivity, mitigating congestion, and advancing sustainable mobility strategies.

Current Active Transportation Planning and Policy

The region's active transportation planning and policy framework is rooted in advancing safety, connectivity, and equity. These principles form the core of the region's planning work, informing and guiding all plans, studies, and policies to ensure a consistent, equitable, and safety-centered approach to active transportation.

Local Plans and Studies

The MTP identifies regional active transportation routes throughout the RPC's nine-parish service area. These bicycle and pedestrian corridors connect major destinations and urban centers; support utilitarian walking and bicycling trips while also accommodating recreational use; provide essential first- and last-mile links to transit; and function as a spine network for local active transportation routes within each jurisdiction. Bicycle and pedestrian facility recommendations were developed primarily from the municipal and parish-wide plans and feasibility studies listed below.

- Moving New Orleans Bikeway Blueprint (2020)
- The Big Green Easy: A Citywide Park and Recreation Vision Plan for New Orleans (2024)
- St. Bernard Parish Bikeway & Pedestrian Plan (2024 Update)
- Jefferson Parish Bicycle Master Plan (2019)
- City of Gretna Comprehensive Plan (2018)
- St. Tammany Parish Comprehensive Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (2025)
- City of Slidell Bicycle Master Plan (2024 Update)
- City of Mandeville Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (2023)
- Town of Madisonville Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (2019)
- City of Covington Bicycle Plan & Complete Streets Policy Feasibility Study (2018)
- St. Charles Parish Comprehensive Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan (2019)
- Manchac Greenway Stage 0 Study, St. John the Baptist Parish (2023)

Complete Streets Policy and Guidebook

In July 2012, the RPC adopted a regional Complete Streets Policy with guidance from the Complete Streets Advisory Committee. The policy complements LADOTD's 2010 Complete Streets Policy and was developed in accordance with applicable regulations and best practices from state and national transportation entities. In 2024, the RPC reestablished the advisory committee as the Complete Streets Working Group to inform development of a Regional Complete Streets Guidebook. Working Group members include staff from state agencies, local parishes, and cities who guide the development of our region's roadway infrastructure and operations. The guidebook will provide policy, design, and implementation best practices for jurisdictions, agencies, design professionals, and advocacy organizations, recognizing the diverse local conditions, land use contexts, and resource needs in the region. Standards in this guide will be a compilation of current best practices and will not supersede any existing federal, state, or local laws, policies, or regulations. It will also outline an implementation action plan to incorporate a Complete Streets approach into RPC's annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which will include providing technical assistance and training for member jurisdictions.

Regional Active Transportation Geodatabase

The Active Transportation Geodatabase contains geospatial data on existing and planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities across RPC's nine-parish service area. Although the geodatabase recently underwent a major overhaul, it is not yet comprehensive, and updates are ongoing as new data are provided by local jurisdictions and as comprehensive plans and corridor studies are completed.

Bike and Pedestrian Network and Planning Needs

While meaningful progress has been made to improve conditions for people walking and biking, safety challenges persist as further discussed later in this chapter. Many local networks remain fragmented, and state-owned corridors lacking bicycle and pedestrian accommodations continue to create significant barriers to comfortable and reliable active transportation. When RPC surveyed transportation system users as part of the MTP outreach effort, approximately 71% of respondents reported having no bike lanes or other bicycle infrastructure in their neighborhoods. Additionally, 59% said their communities lack sufficient sidewalks. When asked what would encourage more frequent bicycling as a means of transportation, most respondents pointed to the need for bike trails that are completely separated from streets, underscoring the challenges cyclists face when sharing roads with automobiles.

Over the next four years, the RPC intends to develop a more coordinated, data-driven, and impactful approach to improving bicycle and pedestrian connectivity throughout the region.

To address network gaps, the RPC plans to develop a comprehensive Regional Active Transportation Plan. A regional plan is needed to establish a shared vision for a safe, connected, and highly functional regional network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the MPA. The planning process should involve developing a comprehensive inventory of existing facilities, conducting a data-driven needs assessment, reviewing relevant best practices and case studies, and robust public engagement. Such efforts will support the creation of an unconstrained regional active transportation network and a tiered priority network that will guide future investment and implementation.

To ensure that future network improvements respond to actual user needs and to maximize the impact of active transportation investments, the region needs accurate and consistent data on walking and biking activity which allows governmental agencies to understand current usage patterns, identify high-demand corridors, and detect gaps or barriers in the network. Developing a regional bicycle and pedestrian count program is critical for planning and managing an effective active transportation network. A standardized, regionwide count program also enables benchmarking over time, supports grant applications, and helps communicate the benefits of active transportation to stakeholders and the public.

Finally, prioritizing economic impact studies for both existing and proposed regional trails is essential for demonstrating the broad value these facilities bring to local and regional economies. Trails generate economic activity by attracting visitors, supporting local businesses, increasing property values, and enhancing quality of life, all of which contribute to long-term community vitality. Economic impact analyses provide the data needed to quantify these benefits, helping policymakers, local governments, and funding partners make informed decisions about future investments. For existing trails, studies can capture the measurable return on past investments. For proposed trails, they strengthen the case for development by highlighting projected tourism impacts, job creation, and economic opportunities. The RPC could use these studies to help illustrate how a connected regional trail system not only supports mobility and recreation but also serves as a catalyst for economic growth.

What We Heard – MTP Survey

"We need safer walking improvements on major streets." *-Jefferson Parish Resident*

"I am a stay-at-home mom, I would love to walk and bike with my children, but drivers are very aggressive and that scares me." *-Terrytown Resident*

"We need more sidewalks with good lighting." *-Ponchatoula Resident*

4.2 Public Transportation

Transit plays a vital role in the Southeast Louisiana region, serving both urban and rural communities. The region is served by six public transit systems: Jefferson Parish (JP) Transit, the Regional Transit Authority (RTA), the River Parishes Transit Authority (RPTA), St. Bernard Urban Rapid Transit (SBURT), the Louisiana Gateway Port (LGP), and Tangi Transit. These agencies provide a range of services, including fixed-route buses, streetcars, ferries, and demand-response transit, with some overlap that enables regional connectivity.

Figure 27. Fixed-Route Transit Lines. *(Sources: LADOTD,2007; JP Transit, 2024; RTA, 2024; SBURT, 2025; Tangi Transit, 2025)*



Transit Ridership

Transit ridership in the region has shown steady recovery and growth since 2022. According to the FTA National Transit Database (NTD), fixed-route ridership increased from 13.6 million trips in 2022 to 15.9 million trips in 2024, a 16.6% increase. RTA bus ridership rose significantly from 7.35 million to 9.53 million trips, reflecting recovery from pandemic-related service disruptions. JP Transit ridership remained relatively stable at approximately 1.3 million annual trips. RTA Streetcar ridership peaked at 3.86 million trips in 2023 before declining to 3.5 million in 2024, likely due to infrastructure work and tourism fluctuations. RTA ferry ridership increased in 2023 before dropping in 2024, while LGP ferry ridership increased steadily over the three-year period. Demand response and paratransit ridership also increased from 298,435 in 2022 to 337,815 in 2024.

Table 15. Transit Ridership 2022-2024

ANNUAL UNLINKED PASSENGERS TRIPS BY TRANSIT MODE & PROVIDER (2022-2024, NTD)

FIXED ROUTE TRANSIT RIDERSHIP				
Mode	**Provider**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**
Bus	Regional Transit Authority (RTA)	7,352,374	8,726,500	9,526,069
	Jefferson Parish Transit	1,325,166	1,360,309	1,340,310
Streetcar	RTA	3,589,947	3,859,266	3,518,666
Ferry	RTA	849,429	967,648	836,782
	Louisiana Gateway Port (LGP)	477,166	555,015	629,214
TOTAL FIXED ROUTE		13,594,082	15,468,738	15,851,041
DEMAND RESPONSE & PARATRANSIT RIDERSHIP				
Mode	**Provider**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**
Demand Response & Paratransit	Regional Transit Authority (RTA)	192,737	229,227	224,511
	Jefferson Parish (JP) Transit	59,993	60,944	65,193
	St. Bernard Urban Rapid Transit (SBURT)	29,108	26,961	29,458
	River Parishes Transit Authority	16,597	18,799	18,653
	Tangipahoa Voluntary Council of Aging (TVCOA)	15,827	19,346	25,903
	St. Tammany Area Transportation	43,817	43,471	45,990
TOTAL DEMAND RESPONSE & PARATRANSIT		358,079	398,748	409,708

Sources: National Transit Database (NTD), 2024 (Published 2025)



Transit Access - Proximity

Transit access refers to the ease with which individuals can reach their desired destinations using the public transit system. Improved access expands personal mobility, increases choice, and supports greater economic opportunity. One common measure of transit accessibility is proximity to associated infrastructure—specifically, the number of residents living within a quarter- or half-mile of a route. These distances generally correspond to short walking or biking times to a transit stop. Access to transit via walking and bicycling infrastructure creates a connected, multimodal transportation network. These connections, often described as first-mile and last-mile trips, link travelers to and from transit routes and together with the transit trip, provide a seamless connection between origins and destinations for transit users.

On the Southshore, the fixed-route transit system covers Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard parishes. Approximately 707,744 (>83%) of residents within these three parishes live within a half-mile of a transit stop, indicating strong overall access. Another 517,660 (give %) reside within a quarter-mile of a stop. The smaller, fixed-route system on the Northshore, entirely within Tangipahoa Parish, services the municipalities of Hammond, Ponchatoula, and more recently, a route through the Town of Independence. The RPC estimates that 43,008 residents in Tangipahoa Parish live within at least half a mile of the parish's transit routes, and 24,481 residents live within a quarter mile, representing 32% and 18% of the total parish population, respectively.

The RPC also evaluated transit access for certain transit-dependent populations, including individuals living in poverty and households without access to a vehicle. A transit-dependent person relies on public transportation as their sole means of travel to primary needs and services due to a lack of personal vehicle, physical or cognitive disability, age, or financial limitations. As shown in Table X, approximately 87% of individuals living in poverty on the Southshore reside within a half mile of a transit route. However, roughly 21,190 individuals in this group remain outside these more accessible areas. In contrast, in Tangipahoa Parish, only 48% of individuals living in poverty reside within a half mile of a transit route, and 13,043 individuals experiencing poverty live outside of these accessible transit sheds.

Transit Access - Proximity Cont.

Household data also show that within the half-mile transit buffer on the Southshore, 37,596 households (12.95% of total households in the vicinity) do not have access to a vehicle. 30,869 households (14.44% of total households in the vicinity) within a quarter-mile of a transit line lack vehicle access. Of the total households in the entire Southshore region without access to a vehicle, 92% are located within at least a half mile of a transit line. In Tangipahoa, only 33% of the households without access to a vehicle live within at least a half mile of a transit line, a factor of more rural development character and lower population density. These findings underscore the importance of transit for nearby residents and highlight the need to expand accessibility to underserved populations located beyond typical walking and biking distances. They reinforce the need to strengthen first- and last-mile connectivity through creative strategies as well as improved infrastructure or services.

Table 16. Population and Households within ½ and ¼ mile of Public Transit

TRANSIT: DEMOGRAPHICS WITHIN A HALF AND QUARTER MILE OF TRANSIT LINE

SOUTHSHORE TRANSIT SERVICE AREA (Orleans, Jefferson Parish, and St. Bernard Parishes)						
Agency	Distance	Total Population	Population in Poverty*1	Total Households	Households with No Vehicle	Percent of Housaeholds with No Vehicle
RTA	0.5 mi	411,616	89,727	169,968	28,207	16.60%
	0.25mi	331,983	74,709	138,386	24,400	17.63%
JP	0.5 mi	380,591	67,663	159,029	16,697	10.50%
	0.25mi	214,142	40,634	89,094	9,350	10.49%
SBURT	0.5 mi	28,991	6,646	10,810	842	7.79%
	0.25 mi	14,226	3,112	5,339	407	7.63%
Southshore	0.5 mi	707,744	140,873	290,369	37,596	12.95%
	0.25 mi	517,660	108,680	213,769	30,869	14.44%
Outside .5 Buffer		144,947	21,190	57,480	3,171	5.52%
Total 3 Parishes		852,691	162,063	347,849	40,767	11.72%
NORTHSHORE TRANSIT SERVICE AREA (Tangipahoa Parish)						
Geographic Area	Distance	Total Population	Population in Poverty*1	Total Households (HH)	HH w/ No Vehicle	Percent HH w/ No Vehicle
Pochatoula	0.5 mi	9,820	1,780	3,965	198	4.99%
	0.25mi	6,233	1,126	2,557	126	4.93%
Independence	0.5 mi	13,037	4,654	4,624	261	5.64%
	0.25mi	6,622	2,464	2,408	136	5.65%
Hammond	0.5 mi	20,151	5,987	6,841	471	6.88%
	0.25 mi	11,625	3,638	4,074	280	6.87%
Northshore	0.5 mi	43,008	12,422	15,430	931	6.03%
	0.25 mi	24,481	7,229	9,039	543	6.01%
Outside 0.5 Buffer		92,210	13,043	34,761	1,837	5.28%
Tangipahoa Parish		135,218	25,465	50,191	2,768	5.51%

*1 Population in Poverty universe excludes children under the age of 15 who are not related to the householder, people living in institutional group quarters (e.g., nursing homes or correctional facilities), and people living in college dormitories or military barracks.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2019-2023

KEY TAKAWAYS

222,808

Total Households within a quarter (0.25) mile of transit stops for Northshore and Southshore regional area

Transit Availability



Total Population of people that have resoanble walking access to transit are within a half (0.5) mile of a transit stop inside the walkshed totaling (750,752) vs. outside of a transit walkshed totaling (237,157) for Northshore and Southshore regional area

31,412

Total of Households wih No Vehicles within a quarter (0.25) mile of transit stops in the Northshore and Southshore regional area

Figure 28. Areas within ¼ mile and ½ Mile of Public Transit. *(Source: RPC 2026)*



Transit Access – Trip Characteristics

Transit access cannot be measured by proximity to stops alone. The ease of use of a transit system is also impacted by other trip characteristics such as wait times, travel times, and number of transfers required. For this MTP, numerical data on these indicators were not available for analysis; however, qualitative input was collected from transit user groups and through the general MTP survey. Both transit users and operators identified inadequate service frequency as a significant constraint on service quality and overall system effectiveness. Further transit service gap analysis comparing areas with larger transit dependent populations against existing fixed-route frequencies, stop amenities, and other first/last mile access is needed to inform future improvements.

What We Heard – MTP Survey

"The bus comes so infrequently that I would have had to leave an hour early to get to work. It's crazy that I live only about 2 miles from work in the CBD and using public transit I would need to leave an hour before I need to be there. I can ride my bike there in 15-20 minutes. Public transit needs to be fast, efficient and reliable." -*New Orleans Resident*

"I would like to see more buses on the line and on time especially for women at night. Especially the Lapalco line." -*New Orleans Resident*

"Metairie buses do not come often enough." -*Metairie Resident*

"I want to see transit that St. Tammany likes, quite different from NOLA (pre-pay only, quiet A/C so that one can take a call, faster than biking)." -*Slidell Resident*

"Bus stops need more coverage/shelter for riders." -*Gretna Resident*





On-Demand Transit and Paratransit Services

In addition to the region's fixed-route transit network, several transportation service providers, human services agencies and organizations offer on-demand and paratransit transportation services to meet the needs of populations that may not be fully served by traditional transit including individuals with disabilities, older adults, or with limited income. See Table 17. The RPC's Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan is currently being integrated into a unified statewide plan led by the LADOTD, covering the state. This plan, expected to be adopted in the near term, will improve alignment between statewide mobility priorities and available funding opportunities. The statewide plan is informed by a collaboration of public, private, and nonprofit agencies representing older adults, individuals with disabilities, low-income populations, and other transportation-disadvantaged groups in the regional area.

Table 17. On-Demand and Paratransit Service in the Southeast Louisiana Region

Agency or Parish	Area of Service	Ridership Eligibility	Hours of Services	Fares	Reservations Requirements
Abundant Life ADHC	Orleans	Adults enrolled in Adult Day Health Care	M-F 7am–4pm	Medicaid waiver or private pay (cost varies)	Pre-arranged rides for program participants
Arc of St. Charles	St. Charles	Persons with disabilities	M-F 8:30am-2:30pm	Program-based	Enrollment required
Arc of Greater New Orleans	Multi-parish	Persons with disabilities	M–F 9am–4pm	Program-based	Enrollment required
Arc of St. John	St. John the Baptist	Persons with disabilities	M–F 7am–4pm	Free	Enrollment required
City of Westwego	Jefferson/ Westwego	Seniors & persons with disabilities	M–F	Not listed	Call scheduled rides
Crossroads LA	Orleans	Seniors & persons with disabilities	Not listed	Not listed	Call scheduled rides
Jefferson COA	Jefferson	Parish resident	M–F 8am–4pm	Not listed	Membership required
NOCOA	Orleans	Persons with disabilities & Age 65+	M–F 8am–4pm	Low-cost/Free for senior	Call ahead dial a ride
Plaquemines CAA	Plaquemines	Disability/medical condition	6:30am–5pm	No fare	Advance call-ahead Dial Service
River Parishes Transit	St. Charles/St. John the Baptist/St. James	General public	M–Sat 5am–7:30pm	$2	24 hours in advance
Starc Of LA	St. Tammany	Persons with disabilities	M–F 8:30am-2:30pm	Program-based	Enrollment required
St. John COA	St. John	Parish resident, seniors, Disability	M–F 8:30am–4:30 pm	Donation	Call ahead 24–48 hours. (Dial Service)
St. Tammany COAST/STAR	St. Tammany	Seniors, persons with disabilities, parish resident	Urban 7am–5pm; Rural 7am–4pm (M–F)	Distance-based $1.50–$4; reduced/free for seniors	Advance call-in required
St. James	St. James	Seniors, persons with disabilities	M–F 6am-5pm	Low-cost & donation (~$1-$5)	24 hours in advance (Dial Service)
St. Margaret's Daughters Home	Orleans	Residents only	24 hours (facility-based care)	Included in residential care (Medicare/Medicaid/private pay)	Transportation only for facility residents / scheduled care trips
St. Charles Council on Aging, Inc. (St. Charles Parish)	St. Charles	Seniors 60+ (and some disabled residents)	M–F 7:30am–2:30pm	free or donation-based	Dial-a-ride / advance scheduling required
TVCOA	Tangipahoa	Parish resident	M–Fi 7am–5pm	$9 (<60); donation 60+	24 hours in advance

Current Public Transit Planning and Policy

The RPC's primary role in transit planning is the distribution of FTA funding. Each year the FTA allocates urban areas with a formula-based amount of funds. As the designated recipient of FTA funds for our region, RPC must determine, through its planning process, how these funds are distributed among the region's transit providers. This planning process takes place through the TPC, the TAG, and the Transit Technical Advisory Group. In recent years the Southshore has received nearly $30 million in such funds; the Northshore nearly $5 million. The funds are mainly used for capital needs, such as maintenance and vehicle procurement.

The RPC also hosts the Coordinated Human Service Advisory Committee, made up of providers and non-profit service agencies. As part of the Coordinated Human Services Advisory process, the RPC identifies gaps in transit service throughout the region and works toward solutions that could fill those gaps.

Finally, the RPC has funded and carried out several regional transit planning efforts. New Links(2020) is a comprehensive operations analysis and network redesign for Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard parishes. Most often, such studies are focused on improving regional coordination. The MPO frequently assists regional transit agencies in their own planning efforts by providing demographic or other data analyses.

Public Transit Needs

Public transit needs fall into three broad categories: fleet maintenance and expansion, insufficient transit-focused infrastructure, and limited operational capacity. These regional challenges are often interconnected.

After Hurricane Katrina, local transit agencies were able to replace much of their vehicle fleets through federal emergency grants. Today, much of this fleet has reached the end of its useful life, and continual maintenance issues make it difficult to run service at full levels. These issues are compounded by the loss of an adequate workforce to perform critical maintenance functions.

A smaller transit fleet means less vehicles on the road, less capacity on routes, unreliable service, and decreased frequencies. A lack of transit-related infrastructure is also problematic. Few transit priority infrastructure, such as bus lanes or priority signals, exist in the region. Public transit must compete with other forms of traffic on highly contested rights-of-way. Slow or unreliable bus times leave riders waiting for their rides in often hostile conditions due to inadequate numbers of shelters or pedestrian infrastructure.

Maintaining an already depleted fleet and lack of transit infrastructure can be addressed, to a large extent, at the regional level. However, they are both tied to larger issues which are hardly exclusive to Southeast Louisiana: a lack of funding and inconsistent political willpower. Federal funds for transit are limited compared to the highway program. State provided funds for public transit in Louisiana rank near the bottom of the nation. Local funds are also limited, can be inconsistent, and must compete with other priorities.

Finally, cross parish trips can be difficult for riders to coordinate. Some parishes lack any form of substantial transit. As the regional population shifts geographically and post-Covid employment changes, the needs of riders do not. Addressing these challenges will require stronger coordination among local, state, and federal agencies to ensure that residents can access jobs, destinations, and essential services through an efficient, reliable, and humane transit system.



4.3 Roadways and Congestion

The roadway network forms the backbone of the regional transportation system, facilitating the movement of people and goods across multiple modes. Ensuring its ongoing maintenance, reliability, and efficient operation remains a central priority for the RPC.

Roadway Network

Approximately 12,000 miles of roadways serve the region. Of these, approximately 4,000 miles are eligible for federal funding programmed by the RPC, otherwise known as the Federal-Aid Network (see Figure 29). The network is determined using the Federal Functional Classification system, which establishes a road hierarchy used to set design standards, establish improvement priorities, and identify funding sources. All roads are classified as either Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, Collector, or Local, and are further categorized as Urban or Rural. Those classified as Urban Collector or higher are included in the Federal-Aid Network.

Roadways are also affected by their ownership. The state, parishes, municipalities, and independent agencies all own roads in the region. Each of these develops its own standards, maintains bridge and pavement preservation programs, and provides matching funds on Federal-Aid projects. Additional designations also affect the standards that apply to roadway design and maintenance. The most significant of these is the National Highway System (NHS), a subset of roadways designated by FHWA as being of national importance. NHS roadways must meet higher standards for design and construction than non-NHS routes. The Interstate system, included on the NHS, has additional requirements beyond the non-Interstate NHS.

Projects listed in **Appendix B** include all federally funded and/or regionally significant proposed facilities that will expand the existing network.

Figure 29. Federal-Aid Network (Source: LADOTD 2026)



Congestion

Roadway congestion is a primary factor leading to unreliable travel times. High levels of congestion lead to longer travel times for all motorized vehicles, including single occupant vehicles (SOVs), freight vehicles, and public transit. Congestion causes frustrated travelersand increases the potential for conflict between vehicles. Congestion is associated with higher emissions as vehicles idle or move slower than free flow speeds. Moreover, the National Performance Management Research Dataset (NPMRDS) estimates that delays on roadways across the region cost road users approximately $1.3 billion in 2025.

Figure 30 illustrates peak hour congestion speed on the major roadways as a percentage of free flow speed. The most severe congestion occurs in the urban core of New Orleans, particularly on the Pontchartrain Expressway and Crescent City Connection Bridge (US 90B). Additional hot spots include I-10 through Kenner, near Slidell, and in St. James Parish; US 190 in Covington and Hammond; and US 61 in Laplace and Gramercy. The data presented in Figure 30 is provided by the federally-funded NPMRDS program which collects and processes vehicular travel data on the nation's major roadways. While the NPMRDS is a valuable resource, the RPC recognizes that no single dataset or measure accurately reflects the complexity of congestion across the MPA. As such, many data sources are used to assess congestion, including additional analyses from NPMRDS, data collected directly by the RPC, and perhaps most critically, input from stakeholders and the public.

Chapter 5 details the federally-required performance metrics used to track regional congestion. They indicate that roadway congestion has remained relatively stable over the past several years; however, input from stakeholders and the public and more fine-grained GIS analysis, demonstrate that congestion is worsening in some areas. When asked what would improve their driving experience, over half (50.5%) of respondents from the Southeast Louisiana Regional Mobility Survey said less traffic congestion on interstates and freeways, and 40% noted less traffic on local streets. This is of particular concern in parishes with high levels of growth such as St. Tammany and Tangipahoa.

Figure 30. Regional Congestion (Source: NPMRDS 2025)



Current Congestion Management Process

SOV trips account for the largest share of personal travel in the region, where almost 75% of residents use driving as their primary means to work.[13] Ensuring that motorists can expect reliable travel times on roads and bridges that are in a state of good repair is and will continue to be a primary focus of 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 locations and reduction needs and recommends mitigation strategies. MPOs are required to establish a CMP by federal legislation (23 CFR § 450.322), and the RPC updates the process concurrently with each iteration of the MTP. Within the CMP, special emphasis is given to the Congestion Management Network (CMN), a subset of the Federal-Aid system that RPC has identified as being highly significant to regional mobility and accessibility. The CMP influences the MTP by providing location analysis that prioritizes congestion mitigation projects, and by suggesting reduction strategies. Mitigation strategies recommended by the CMP include:

- **Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO):** Strategies that enhance the efficiency of the transportation system through improved operations and management. These include: Access Management, which controls the entrance and exit of vehicles on the roadway; Operations Management, which optimizes the flow of vehicles on the roadway; Incident Management, which improves response to incidents such as crashes and disabled vehicles; and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), which use technology to improve roadway functionality.

- **Travel Demand Management (TDM):** Strategies that reduce the need for SOV travel. Such strategies include High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) usage; alternative work arrangements such as remote work; and increasing travel by walking, biking, and transit.

- **Capacity Increases:** This strategy increases the number of lanes on the roadway. While it may reduce congestion in the short term it often results in increased VMT and SOV use in the long term. It is also often more costly than other strategies. As such, the CMP specifies that capacity increases should only be considered when other congestion mitigation strategies have been shown to be insufficient to address the needs of a given corridor.





[13] U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, 2019-2023

State of Good Repair

It is critical to maintain a state of good repair (SGR) on roads and bridges ensuring the regional transportation system functions for all travelers. The majority of NHS roads and bridges, including Interstates, are in Good or Fair condition (see Chapter 5). However, stakeholders and the public frequently cite maintenance and poor condition as a major concern for non-NHS roads and bridges. When asked generally what would improve their driving experience, the majority (77.6%) of MTP survey respondents said, "roads in better condition." This is particularly true of locally-owned facilities, highlighting RPC's crucial role to ensure local governments access federal funding to maintain a state of good repair on the Federal-Aid Network.

Current Roadway Maintenance and State of Good Repair Practices

The RPC evaluates the need for roadway maintenance and repair through quantitative performance measures and stakeholder input. Road and bridge conditions are federally-required performance measures tracked by the RPC (further discussed in Chapter 5). The measures provide an overview of both regional and specific roadway conditions. Local and state partners provide further details about which roadwasy should be prioritized for repair. The partners are encouraged to utilize the RPC's resources to maintain the system in a SGR.

Roadway Needs

Moving forward, the RPC's roadway planning efforts will require balancing the needs of the whole region with the needs of diverse communities. Rapidly growing areas may require intense focus on proactive congestion mitigation, while highly developed communities may focus on maintaining existing infrastructure.

Future congestion management planning will rely on both quantitative analysis to identify locations where congestion is already severe and qualitative input from local experts to determine where congestion may increase due to changing land use patterns. These distinct needs will require solutions that are appropriate to their context. High congestion corridors may require large scale operational or capacity improvements. Northshore areas that are expected to seeresidential an dcommercial . Major industrial projects on the Southshore, may benefit from new infrastructure that enhances network connectivity and provides access via non-SOV modes. Relatively stable growth in highly developed communities such as Jefferson Parish and New Orleans introduces the opportunity to rethink existing infrastructure to respond to future needs. The roadway systems in these locations could be adapted to include green infrastructure systems that reduce flooding, or roadway capacity could be reduced via road diets to open up space for dedicated non-motorized or transit facilities. As the MPO, the RPC will be identifying and responding to these varying needs and opportunities, working with local and state partners to advance projects that address them.

Maintaining a SGR on the region's roadways will require a context-specific approach. In many cases, roadway ownership will determine the RPC's role in advancing maintenance and repair projects. On state-owned routes, particularly Interstates and the non-Interstate NHS, the RPC will support LADOTD by communicating local needs to the state and, following consultation with LADOTD, and including state-sponsored projects in the MTP and TIP. The RPC can serve a more direct role in keeping locally-owned Federal-Aid routes in good condition by working with local governments to proactively identify maintenance needs and program those into the MTP and TIP. Pavement monitoring and repair programs vary widely across the region's parishes and municipalities. Some communities routinely collect road condition data and use it to plan future maintenance projects, while others rely on local expertise to respond to repairs as needed. Regardless of individualprocesses, the RPC can support by helping to develop methods for cataloguing needs on locally-owned Federal-Aid routes and translating that information into federally-funded SGR future projects.

Future Travel Demand

The RPC Travel Demand Model estimates that total daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) will continue to grow from the current baseline to 2056. Regional VMT and VHT are forecast to grow by 26% and 25%, respectively. See Table 18.

Table 18. Travel Demand Forecast, VMT & VHT

FORECASTED DAILY 9-PARISH VMT AND VHT

2026 vs. 2056

METRIC	2026	2056	Percent Change
Daily VMT	39,843,509.05	50,272,427.57	26% ↑
Daily VHT	1,547,701.62	1,933,779.83	25% ↑

Source: RPC (2026). Southeast Louisiana Travel Demand Model (SELATRAM)

The forecasted VMT/VHT numbers above are presented with a few caveats:

1. The RPC's VMT estimates do not fully account for major disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic, and their potential long-term impacts to travel patterns.
2. VMT estimates are based on older baseline data (2012-2016 Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP)) and do not fully reflect regional changes in employment and population since 2015.
3. These numbers assume no further interventions to the transportation network; they do not account for potential changes in travel patterns due to work from home (WFH) and remote learning, emerging technologies, such as automated vehicles, which may impact VMT over the next 30 years.
4. VMT/VHT estimates are developed under a "no-build" scenario and do not account for infrastructure investments and programmatic interventions that may reduce VMT/VHT through operational improvements or mode shifts to transit, walking, or biking.

Future Travel Demand Cont.

Forecasted regional VMT and VHT growth is slightly outpaced by projected population growth, which is 33% by 2060, suggesting that vehicular congestion may stabilize or decrease over time. But as with population growth, the anticipated changes vary considerably by parish.

The greatest increases in VMT and VHT are predictably forecasted to occur in parishes with high projected population growth. However, many parishes with more moderate population projections are also forecasted to experience substantial VMT and VHT growth. In all instances, regional transportation planning should take these forecasts into consideration to ensure the roadway system continues to efficiently provide mobility and accessibility.

Figure 31. VMT, VHT, and Population Change, 2060





4.4 Safety

Ensuring the safety for all modes of the traveling public is one of the RPC's most important objectives. While preliminary strides in safety are starting to show improvements post-Covid, there is still considerable work to be done to improve safety on the transportation network. The RPC uses data provided by the LSU's Center for Analytics and Research in Transportation Safety (CARTS) to track safety metrics. CARTS disseminates traffic related data captured from Law Enforcement and other agencies. The RPC's safety planning program closely aligns with the strategies and recommendations outlined in LADOTD's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).

Total Fatalities and Serious Injuries

As shown in Figure 32, traffic fatalities within the region in the past two years have decreased from 220 fatalities in 2022 to 181 in 2024 (the most recent year crash data are available). Though alarmingly high compared to the region's low of 157 in 2017, these decreases may indicate a downward trend.

Traffic suspected serious injuries (SSI) within the region have dramatically increased in recent years, peaking at 1,054 in 2023. See Figure 33. It is important to note that a revision to the crash report that defined injury codes went into effect in late 2020 and a new crash reporting tool was rolled out in 2021, which included the new Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) injury definitions. With this revision increases in SSI's were expected as the new injury codes are more explicitly defined. Despite this, there is still considerable work to be accomplished to reduce the catastrophic consequences of these crashes.

Crash Data Note
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: This document and the information contained herein is prepared solely for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, and planning 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. 407. Contact the LADOTD Traffic Safety Office at (225) 379-1941 before releasing any information.

Figure 32. Traffic Fatalities, 2015-2024



Source: Center for Analytics & Research in Transportation Safety. (n.d.). 2026 HSIP target development tool for MPOs [Interactive dashboard]. CARTS Dashboard Server.
https://cartsdashboardserver.lsu.edu/t/CARTS/views/2026HSIPTargetDevelopmentToolforMPOsv1/TargetSettingTool?%3Adisplay_count=n&%3Aembed=y&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3AshowVizHome=n

Figure 33. Traffic SSI, 2015-2024



Source: Center for Analytics & Research in Transportation Safety. (n.d.). 2026 HSIP target development tool for MPOs [Interactive dashboard]. CARTS Dashboard Server.
https://cartsdashboardserver.lsu.edu/t/CARTS/views/2026HSIPTargetDevelopmentToolforMPOsv1/TargetSettingTool?%3Adisplay_count=n&%3Aembed=y&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3AshowVizHome=n

Crash Data Note
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: This document and the information contained herein is prepared solely for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, and planning 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. 407. Contact the LADOTD Traffic Safety Office at (225) 379-1941 before releasing any information.

Vulnerable Road User Fatalities and Serious Injuries

Vulnerable road users are defined as people walking, bicycling, using mobility aids (such as wheelchairs), or using micromobility devices (whether motorized or not), but not motorcyclists. The region has seen recent dramatic increases in non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries from 217 in 2022 to 282 in 2024. In 2019, Louisiana met the threshold to qualify for the FHWA Pedestrian Special Rule; in 2021, it was identified as a focus state for pedestrian fatalities, and by 2022 the state met non-motorized fatality thresholds to trigger the FHWA's Vulnerable Road User Special Rule. These special rules require the state and the region to complete additional analyses and dedicate Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) spending to vulnerable road users projects. It is the RPC's goal to use stakeholder input and data driven planning to identify and fund projects that can reduce these tragic crashes.

Figure 34. Non-Motorized Fatalities and Suspected Serious Injuries, 2015-2024



Source: Center for Analytics & Research in Transportation Safety. (n.d.). 2026 HSIP target development tool for MPOs [Interactive dashboard]. CARTS Dashboard Server. https://cartsdashboardserver.lsu.edu/t/CARTS/views/2026HSIPTargetDevelopmentToolforMPOsv1/TargetSettingTool?%3Adisplay_count=n&%3Aembed=y&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3AshowVizHome=n

Crash Data Note
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: This document and the information contained herein is prepared solely for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, and planning 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. 407. Contact the LADOTD Traffic Safety Office at (225) 379-1941 before releasing any information.

Fatalities on Locally Owned Roads and State-Owned Roads

Reducing fatalities and serious injuries requires cooperation and coordination between roadway owners and agencies responsible for behavior modification. Within the nine-parish RPC region, local roads (non-state owned and maintained) make up 65% of the roadway lane miles, yet only 26% of the fatalities take place on them. State-owned and maintained roadways account for 35% of the lane miles yet host 74% of the fatalities. These state-owned and maintained roads often handle the majority of daily traffic in the region. Therefore, the RPC will continue to work hand in hand with LADOTD to continue to fund and improve safety on the state owned and maintained roadways.

Figure 35. Fatalities on Local Versus State Roads



Source: Center for Analytics & Research in Transportation Safety. (2025). Crash reports: Section I – State routes, I1: Crashes, fatalities, alcohol, seatbelt use, intersection and roadway departure crashes on state highways, 2024. Louisiana State University. https://carts.lsu.edu/datareports/report/crash/; Center for Analytics & Research in Transportation Safety. (2025). Crash reports: Section I – State routes, I2: Crashes, fatalities, alcohol, seatbelt use, intersection and roadway departure crashes on local roads. Louisiana State University. https://carts.lsu.edu/datareports/report/crash/.

Crash Data Note
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: This document and the information contained herein is prepared solely for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, and planning 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. 407. Contact the LADOTD Traffic Safety Office at (225) 379-1941 before releasing any information.

Current Safety Policy, Planning, and Initiatives

The RPC's safety planning efforts take a comprehensive, proactive approach, accounting for many factors that influence transportation safety and engaging diverse partners to drive meaningful change. The RPC is currently implementing, and will continue to advance, the following policy and planning practices to address safety challenges effectively.

Safe Systems Approach

The Safe Systems Approach is holistic and comprehensive providing framework to create a safter the transportation network for people. It is a shift from a conventional safety approach because it focuses on both human mistakes and vulnerability and designs a system with redundancy to protect all users. The safe systems approach incorporates the following principles: Death and serious injury are unacceptable, humans make mistakes, humans are vulnerable, responsibility is shared, safety is proactive, and redundancy is crucial. The approach is implemented through safer people, safer vehicles, safer speeds, safer roads, and post-crash care.

Through its planning studies and programmatic work, the RPC will strive to create safer speeds, safer roads, and safer people. These can be achieved through feasibility studies that identify safety concerns and propose countermeasures to improve the safety for all, and especially vulnerable users. Regarding safer people, the RPC can examine the behavioral safety concerns discerned through crash data, public outreach and propose National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) identified countermeasures.

While the RPC has little ability to affect change in post-crash care and safer vehicles, it is committed to ensuring project management teams are multi-disciplinary and include the four E's (education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency services). The RPC will continue to collaborate with the regional and state Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) teams to further post-crash care and safer vehicle outcomes.

Operational Safety

Improving the operational safety of the region's transportation network continues to be a vital part of the work at the RPC. The RPC continues to use federal funds to support the Motorist Assistance Patrol (MAP) on the interstate system. MAP responds to every incident by first protecting the scene and then providing services to remove obstacles and allow traffic to flow again. This reduces the frequency of secondary crashes which often lead to additional fatalities and serious injuries.

Coordination

Coordination and collaboration are fundamental to reducing fatalities and serious injuries on the transportation network. The RPC regularly engages with the state, and its parishes municipalities on safety-related issues and regularly attends both the state and regional strategic highway safety plan meetings. Additionally, the RPC acts as a regional point of contact for crash data and safety analysis for the region's agencies. The mission is continuing to encourage the use of safety data to help inform transportation decisions throughout the region.

Integration of Safety into All Planning Activities

The RPC takes a proactive approach to incorporating safety throughout the agencies' planning and programmatic work. Planning projects integrate specific safety network screening tools, aligned with the SHSP. These tools include LADOTD's High Potential for Safety Improvement list, Roadway Departure Implementation Tool, Pedestrian Study, Active Transportation Planning Tool, and the CARTS crash query tool. In addition to network screening tools, extensive use of crash data is used and analyzed to inform project recommendations. This ensures that each project has an emphasis on reducing fatalities and serious injuries on the transportation network.

Past and Current Safety Plans and Studies

Path To Zero Safe Streets and Roads for All Regional Action Plan: The RPC completed a regional action plan for the parishes of St. Tammany, Tangipahoa, and St. John the Baptist as part of the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) program introduced in the IIJA. This regional action plan identifies actionable behavioral and infrastructure-based safety countermeasures. Special care was made to integrate a public health methodology into the plan to help inform behavioral countermeasure recommendations.

South Range Road Operations Study: This study examined the specific operating conditions and nearby trip generating land uses of the intersection of Old Covington Hwy. and S. Range Rd. in the Hammond area of Tangipahoa Parish. It identified conceptual, feasible improvements that would enhance operations for all roadway users, including a roundabout, marked crosswalks, pedestrian refuge islands, ADA compliant ramps, and sidewalks.

New Orleans East Service Roads: This study analyzed the I-10 service roads between Dwyer Road and the I-510 interchange, a corridor with a high concentration of bicycle and pedestrian crashes. Identified by the City of New Orleans and the RPC as a major barrier to active transportation, the study proposed safety improvements including shared-use paths, ADA ramps, crosswalks, pedestrian countdown signals, and three pedestrian bridges to better connect communities on both sides of the interstate.

Additional Needs for Safety Planning

A central objective for the RPC over the next four years is to improve transportation system safety by reducing serious injuries and fatalities among all users, both motorists and non-motorized travelers. Public input gathered through the MTP survey underscores the urgency of this goal, with roadway safety and bicycle and pedestrian safety identified among the most frequently cited concerns. Survey respondents consistently emphasized the need for safer and more accessible pedestrian crossings, particularly along major corridors where current conditions are perceived as hazardous. The RPC recognizes these concerns as critical and will work with partners to prioritize strategies and investments that respond directly to public input and improve overall safety outcomes.

In addition to the safety policy and planning practices described above, the RPC has identified several key planning resources needed to advance safety improvements across the region. First, to strengthen a data-driven approach to decision making, the RPC will develop a High Injury Network (HIN) for each parish within the metropolitan planning area. At present, a HIN has been established only for the three parishes that participated in the Regional SS4A effort; expanding this network to all nine RPC parishes will significantly improve the ability of the RPC and its local partners to identify, prioritize, and address high-risk locations across the transportation network.

Further, the RPC will work closely with LADOTD safety section to ensure the most up to date crash data and roadway data are employed in any analysis undertaken. Improved data integration will support more informed and effective decision when planning and implementing safety improvements. Finally, the RPC will continue to prioritize the safety of vulnerable road users by incorporating dedicated safety screening tools, robust crash analysis, industry best practices, and ensuring consistent consideration of these users in feasibility studies and project development.

4.5 Inter-Regional Transportation

Air

The Louis Armstrong New Orleans International Airport (LANOIA) is the region's primary commercial passenger airport. Following years of steady growth, passenger travel through LANOIA dropped significantly at the outset of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. However, travel has largely rebounded to pre-pandemic levels in recent years.

Figure 36. Passengers at LANOIA



Source: Center for Analytics & Research in Transportation Safety. (2025). Crash reports: Section I – State routes, I1: Crashes, fatalities, alcohol, seatbelt use, intersection and roadway departure crashes on state highways, 2024. Louisiana State University. https://carts.lsu.edu/datareports/report/crash/; Center for Analytics & Research in Transportation Safety. (2025). Crash reports: Section I – State routes, I2: Crashes, fatalities, alcohol, seatbelt use, intersection and roadway departure crashes on local roads. Louisiana State University. https://carts.lsu.edu/datareports/report/crash/.

Additional private and charter air passenger facilities in the region include Hammond North Shore Regional Airport, St. Tammany Regional Airport, Slidell Municipal Airport, Port of South Louisiana Executive Regional Airport, and the New Orleans Lakefront Airport. In addition to general aviation facilities, Alvin Callendar Field, a large military airport at the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve, is located in Belle Chasse. There are 21 other private airports, 45 private heliports in the area, and seven private seaplane bases in the region.

Intercity Passenger Rail and Bus

Federally funded passenger rail service operated by Amtrak is provided daily from New Orleans to Chicago (City of New Orleans line), three times per week to Los Angeles (Sunset Limited line), and daily to New York through Washington DC (Crescent line). The City of New Orleans line stops in Hammond and the Crescent line stops in Slidell. A recent success is the August 18, 2025 restart of the Mardi Gras service line between New Orleans and Mobile, 20 years after Hurricane Katrina suspended long-distance service into Florida. The new service is no longer a part of the Amtrak long-distance route, but now a state-supported service running two round trips daily. Funding is composed of a Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Restoration and Enhancement grant to support operating costs over the first three years. The service carried nearly 19,000 passengers in just over four months of operation in 2025.[14] Passenger rail travel through New Orleans increased 11% from 2024 to 2025, and ridership through Hammond and Slidell increased by 1% and 23%, respectively, over the same period.[15]

The Southern Rail Commission (SRC) for Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi (established in 1982 as an interstate compact), leads efforts to fund and plan for the future of intercity passenger rail for Louisiana but with fluctuating support from federal, state and local administrations. In 2022, the Louisiana legislature authorized $12.5 million of state funds for planning and environmental work for intercity service between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. This effort is an important first step to fulfill regional multimodal goals but requires a state commitment for engineering, infrastructure investments, and operating expenses, all of which historically face uncertain support and financial challenges.

Intercity bus service is provided by Greyhound and Flixbus from New Orleans, Reserve, and Slidell. These services provide an important, low-cost option for traveling to destinations nationwide. They can also offer congestion relief by reducing SOV travel on major routes such as I-10 between New Orleans and Baton Rouge. Multiple respondents to the RPC's public survey mentioned a desire for more multimodal connections to Baton Rouge, and while there was a frequently stated preference for rail connections, intercity bus service can fulfill some of the demand.

Union Passenger Terminal

The New Orleans Union Passenger Terminal (NOUPT) is the region's hub of long-distance passenger rail and bus operations. Intermodal connections at the UPT include the Rampart streetcar line, multiple RTA and JP Transit bus lines, and a Blue Bikes bikeshare hub. In 2017, the FRA awarded a State of Good Repair Grant to NOUPT for improvements to ADA accessibility and other updates. The grant was rescoped in 2024 to respond to changing needs but is still expected to bring significant improvements to the station, including enhanced accessibility.

[14] Amtrak (2025). Amtrak FY25 Ridership. https://media.amtrak.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/FY25-Year-End-Ridership-Fact-Sheet.pdf
[15] Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2025). Amtrak Ridership. https://www.bts.gov/browse-statistical-products-and-data/state-transportation-statistics/amtrak-ridership



4.6 Freight

Planning for the flow of freight, while taking into account all other modes of transportation, is a key focus area for the RPC. The movement of freight through the Southeast Louisiana region is a critical part of the region's transportation system and economy. In 2024, approximately $38 billion worth of commodities were exported through the region and $21 billion were imported, representing approximately one third of all imports and exports statewide.[16] Due to its location on the lower Mississippi River, the region moves grain, coal, crude oil and other bulk products through five ports. The region is home to the largest tonnage port in the nation, the Port of South Louisiana, and the largest container port in Louisiana, the Port of New Orleans (Port NOLA). There is significant barge and tow traffic as well as foreign flag vessels, six Class I railroads, and two Class III railroads. The National Highway System (NHS) and National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) serve all the major terminals, warehouses and local businesses and the air freight market based out of the LANOIA. Figure 37 illustrates the major freight facilities in the region. In addition to these, the region is also home to numerous supporting facilities, including nearly 2.5 million square feet of warehousing.[17]

[16] Freight Analysis Framework (FAF) (2024). Import and Export Flows by M-Dollar Value.
[17] DatabaseUSA (2024). NAICS Code 49: Warehousing Square Footage.

Maritime

The region is located along the 168 Mississippi River miles above head of passes (AHP) and drives a large maritime presence and active multimodal environment. The Southeast Louisiana region has four deep water ports, each entity offering services that suit their landside operations and location. The **Port of South Louisiana** serves approximately 54 river miles and includes St. James, St. John the Baptist, and St. Charles parishes. Facilities predominantly handle grain, chemical, steel, petroleum, and aluminum. The **Port of New Orleans**, the only container facility in the region, has a 34-river mile, three-parish jurisdiction covering Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard parishes. The Port of New Orleans is currently working with the Corp of Engineers (USACE) to permit a new primary facility in St. Bernard Parish called the Louisiana International Terminal (LIT), which would significantly expand container capacity and resolve insufficient height to navigate under the Crescent City Connection Bridge for larger ships. Recent designs show that the new terminal would have 3,600 feet of wharfage, one container-on-barge berth, and two berths with up to 24,000 TEU capacity.

The **St. Bernard Port and Terminal District** hosts the only deep-draft, calm water slip on the river and covers 10 river miles overlapping with the Port of New Orleans. Two major refineries are served by the ports' ship traffic. The Port also offers mid-streaming services and dry-bulk and general warehousing. The **Louisiana Gateway Port** (previously Plaquemines Port, Harbor & Terminal District), with territory from river mile 81 to mile 0, recently established a major Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) plant on site. Annual capacity forecasts approximately 875 LNG export vessels and a facility expansion is in the permitting process.

Rail

There are six Class I railroads operating in the region across approximately 500 miles of track. The two most active railroads, **Norfolk Southern (NS)** and **Union Pacific (UP)**, plan to merge following approval of the Surface Transportation Board (STB). This would create a massive east-west transcontinental service. The merger could support improved train efficiency and capacity for train movements across the southernmost Mississippi River crossing, the Huey P Long Bridge. The **Canadian Pacific Railroad** officially merged with the **Kansas City Southern Railroad** in April 2023 making it the first Mexico-Canada rail network in the U.S., now named **CPKC**. The **Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF)** yard is on the west bank and coordinates movements with the UP Avondale Yard. The **CSX** railroad operates along the Gulf Coast between New Orleans and Florida.

Two local Class III railroads also operate in the region: the **New Orleans Public Belt Railroad** which is owned by and serves the Port of New Orleans over 26 miles of track along the Mississippi river, and The **New Orleans Gulf Coast Railroad (NOGC)** which operates over 32 miles of track on the west bank in Jefferson and Plaquemines parishes. An expansion of rail track is in preliminary design along the industrial Peters Road corridor which would create a shorter route through Jefferson Parish and reduce the number of rail/highway intersections. In a separate effort, the NOGC plans to extend track 10 miles to reach the Louisiana Gateway Terminal in Plaquemines Parish, which is not currently rail served.

Aviation

The Louis Armstrong New Orleans International Airport is the major hub for air cargo in the region. Although it makes up less than one percent of all regional freight, it is a vital component, moving high value, light weight goods. In 2022, 2023, and 2024 domestic freight originating in the region decreased 16% from 58,756,927 pounds to 46,172,823.[18] This follows national trends. In 2024, an additional 55,068 pounds of air cargo went to international destinations. Nationally, inbound international freight has historically been higher than outbound international freight. The imbalance grew from 32.2% in 2014 to 75.3% in 2023. Since 2002, the top freight and mail carriers at LANOIA include Federal Express, Sun Country, United Parcel Service, and Southwest Airlines.

Trucking

Motor carriers have the greatest flexibility providing pick-up and delivery for rail, ships, air, and pipelines as well as serving local businesses. Year over year, the value by volume of product moved by trucks consistently outpaces the value of goods moving by other modes in the region. The high number of major intermodal nodes in the region produces a need for short haul movements related to port and rail intermodal drayage. Local owner or leased operators with one to three trucks predominate in the region. Medium-size fleets serve industries related to oil and gas, equipment, beverage, construction, lumber, towing, and moving. There are fewer than twenty fleets with one hundred or more trucks. They serve beverage delivery, construction, utilities, food services, and truck leasing.

FHWA designates key freight trucking corridors on the NHFN. This allows FHWA to strategically direct federal resources and policies to improve the freight roadway network. It further designates a subset of the NHFN as the Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS), which are the most critical portions of the freight highway network. Non-PHFS roadways on the NHFN are considered to be important links connecting PHFS roadways. Within the MPA there are approximately 217 miles of roadways on the PHFS and an additional 71 miles of non-PHFS roadways.

Pipeline

Extensive gas and hazardous pipeline mileage exist in the New Orleans region, due to prolific natural gas production fields located in Louisiana and surrounding states. Pipelines power regional natural gas distribution companies, municipalities, and large industrial facilities which have located near this accessible energy source. The greatest pipeline mileage is found across the Southshore parishes. A new LNG plant opened at the Louisiana Gateway Terminal in March 2025. It is served by interstate and intrastate pipelines as part of a supply link to Plaquemines LNG export facility and the U.S. Gulf Coast export chain.

[18] Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2026). Aviation Facts and Figures, T100 Traffic - Market Data - Freight (pounds). https://data.bts.gov/stories/s/Freight/9q4x-3dwy

Figure 37. Major Freight Facilities. *Sources: Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) (2019), Intermodal Freight Facilities; LADOTD (2026), Ports of Louisiana; National Transportation Atlas Database (NTAD) (2024), North Americal Rail Network Lines; FHWA (2025), National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)*



Current RPC Freight Planning & Initiatives

Due to the strong presence of multiple freight modes and the high degree of interdependence among closely connected modal networks, multimodal freight planning in the Southeast Louisiana region is complex. The slower speed of public sector investment in roadways, rail crossings, and other infrastructure contrasts with demand-driven, quick-response decisiveness needed in the freight industry, a largely private marketplace. The public sector role is limited, but important, in removing a degree of risk to create a stable playing field for business development through regulation, targeted support, and for the RPC, optimization of planning work and projects that meet public goals.

To address these issues as they apply to the region, the RPC created a Freight Mobility Plan in 2022. The 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 overarching goals of the MTP, ensuring that future freight projects and planning contribute to the region's overall transportation vision. The RPC 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. The Freight Roundtable provides valuable insight into current marketplace influences and transportation needs. The RPC's freight planning activities also align with LADOTD's 2024 Louisiana State Freight Plan, which similarly recognizes the trends, opportunities and needs identified by the regional Freight Mobility Plan.[19]

Regional Freight Needs

Building on the 2022 Freight Mobility Plan and acknowledging the complex interplay between public and private stakeholders, the RPC has identified three priority areas for near-term regional freight planning. These priorities include improving safety and reducing delays at rail crossings, addressing the shortage of truck parking, and responding to evolving economic trends and challenges.

Rail Crossings

Traffic delays and vehicle crashes at rail crossings are an ongoing problem. Highway/rail grade separation projects have been identified in several parishes, but these require additional development and substantial funding. Existing grade separated infrastructure, built in the 1950's and particularly in Orleans Parish, needs assessment and attention.

Truck Parking

Adequate security and truck parking spaces are a large concern for truck drivers. To accommodate hours of service regulation for long-haul motor carriers, more parking along the interstate is needed. At interior urban locations, to meet local business hours of operation for short- and long-haul drivers, more stage parking is needed. With the acceleration of e-commerce and more demand for warehousing, staging , and parking spaces, considering staging locations in urban and suburban zones, researching parking and staging requirements in local zoning codes are needed. Parking is a local land use issue and requires local governments to enact ordinances, allowing for the accommodation of commercial truck parking on specific parcels or zoning districts.

[19] LADOTD (2024). Louisiana State Freight Plan. https://latransportationplan.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/DOTD-State-Freight-Plan-Final-1.pdf

Regional Freight Needs Cont.

Other Economic Trends and Challenges

The agglomeration of container traffic destined for large fulfillment centers is a major concern. Often over 800,000 square feet in size, for single users such as Walmart or Amazon, those influence ship routes and schedules. The lack of a major distribution center in the region or state is blamed, in part, for the reduction of imported containers and a regional imbalance of exports (65-70%) to imports (30 to 35%). The loss of imports triggers a shortage in available containers and additional costs to bring empty containers back to the region. This hampers regional business. Meanwhile, growing populations on the Northshore and expanding industry in the river parishes will require increased warehousing and freight accommodations upriver and along the I-12 corridor. Alabama and Texas ports have successfully attracted this business. The RPC could review adjacent state processes in an effort to resolve this costly issue.

In 2025, federal policy imposed higher tariffs on imports to incentivize reshoring of American companies. Other policies stipulated higher anchorage fees on ships built or owned by China to rejuvenate American ship building, exercising both punitive and negotiation power with China and other selected countries. The tariff fluctuations and the introduction of ship fees caused uncertainty in markets affecting freight logistics and modal pricing worldwide, and triggered commodity instability for agriculture and other industries. Regionally, all associated freight industries must work to manage this risk.





4.7 Emerging Technologies

As new technologies emerge to enhance the movement of people and goods, the RPC is committed to ensuring that the regional transportation network can adapt to and accommodate these advancements safely. The RPC works to proactively anticipate and integrate innovative solutions that strengthen system performance and regional connectivity, by partnering with LADOTD as well as other applicable stakeholders. However, the RPC recognizes that many emerging technologies rely on a well-maintained transportation system for effective deployment; therefore, maintaining assets in a state of good repair remains the highest priority.

Connected and Automated Vehicles (CAV)

Connected and automated vehicles (CAVs) offer potentially transformative and far-reaching impacts to the transportation system. Connected vehicles are vehicles equipped with wireless communication technologies that enable them to exchange information with other vehicles as well as with surrounding networks or infrastructure over short- to medium-range distances. Automated vehicles are any vehicle equipped with automated driving systems (ADS), which are hardware and/or software capable of performing one or more operational driving tasks, such as steering, accelerating, or braking, without human intervention.

Advancements in CAV technology, research, and regulation are occurring rapidly. These technologies may present significant potential benefits, including improved safety (crash prevention), expanded mobility(older adults, individuals with disabilities, and others who face barriers to driving), as well as greater efficiency in the movement of goods. However, they may also introduce a range of challenges, including increased traffic demand, potential impacts on air quality, and heightened risks related to cybersecurity, among others.

The state of Louisiana is one of several states that have enacted CAV legislation to allow these vehicles to operate commercially on public roads. The main CAV efforts in Louisiana stem from two legislative bills. In 2018, the Louisiana legislature authorized vehicular platooning allowing non-lead motor vehicles to follow other motor vehicles in a platoon closely utilizing vehicle-to-vehicle communication technology.[20] In 2019, they enabled autonomous commercial motor vehicles subject to several operational and reporting requirements. Autonomous commercial vehicles were defined as those “used in commerce to transport passengers or property.” This Act also stipulated that the LADOTD shall be the sole and exclusive agency with jurisdiction over autonomous commercial vehicles and automated driving systems.[21]

In Louisiana, autonomous vehicles are largely in the research and early deployment stages; however, market integration is expanding rapidly across the United States. As of 2026, the autonomous vehicle company Waymo is testing its technology in New Orleans. Waymo is a “robotaxi” company that develops and operates fully autonomous, driverless ride-hailing services.

The RPC is committed to staying current on the integration of connected and automated vehicle (CAV) technologies by collaborating with the LADOTD’s CAV Working Group, monitoring developments in technology deployment, and leveraging existing data tools to assess potential impacts. The RPC will also engage local jurisdictions to ensure that stakeholders are informed of the latest developments in CAV technologies, including their anticipated community benefits, limitations, and associated challenges in both urban and rural areas.

[20] Act 310 2018 Regular Session
[21] Act 232 2019 Regular Session

Electric Vehicles

Electric vehicle (EV) registration has grown in the region since 2017 with significant increases since 2021.[22] This trend is tracked via EV registration data, which reflects an increasing adoption in EVs nation-wide. Federal tax credits that provided up to a $7,500 credit for eligible EVs ended in September 2025 which may affect registration increases. However, registration data for 2025, not yet available, will provide clarity on how these credits affect EV adoption. National EV sales already indicate a reduction in EVs for 2026.[23] Still, fluctuations in fuel prices and the availability of fuels may positively influence the purchase of EVs in the near future.

Figure 38. Electric Vehicle Registration in Southeast Louisiana



Source: National Lab of the Rockies, Experian Information Solutions.

EV Readiness GIS App

To help guide EV planning in the region, the RPC hosts an EV Readiness GIS App that includes EV Registration data with additional transportation and demographic layers.

CLICK HERE TO SEE THE EV READINESS GIS APP

[22] Vehicle Registration Counts Derived by the National Lab of the Rockies, Experian Information Solutions
[23] https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=67144#

EV Expansion

To support the expansion of EV adoption, the region will need sufficient charging infrastructure to support both local and through traffic. EV registrations in the region currently account for less than 1% of total registrations. To support 1% or more of registered EVs to match the national adoption rate, the region would need approximately 10,000 chargers.[24] The majority of these (95%) would be residential chargers, but the region would also need 16 public DC fast charging ports and 269 public Level 2 charging ports. With these estimates, the region's current less than 150 total public chargers do not meet the needs to support EV expansion.[25]

Continued coordination among utilities, local governments, and private-sector partners will be essential to ensure that infrastructure deployment keeps pace with vehicle adoption. Funding for infrastructure and vehicles will also greatly influence implementation. The RPC plans to continue to facilitate its EV working group, the Regional EV Readiness Roundtable, to convene stakeholders, enhance coordination, support more targeted EV infrastructure investments through the adoption of a regional EV readiness plan, and stay informed on evolving regulatory and market conditions.

[24] National Lab of the Rockies' Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Projection tool, EVI-Pro, https://afdc.energy.gov/evi-x-toolbox#/evi-pro-ports?region_type=cbsa&charging-state=LA&cbsa-id=25220&vehicles=1100
[25] Department of Energy's Alternative Fuel Data Center Alternative Fueling Station Locator, https://afdc.energy.gov/stations#/find/nearest

4.8 Transportation Resilience

Transportation Resilience Planning

To address vulnerabilities in the transportation system, particularly those posed by weather-related hazards, the RPC developed the region's first transportation resilience improvement plan in early 2026, recognizing this effort as a critical step toward a more secure and adaptive future. This plan, the Transportation Risk and Infrastructure Protection Plan (TRIP), follows recent guidelines issued through FHWA's Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation Program (PROTECT). PROTECT provides funding for transportation projects that improve the resilience of the transportation network, both hard infrastructure improvements and nature-based solutions.

Following federal guidance, the TRIP identifies the greatest natural hazards in the region and analyzes the vulnerability of transportation assets to these hazards. This plan includes a transportation vulnerability assessment calculated via the FHWA's Vulnerability Assessment Scoring Tool (VAST) to analyze roads and bridges against hazards. The VAST analysis creates a score for transportation assets that may indicate where infrastructure improvements are needed. Figure 39 provides a simplified example of how VAST creates scores for assets like roads and bridges. VAST scores provide a high-level, initial assessment of potential vulnerabilities on the transportation system to various hazards and may be used to identify vulnerable locations. Future transportation studies can analyze the vulnerability scores to help identify and prioritize projects. The vulnerability assessment could be applied to all RPC projects to measure the vulnerability of an asset against other similar assets in the same jurisdiction to identify whether resilience improvements could improve the asset. The plan also includes a list of priority projects and strategies that reflect the region's identified needs, incorporating both projects currently included in the TIP and new projects submitted by stakeholders for future review, development, and potential programming in the MTP and TIP.

Figure 39. Simplified Example of VAST Calculation of Bridge Vulnerability to Storm Surge



To keep the plan updated and ensure additional projects are identified, the RPC plans an on-going review of resilience projects. The tools used to create vulnerability assessments, such as the VAST analysis, can also be applied to other transportation projects to determine the overall risk and vulnerability of planned projects. The analysis gives the RPC a quantitative measure for identifying vulnerabilities that can then be further reviewed and shared with partner agencies.

TRIP Incorporation Into MTP

The TRIP complements and supports the goals and recommendations of the MTP, and its implementation will lead to a transportation system that better serves the region. As such the TRIP, including its assessments, recommendations, and priority projects, is incorporated into the MTP by reference. Projects listed in the TRIP are not fiscally constrained and should be considered illustrative until they are further developed and added to the MTP or TIP via amendment. As stated in the TRIP, the RPC may modify the plan as needed to "add, remove, or change information, including amendments to projects." Any modifications made to the TRIP following adoption of the MTP are also incorporated into this plan by reference.

Transportation Resilience Needs

The region recognizes its vulnerability to extreme weather and flooding. Parts of the transportation network are at greater risk due to locations such as outside the hurricane protection system. The social vulnerability of residents, including factors like low income, limited access to vehicles, age, disability, and language barriers further increases the region's risk. Many local leaders noted that street flooding was a top transportation challenge facing parish and municipal governments today. Across the region, there is a need to retrofit infrastructure and improve stormwater drainage via natural systems or increased drainage capacity. Addressing these challenges is essential to strengthening and adapting our regional transportation to withstand future extreme weather events.

Funding remains one of the largest hurdles for continuing sustainability and resilience work. To date, much of the funding for resilience-related transportation planning and implementation has come from competitive discretionary grant programs. While resilience projects can be funded through MPO-attributable transportation funds such as STBG, those projects must then compete for funding against other more immediate transportation needs. Many of the objectives of the TRIP also require additional discretionary funding outside of formula funding to coordinate and facilitate policies and programming across local jurisdictions.

The RPC continues updating and improving the TRIP by identifying better data sources to potentially expand the types of assets and hazards analyzed. Improved flood and subsidence data could help better illustrate localized flooding issues. An analysis of vulnerable populations will also improve the TRIP by identifying which communities need additional resilience efforts. Tailoring the RPC's SVI to include environmental hazards and overlaying with the VAST could help determine populations and areas of the region that need additional resources and mitigation efforts.

With future expectations of worsening weather due to climate change, potential land loss, and sea level rise, the RPC will also need to coordinate evacuation and recovery efforts at a higher level to ensure adaptation efforts include climate considerations. Coordination amongst parishes, state and federal agencies will be needed.

What We Heard – SELA Mobility Survey

"My area needs flood protection from flooding streets that become inaccessible to drive on." - *Plaquemines Parish Resident*

"More trees and plants to make walking more pleasant and to help reduce flooding." - *Metairie Resident*

05 System Performance

Performance Measures and System Performance Report



This chapter discusses the RPC's performance-based planning and programming process, detailing current performance measures and targets as well as reporting on current system performance with the latest available data.

5.1 Performance-Based Planning and Programming

Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) is an approach adopted by the FHWA, FTA, state DOTs, transit agencies, and MPOs to use quantitative and other data to strategically direct transportation decision making. PBPP is a systematic, evidence-based approach to integrating data into the transportation planning process at all levels, from concept to design to implementation. PBPP is intended to support, not supplant, the decision-making roles and responsibilities of the general public, elected officials, or technical experts.

The use of PBPP by MPOs is formally codified by the IIJA (23 CFR Part 490), which requires MPOs and State DOTs to identify quantitative targets for several performance measures within five key policy areas: roadway safety; roadway infrastructure condition; roadway system performance and freight movement; Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ); and transit asset management.[26]

LADOTD is required to establish statewide targets for each roadway-related measure; the RPC may choose to adopt these or develop its own targets. The transit providers within the region similarly establish their own targets for measures and the RPC, in coordination with the providers, develops regional targets. Safety performance targets are updated annually, and the RPC has done so via MTP amendment each year since 2019. Other performance measures are updated every four years. The previous round was last updated in 2023, and the next round of targets for those measures will be included as an amendment to the MTP in 2027.

[26] 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

5.2 Safety Performance

Safety Performance Measures

Performance measures defined by the IIJA 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.

Each measure includes fatalities and/or serious injuries that occur on any roadway in the MPA (including non-Federal Aid roads).

Safety Performance Report

Safety targets for the New Orleans MPA were first established in January 2018 and have since been updated annually thereafter. For each year, the RPC has adopted the same targets as LADOTD – a 1% annual reduction in all measures. The base comparison period comprises an average of the most recent five calendar years (prior to the target year) for which data is available. Current targets were set in 2026, with 2024 as the most recent data available; therefore, the base period 2020-2024. The measures, base values, and target values are listed in Table 19.[27] Note that the targets reflect two years of change from the base: a 1% reduction in 2025 and a further 1% reduction in 2026.

Table 19. Regional Safety Targets

SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA
2026 SAFETY TARGETS

Statistic	2026 Baseline (2020-2024 Average)	Targeted Annual Change*	2026 Target (2022-2026 Average)
Number of Fatalities	195	-1%	191
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million VMT	1.48	-1%	1
Number of Serious Injuries	781	-1%	765
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT	5.92	-1%	6
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	208	-1%	204

Source: LADOTD

*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%).

[27] 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.

Safety Performance Report Cont.

The region failed to achieve its safety targets for most measures from 2020 to 2024. See Figure 40. The year-over-year percent change for serious injuries, serious injury rate, and non-motorized fatalities or serious injuries increased from less than 5% to over 10% per year. However, the number of fatalities and fatality rate exceeded the target by decreasing 3%, despite an overall increase in VMT. The RPC and its partners will continue to implement safety projects with the intention of decreasing these harmful statistics; to continue trending in the safer directions. Meeting safety targets is impacted by the length of time required to implement infrastructure-based safety improvements. The measures focus on year-over-year change, but projects take years to complete. The decreasing fatality measures may reflect the increased focus on safety performance, beginning in 2018 and emphasized in the previous 2022-adopted MTP.

Figure 40. Safety Performance, 2020-2024



5.3 Road and Bridge Condition

Road and Bridge Condition Performance Measures

The performance measures 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.

Performance Report – Pavement Condition

States are required to set two- and four-year targets for each measure; MPOs must set four-year targets and may either adopt the state targets or set their own. The most recent targets were developed in 2022 and formally adopted in 2023. Targets will be updated in 2026 and adopted via MTP amendment in 2027. The 2022 targets were created when the RPC served four separate MPAs: Mandeville-Covington, New Orleans, Slidell, and South Tangipahoa. These are now consolidated into a single MPA. The targets presented in this plan reflect that consolidation and indicate combined targets for all four previous MPAs.

Pavement condition targets indicate the percentage of Interstate and Non-Interstate NHS lane miles that are expected to be in good or poor condition, within the four-year target period. To set targets, the RPC applied an expected rate of change to the current number of lane miles within each category. For example, there are 100 Interstate lane miles total and 10 miles (or 10%) of these were in poor condition in 2022. If this was expected to decrease by 10% in four years, then the targeted number of Interstate lane miles in poor condition 2026 would be nine miles (or 9%) of the total number of Interstate lane miles.

Table 20 shows historic and current regional baselines and targets. From 2018 to 2022, most pavement condition targets were met regionwide. The exception is the percentage of Interstate lane miles in poor condition, which increased from 0.2% to 0.5%.

Table 20. Pavement Condition Baselines and Targets

PAVEMENT CONDITION BASELINES & TARGETS					
Interstate	**2018 Baseline**	**2022 Target**	**2022 Actual**	**Target Met?**	**2026 Target**
PERCENT IN GOOD CONDITION	12.70%	9.60%	23.60%	YES	15.80%
PERCENT IN POOR CONDITION	0.10%	0.20%	0.50%	NO	0.80%
Non-Interstate NHS	**2018 Baseline**	**2022 Target**	**2022 Actual**	**Target Met?**	**2026 Target**
PERCENT IN GOOD CONDITION	12.90%	10.20%	10.80%	YES	3.90%
PERCENT IN POOR CONDITION	14.70%	15.00%	9.90%	YES	13.20%

Source: LADOTD

Performance Report – Pavement Condition Cont.

The 2026 targets reflect expectations that pavement conditions may generally deteriorate in the future due to limited funding, particularly for state-owned facilities. LADOTD acknowledged that there may be future challenges in funding maintenance and preservation, particularly the local matches to Federal-Aid funds. As such, LADOTD set conservative pavement conditions targets; they expect the percentage of pavement in good condition to decrease pavement in poor condition to increase.

The RPC prioritizes maintenance and preservation in its planning while acknowledging funding limitations and the effects in maintaining roadways. LADOTD is largely responsible for selecting maintenance and preservation projects on the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS, and as the entity providing the local match on state-owned routes, LADOTD determines the speed with which these projects can be implemented. All Interstates and the majority of non-Interstate NHS routes are state-owned, thus LADOTD will have a substantial impact on the regional pavement condition performance measures. It is reasonable to assume that state projections for roadway conditions will be substantially reflected in the RPC's regional performance measures.

With LADOTD funding in mind, the RPC chose to use LADOTD's proposed rates of change to set its 2026 regional pavement condition targets, with the exception of Interstate condition in the Mandeville-Covington and Slidell MPAs. At that time, recent or upcoming improvements to the Interstate system in those MPAs made it likely that Interstate pavement condition would be better in those MPAs than the overall state. Their targets were adjusted to reflect a higher percentage of Interstate lane miles in good condition, and a lower percentage in poor condition. The targets presented in this plan for the new, consolidated MPA take the differences between the previous separate MPAs into account.

Performance Report – Bridge Condition

Bridge condition targets indicate the percentage of NHS bridge deck area expected to be in good or poor condition, within the 4-year target period. As with pavement condition targets, bridge condition targets are set by applying an expected rate of change to the current deck area within each category. Table 21 displays the regional bridge conditions and targets from 2018 through 2026. In 2022, the region successfully met its targets.

Table 21. Bridge Condition Baselines and Targets

BRIDGE CONDITION BASELINES & TARGETS

NHS Bridges

METRIC	2018 Baseline	2022 Target	2022 Actual	Target Met?	2026 Target
PERCENT IN GOOD CONDITION Bridges rated in good condition	43.10%	28.80%	42.60%	YES	38.60%
PERCENT IN POOR CONDITION Bridges rated in poor condition	7.80%	8.60%	7.60%	YES	5.30%

Source: LADOTD

Performance Report – Bridge Condition Cont.

Similar to pavement condition targets, LADOTD set its 2022 bridge condition targets with the assumption that funding limitations would negatively affect its ability to maintain a SGR on NHS bridges. This resulted in some bridges moving from a good condition rating to fair condition; however, several projects planned for 2022 to 2026 were expected to improve those in poor condition. As such, the state expected the number of bridges in good condition to decrease and fewer bridges in poor condition. The RPC concurred with this assessment and aligned its regional bridge condition targets with the state.

Despite funding challenges, the RPC continues to prioritize state of good repair on the region's roadways and bridges. This is reflected in the strategies, actions, and projects programmed in the MTP.

5.4 System Reliability Performance

System Reliability Performance Measures

System reliability is a key metric for assessing traffic congestion on the region's roadways. It refers to the degree to which travel from one place to another takes the same amount of time, regardless of factors including season or time of day. Three performance measures are used to track the reliability of passenger and freight vehicle travel on the 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).

System Reliability Performance Report

System performance targets are set every four years but may be adjusted at the two-year midpoint. As with other performance measures, MPOs may use the state's targets or set their own. The RPC set its own regional targets for both 2018 and 2022 but used a similar methodology as LADOTD. For this plan, the system reliability measures and targets have been adjusted to reflect the merged MPAs. Annual growth rate was applied to a 2019 baseline, and projected growth rates were based on the 2016-2019 average annual growth. The current system reliability targets are listed in Table 22.

Overall, the system reliability targets reflected an expectation that system reliability would decrease slightly over the four-year target period. This assumption was based on (1) prior year trends; (2) slow regional growth; and (3) the number of projects that would have a significant impact on reliability measures. While the region did not meet its system reliability targets in 2018 or 2019, it has met most targets since the COVID-19 pandemic. See Figures 41, 42, and 43.

In 2020 and immediately after, performance measures were impacted by pandemic-related shifts in travel patterns, including a decrease in overall driving and large-scale shift to remote working due to lockdown restrictions. As travel returned to pre-pandemic levels in more recent years the region continued to meet its system reliability targets. The region's insignificant growth, shifting population, and development patterns, are dispersing vehicle travel across a wider geography. These trends could contribute to greater travel time reliability. Projects programed in the RPC's TIP along with those implemented by local and state partners may have contributed to this important target achievement.

Table 22. System Reliability Baselines and Targes

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE TARGETS		
Level of Travel Time Reliability & Truck Travel Time Reliability Index		
Interstate LOTTR	**Non-Interstate NHS LOTTR**	**Truck TTRI**
79.8% **2019 BASELINE**	**85.7%** **2019 BASELINE**	**1.59%** **2019 BASELINE**
ANNUAL RATE OF CHANGE **-1.30%**	**ANNUAL RATE OF CHANGE** **-0.54%**	**ANNUAL RATE OF CHANGE** **0.5%**
77.7% **2024 TARGET (2-year)**	**84.8%** **2024 TARGET (2-year)**	**1.16%** **2024 TARGET (2-year)**
75.7% **2024 TARGET (4-year)**	**83.9%** **2024 TARGET (4-year)**	**1.62%** **2024 TARGET (4-year)**

Source: LADOTD

Figure 43. Interstate LOTTR, 2018-2026



Figure 42. Non-Interstate LOTTR, 2018-2026



Figure 41. Truck TTRI, 2018-2016



5.5 Transit Asset Management

Transit Asset Performance Measures

Transit performance measures focus on tracking asset condition. These Transit Asset Management (TAM) programs assist in tracking the age and condition of transit vehicles, facilities, and equipment, plus guide their maintenance and replacement schedules at each transit agency in the region. As part of the TAM program, the 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 Transit Economic Requirement Model (TERM) scale.

Table 23. Transit Asset Useful Life Benchmarks & Targets

TRANSIT ASSETS		
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%
Ferry Boat	42	50%
EQUIPEMENT	ULB	Target
Automobiles	8	5%
Trucks, SUVs, Vans	8	18%
Steer Wheel	25	100%
FACILITIES	Target	
Admin & Maintenance	20%	
Passenger & Parking	10%	
INFRASTRUCTURE	Target	
Streetcar Rail	5%	

Source: Regional Transit Providers, 2022

Transit Asset Performance Report

Annual TAM targets are established by the transit providers and submitted to FTA via the National Transit Database (NTD). These targets are then provided to the MPO, which aggregates regional asset management targets into the MTP. See Table 23 for the recent targets. The MPO assists transit agencies in achieving these targets by distributing annual federal funds used to purchase and rehabilitate capital assets.

5.6 MTP Projects Performance Review

A successful PBPP approach relies on states and MPOs implementing projects that will lead to improved system performance and achieving desired targets. The 2056 MTP project evaluations included expected impacts on each performance measure. Projects in the MTP contribute to the achievement of at least one, but ideally multiple targets. By implementing projects that comprehensively address performance measures, the region will incrementally reach self-set targets. Table 24 displays the percentage of projects that contribute to each highway performance measure category: Motorized Safety; Non-motorized Safety; Road Condition; Bridge Condition; Travel Time Reliability; and Truck Travel Time Reliability. Many projects contribute to more than one category. Projects that contribute to improved system reliability may also improve freight movements. The RPC attempts to equally balance the percentage of projects per federal performance measures.

Table 24. Percentage and Number of MTP Projects Contributing to Performance Targets

Transportation Projects Contributing to Performance Measures		
Performance Area	**Number of Projects**	**Percent of Total Projects**
Motorized Safety	30	16%
Non-Motorized Safety	40	19%
Road Condition	30	21%
Bridge Condition	12	13%
Travel Time Reliability	67	24%
Truck Travel Time Reliability	39	12%
Total Projects	**431**	

Transit projects in the MTP similarly contribute to achieving federal performance measures. Since Section 5307 funded projects are typically determined on a short-range basis, it can be difficult to anticipate which performance measures will be impacted over the course of a thirty-year plan. The MTP recommends that future transit projects contribute to overall state of good repair, which in turn will impact associated transit performance measures. Moreover, the RPC routinely coordinates with regional transit operators to effectively use federal funding and proactively address maintenance and repair needs.

06 Goals and Objectives

Southeast Louisiana's Long-Term Priorities



6.1 Goals

Overview

The primary purpose of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is to build consensus around regional transportation priorities and provide a strategic framework for achieving them. Each MTP update cycle provides an opportunity to reassess the region's transportation system challenges as well as opportunities for overcoming them. Through this collaborative process, the MTP helps align transportation investments and policies with the evolving priorities of the region, ensuring that the transportation system continues to serve residents, businesses, and visitors effectively.

This chapter presents the region's long-term transportation goals. The goals build upon prior long-range transportation planning efforts while incorporating current regional needs and priorities identified through the combination of technical analysis, stakeholder collaboration, and public input.

Each of the region's six goals is supported by a set of measurable objectives to monitor progress and evaluate performance over time. Together, these objectives provide a framework for assessing progress toward the region's long-term goals. While the goals and objectives help define the region's desired future, achieving it will depend on the RPC's implementation efforts. The next chapter outlines an implementation framework including planning actions and project investments which will help advance the MTP goals and objectives.

Goal 1: Safety and Security

The region prioritizes investment 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.

The RPC heard overwhelmingly from community members that safer roads and a greater sense of safety while traveling, regardless of mode, are among their highest needs. Recent transportation safety trends underscore the need for significant safety improvements across the region, particularly on state-owned roadways.

The RPC will work to enhance its data analysis and collection capabilities in order to target where safety countermeasures can be implemented to both save lives and keep our region's people healthy. Safety improvements should be incorporated into all transportation projects whenever possible. Each new project proposal identified through the project delivery process introduces an opportunity to create a safer system, and even during routine maintenance work, minor modifications can make roadways safer for all users.

Transportation safety also has multiple broad implications for the community. Crashes can cause severe economic impacts for individuals through property damage and congestion delays. Safe transportation systems 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. When all modes of transportation in a regional network are equally safe, residents have more travel options and greater flexibility in how they move throughout the region, which can also improve transportation affordability. In summary, a safer transportation system is one that will be used more frequently, contributing to public health, community connectivity, and economic opportunity.

Goal 2: Economic Opportunity

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

The regional transportation system is vital to Southeast Louisiana's economy, connecting workers, businesses, and destinations throughout the region. It supports the movement of goods, delivery of services and enables freight transportation by road, rail, water, pipeline, and air, generating substantial economic activity and employment. Stakeholders frequently expressed concerns about transportation needs in growing residential, commercial, and industrial areas, underscoring the importance of coordinating transportation investments with land use, housing, and economic development strategies.

Improving transportation access across all modes helps connect people to opportunities, supports business growth, and encourages reinvestment in underutilized areas, strengthening the region's economy as a whole. Conversely, limited access can contribute to a loss of customers and economic decline in a neighborhood or serve as a disincentive to new investment. Many RPC stakeholders, including representatives from housing, land use, and economic development organizations, emphasized that expanding accessible transportation options, particularly through a more robust regional transit system, is critical to supporting workforce development and strengthening the region's long-term economic competitiveness.

The health and well-being of the region is also directly linked to the economic resiliency of the community. The Southeast Louisiana region has a high rate of poverty and lower median household incomes relative to the rest of the nation. There are also 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 individuals' 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 of the regional economy.

Goal 3: Sustainability and Resilience

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

In the two decades since Hurricane Katrina, Southeast Louisiana has become increasingly aware of its vulnerability to climate change and other environmental hazards. Although the region has made significant investments in flood protection infrastructure and the State of Louisiana continues to implement its Coastal Master Plan, additional efforts are needed to strengthen the region's ability to withstand, adapt to, and recover from both natural and human-caused hazards

Local parish and municipal leaders consistently identified increased flooding risks associated with climate change as a major concern and emphasized transportation risk-reduction projects as a top priority over the next 30 years. Other stakeholders similarly highlighted environmental sustainability and resilience as essential considerations for the region's future transportation investments. The RPC recognizes the need to strengthen the resilience of the region's transportation infrastructure while also improving network conditions as well as services that enhance the resilience of its most vulnerable communities.

The transportation planning process is uniquely positioned to advance both environmental sustainability and community resilience. In many cases, strategies that address one concern will also address the other; transportation infrastructure both influences and is affected by the natural environment. Vehicle emissions diminish air quality and contribute to climate change. Meanwhile, climate change has increasingly exposed the transportation system to several hazards disrupting mobility, the economy, and threatening public safety. Impermeable surfaces, such as asphalt on the roadways, strain drainage infrastructure, contribute to water pollution via urban runoff, and prevent groundwater replenishment. Transportation infrastructure also shapes land-use patterns, which can contribute to habitat fragmentation, development in environmentally vulnerable areas, and longer travel distances that increase emissions. By integrating sustainability and resilience into transportation decision making, the region can reduce environmental impacts, protect critical infrastructure, and better prepare communities for future challenges.

Goal 4: Community Impact

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.

The Southeast Louisiana region is home to a diverse population encompassing people of many backgrounds, races, and ethnicities, all of whom contribute to the distinctive, rich, and vibrant culture that makes the region a destination for people from around the world. However, many communities and individuals in our region have been historically disadvantaged through a lack of inclusion in the transportation decision-making process or by being disproportionately negatively impacted by the system itself.

All people deserve a high quality of life, and a key part of that is dependent on access—to employment opportunities, businesses that provide essential goods and services, schools and job-training programs, healthcare facilities, and to the people and places that help individuals stay connected to their communities. Addressing historical inequities can be achieved in part through a deliberate and equitable transportation planning process that improves quality of life for disadvantaged communities while benefiting the region as a whole. Including a diverse range of voices in decision making leads to programs and policies that are more responsive to the needs of the broader population, helping ensure that as many people as possible are served. Moreover, improving access to jobs, education, services, and businesses supports stronger economic development and shared prosperity across the region.

Goal 5: Reliability and Connectivity

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

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 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 and is essential to their quality of life.

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. Reliability and connectivity challenges expressed through the MTP public engagement effort differed across the region. Leaders of rapidly growing communities frequently cited traffic congestion at key corridors and intersections as a major challenge, while many residents in the region's urban core often pointed to long wait times, unreliable service, and limited transit connectivity as barriers to mobility.

The RPC recognizes that enhancing system reliability and strengthening multimodal connections are essential to improving mobility, expanding access, and supporting the region's long-term growth and prosperity. 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.

Goal 6: System Preservation and 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. This goal is based on emphasizing a state of good repair by prioritizing maintenance of existing transportation assets over building new capacity. Though not always the most visible investments, maintenance activities help create a safer, more reliable transportation system and contribute to a higher quality of life for residents and visitors alike. Furthermore, as connected and automated vehicle technologies become more prevalent, their effectiveness will depend on the quality and condition of the infrastructure that supports them.

Many local parish and municipal leaders identified the preservation of existing infrastructure and the long-term maintenance of roadways as top regional priorities. Community members similarly emphasized the need to improve road conditions and prioritize the maintenance of transportation facilities across all modes.

It is important to strike a balance between the provision of new infrastructure versus 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.

Consistency with State Goals

The regional transportation planning goals set forth in the MTP are closely aligned with and supportive of the goals outlined in LADOTD's 2015 Statewide Transportation Plan[28] which are as follows:

- Infrastructure Preservation and Maintenance: Preserve Louisiana's multimodal infrastructure in a state-of-good-repair through timely maintenance of existing infrastructure.
    - Aligned with Goal 6 of the MTP.
- Safety: Provide safe and secure travel conditions across all transportation modes through physical
    - infrastructure improvements, operational controls, programs, and public education and awareness.
    - Aligned with Goal 1 of the MTP
- Economic Competitiveness: Provide a transportation system that fosters diverse economic and job growth, international and domestic commerce, and tourism
    - Aligned with Goal 2 of the MTP
- Community Development and Enhancement: Provide support for community transportation planning, infrastructure, and services.
    - Aligned with Goal 2 and 4 of the MTP
- Environmental Stewardship: Ensure transportation policies and investments are sensitive to Louisiana's environment, history, and culture.
    - Aligned with Goal 3 of the MTP

The MTP also builds upon these statewide priorities by identifying additional goals and objectives that reflect the region's unique needs and priorities for transportation system. As of the writing of this plan, the LADOTD is in the process of updating its statewide transportation plan. RPC is participating in the process and will continue to provide a regional perspective as the state plan is developed. Once the plan is finalized, its goals, priorities, and recommendations will be incorporated into the regional transportation planning process as appropriate.

[28] LADOTD (2015). Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan, https://dotd.la.gov/about/office-of-project-delivery/planning/transportation-planning/statewide-transportation-plan/2015-plan-update/

6.2 Objectives

he MTP goals define the Southeast Louisiana region's strategic priorities. To support them, the RPC developed measurable objectives that translate broad goals into quantifiable outcomes and help track progress through its performance-based planning program. While each objective is associated with a specific goal, several have cross-cutting impacts that support multiple goals across the planning framework. The objectives were developed to be measurable and applicable to the RPC's performance-based program, providing a framework for tracking progress over time. Each objective was crafted to translate a broader goal into a quantifiable outcome, ensuring that progress can be tracked over time. Over the next four years, the RPC will use existing tools and resources to monitor performance, assess progress, and strengthen its data, analysis, and decision-support capabilities. Although no specific targets have been established, they may be developed through future analysis and engagement. Objectives and performance measures will be reviewed and refined during the next MTP cycle, with additional targets and measures potentially incorporated to further support performance-based decision-making.

Table 25. 2056 MTP Objectives

MTP Goals	Objectives
Safety & Security	Objective 1. Reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries from crashes. Objective 2. Expand the use of proven safety counter measures for vulnerable road users, including expanding number of miles of protected bicycle and pedestrian facilities, intersection improvements, and traffic calming improvements. Objective 3. Reduce freight-related crashes.
Economic Opportunity	Objective 1. Support and grow freight industries to increase competitiveness nationally and globally. Objective 2. Improve coordination between transportation planning and broader economic development planning, housing development, and land use planning. Objective 3. Reduce travel times between the regional workforce and living-wage employment locations, as well as job training and educational opportunities, to support workforce attraction and retention.
Sustainability & Resilience	Objective 1. Reduce the vulnerability of transportation facilities to natural hazards. Objective 2. Reduce transportation-related emissions. Objective 3. Reduce environmental risks to individuals and communities, with emphasis on disadvantaged communities.
Community Benefits	Objective 1. Remove mobility barriers including limited access to transit, lack of sidewalks and safe crossings, transportation cost burdens, inadequate service frequency, and barriers faced by older adults, people with disabilities, and no-vehicle households. Objective 2. Increase opportunities for community members to meaningfully engage in planning and decision-making processes. Objective 3. Minimize accessibility barriers for persons with disabilities.
Reliability & Connectivity	Objective 1. Reduce delay on the region's roadway network. Objective 2. Reduce trip travel times for users of public transit. Objective 3. Increase non-motorized network connectivity.
System Preservation & Stewardship	Objective 1. Increase the percentage of roads and bridges in good condition. Objective 2. Increase the percentage of transit assets in good condition. Objective 3. Increase the percentage of walking and biking infrastructure in good condition

Consistency with Federal Planning Factors

Per federal requirements (23 CFR § 450.324(a)), the MTP shall consider the following strategies, or planning factors, as outlined below. The RPC's goals and objectives are consistent with these factors and contribute to advancing national goals[29] as outlined in U.S. Code. An explanation of the connection between the federal planning factors and the MTP goals and objectives is shown in Table 26 below.

Table 26. Consistency of MTP Goals and Objectives with 10 Federal Planning Factors

FEDERAL PLANNING FACTORS		MTP GOALS & OBJECTIVE CONSISTENCY
1	Support the economic vitality of the United States, the States, metropolitan areas, and nonmetropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency	▶ Goal 2, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 2, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 2, Objective 3 ▶ Goal 3, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 3, Objective 3 ▶ Goal 4, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 6, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 6, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 6, Objective 3
2	Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users	▶ Goal 1, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 1, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 1, Objective 3 ▶ Goal 4, Objective 3
3	Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users	▶ Goal 1, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 1, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 4, Objective 3
4	Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight	▶ Goal 2, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 2, Objective 3 ▶ Goal 5, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 5, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 5, Objective 3
5	Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns	▶ Goal 2, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 3, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 3, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 3, Objective 3 ▶ Goal 4, Objective 1
6	Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes throughout the State, for people and freight	▶ Goal 5, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 5, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 5, Objective 3
7	Promote efficient system management and operation	▶ Goal 6, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 6, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 6, Objective 3
8	Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system	▶ Goal 6, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 6, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 6, Objective 3
9	Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation	▶ Goal 3, Objective 1 ▶ Goal 3, Objective 3
10	Enhance travel and tourism	▶ Goal 1, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 2, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 4, Objective 3 ▶ Goal 5, Objective 2 ▶ Goal 5, Objective 3

[29] 23 USC § 150

07 Plan Implementation

Putting the Plan into Action



To support the implementation of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) goals and objectives outlined in Chapter 6, this chapter details the specific planning actions the RPC will undertake to advance each objective. It also presents the RPC's program of short- and long-term transportation investments and funding priorities designed to further the implementation of the MTP's transportation goals for the region.

7.1 Planning Actions

For each MTP goal, the RPC has established a set of measurable objectives to track progress and evaluate performance over time. These objectives, detailed in Chapter 6, provide a framework for measuring advancement toward the region's long-term transportation priorities. To address the transportation needs identified through the MTP planning process and support achievement of these objectives, the RPC also has developed a series of targeted planning actions which can be directly implemented by the RPC. The planning actions are designed to guide implementation efforts and advance corresponding regional goals over the next four years, culminating in the next update of the MTP.

For the purposes of this MTP, the RPC employed the following planning framework, which is based on guidance[30] from the U. S. Department of Transportation:

Planning Framework

- **Goal:** A desired long-term result or condition for the regional transportation system. A goal establishes the strategic priorities of the community.
- **Objective:** A measurable outcome that supports progress toward a goal.
- **Action:** A specific activity, policy, study, investment priority, or initiative that the RPC can undertake to achieve an objective and advance a corresponding goal.
- **Coordinating Agency:** Partners, including public agencies, private-sector entities, community organizations, and other stakeholders that help carry out and support an action.
- **Performance Measure:** A metric used to measure performance and as a basis for setting a target and for comparing alternative investments. See Chapter 4 for RPC's current performance measures and targets.

The actions identified in this chapter are informed by the quantitative analysis conducted through the MTP planning process as well as by input received from stakeholders, agency partners, public outreach efforts, and the RPC's Technical Advisory Group. The RPC also examined the policies and actions in the previously adopted 2052 MTP to gauge progress, identify which initiatives remain relevant, assess ongoing implementation needs, and identify any necessary updates or refinements. Implementation will occur through a combination of projects, programs, policies, and partnerships, with ongoing monitoring and evaluation to assess effectiveness and ensure continued progress toward achieving the region's transportation goals and objectives.

These actions are also intended to guide development of the RPC's annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) over the next four years. The UPWP serves as the agency's primary implementation document, delineating major work elements, planning activities, deliverables, and schedules that support the execution of the strategies and actions outlined in this MTP.

[30] U.S. DOT, Federal Highway Administration. Performance-Based Planning and Programming Guidebook. September, 2013.

Action Subcategories

The actions are strategically organized according to RPC's core planning functions and areas of responsibility as the region's MPO. Many actions involve ongoing efforts that will continue throughout the four-year implementation period leading up to the next MTP update and may extend into the long-term planning horizon. Others are intended to result in a specific deliverable, such as a study, plan, dataset, analytical tool, or similar published work. Together, they provide a comprehensive framework for implementing the MTP and responding to evolving regional transportation needs.

Project Development – Actions focused on identifying, evaluating, and prioritizing transportation projects. These efforts typically include corridor studies, feasibility assessments, project scoping activities, and others that support the development of transportation investments.

Data & Analysis Tools – Actions that enhance the RPC's ability to collect, manage, analyze, and communicate transportation data. These efforts may include the development of datasets, performance measures, forecasting tools, mapping applications, and analytical frameworks that support informed decision making.

Regional Plans and Studies – Actions involving the preparation of plans, studies, strategies, and policy frameworks that provide more detailed guidance on addressing specific transportation issues, modes, or populations. These efforts often establish priorities and recommendations for future implementation.

Outreach & Engagement – Actions designed to encourage meaningful participation by residents, stakeholders, and transportation system users in decision making.

Coordination & Collaboration – Actions that strengthen partnerships among local governments, transportation providers, public agencies, private-sector entities, community organizations, and other stakeholders. These efforts often involve convening partners, facilitating regional decision making, sharing information, and coordinating implementation to advance common transportation objectives.

Evaluating Progress

The following goals, objectives, and planning actions collectively represent the RPC's application of performance-based planning and programming principles to guide investment decisions and measure progress toward desired outcomes. Over the next four years, the RPC plans to utilize existing tools and resources to track performance and evaluate progress toward plan objectives, while advancing its data collection, analysis capabilities, and decision-support tools to support more accurate measurement, reporting, and outcomes-based decision making over time.

Safety and Security Actions

The region prioritizes investment 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.

Objective 1. Reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries from crashes.	
Actions	**Coordinating Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Develop a high-injury network (HIN) for each parish within the Metropolitan Planning Area and include identification of locations affecting vulnerable road users.	**DOTD, Parish Governments, Municipal Governments**
Coordination & Collaboration: Regularly confer with LADOTD to ensure alignment of RPC project safety analysis and with current screening tools and the SHSP.	**LADOTD**
Coordination & Collaboration: Commence quarterly or bi-annual meeting with LADOTD Districts to discuss upcoming and proposed safety studies.	**LADOTD**
Outreach & Engagement: Identify and pursue funding opportunities to develop and deliver educational courses that build local capacity in data-driven traffic safety planning best practices.	
Project Development: Include safety analyses and a safe system approach in all transportation studies.	
Outreach & Engagement: Work with the New Orleans Regional Safety Coalition and North Shore Regional Safety Coalition to advance road user education regarding vulnerable road users and other best practices for traffic safety.	**Regional Safety Coalition Coordinators, LADOTD, Parish and Municipal Governments, Advocacy Groups.**
Regional Plan: Explore the development of data-driven, parish level safety action plans aligned with SHSP and HSIP emphasis areas to address fatal and serious injury lane departure and intersection crashes.	**LADOTD, Parish Governments, Municipal Governments**
Objective 2. Expand the use of proven safety counter measures for vulnerable road users, including expanding number of miles of protected bicycle and pedestrian facilities, intersection improvements, and traffic calming improvements.	
Actions	**Coordinating Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Incorporate bicycle and pedestrian count data collection into RPC transportation studies to identify infrastructure needs and support multimodal planning and investment decisions.	**Parish and Municipal Governments**
Project Development: Locate and prioritize locations within the regional High Injury Network where proven safety countermeasures can reduce pedestrian and bicyclist crash risk.	**Parish and Municipal Governments**
Project Development: Support implementation of protected bicycle facilities on corridors identified through local, parish, and regional transportation plans through calls for projects and studies, and through the provision of technical assistance on discretionary grants.	**Parish and Municipal Governments**

Project Development: Evaluate the regional bicycle network using Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) analysis to develop a prioritized list of corridor improvements that advance local plans and support implementation of protected bicycle facilities and low-stress network connections.	**Parish and Municipal Governments, LADOTD**
Project Development: Incorporate Complete Streets principles into the planning and conceptual design of roadway projects whenever feasible.	**Parish and Municipal Governments**
Coordination & Collaboration: In plans and studies, coordinate with LADOTD on completion of the complete streets checklist for every project programmed in the TIP.	**LADOTD**
Objective 3. Reduce freight-related crashes.	
Actions	**Coordinating Agencies**
Outreach & Engagement: Convene the Freight Roundtable to identify and advance strategies for reducing freight-related crashes.	**Freight Roundtable**
Coordination & Collaboration: Collaborate with trucking associations to identify measures to reduce fatalities and serious injuries in the region.	**LMTA, ATA, and other trucking associations**
Project Development: Ensure roadway designs provide clear right of way assignments, visibility of all users, and a clear path of travel for all modes.	**LADOTD**
Project Development: Study potential locations for improved grade-separated rail crossings.	**LADOTD, FRA**

Economic Opportunity Actions

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

Objective 1. Support and grow freight industries to increase competitiveness nationally and globally.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Coordination & Collaboration: Coordinate with local governments, freight operators, ports, and private-sector logistics providers to develop strategies that support staging, warehousing, and distribution facilities that accommodate e-commerce growth, improve last-mile delivery efficiency, and reduce congestion impacts on the regional transportation network.	**LADOTD, Parish and Municipal Governments, Ports, Freight Operators, Logistics Industry Representatives**
Coordination & Collaboration: Partner with freight industry representatives and educational institutions to assess current and future workforce needs, address skills shortages, and when possible assist in the creation of coordinated education, training, and recruitment initiatives.	**Technical Colleges, Universities, High Schools, Freight Roundtable**
Coordination & Collaboration: In coordination with the Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuels Partnership, support ports and other regional freight hubs in meeting low-emission requirements and adopting cleaner technologies to enhance competitiveness in the global marketplace.	**Ports, Freight Operators**
Objective 2. Improve coordination between transportation planning and broader economic development planning, housing development, and land use planning.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Project Development: Develop a consistency analysis with the CEDS to ensure MPO-related transportation planning supports regional economic development strategies.	
Regional Plan: Conduct economic impact studies for both existing and proposed regional trails to inform trail-oriented development.	**Parish and Municipal Governments**
Coordination & Collaboration: Build continuous collaboration with regional industry leaders and economic development partners to evaluate transportation needs, track shifting economic conditions, and ensure transportation investments stay aligned.	**Economic Development Corporations, Economic Development Agencies**
Coordination & Collaboration: Maintain continual communication with local land use planning agencies, participating in land use planning processes where appropriate and considering local land use plans in metropolitan transportation planning efforts.	**Local Land Use Planning Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Develop tools and guidance to coordinate transportation and land use planning in growing communities, promoting transit-oriented development, smart growth, and improved access to housing, jobs, and services.	**Parish and Municipal Governments**

Data & Analysis Tools: Track regional economic indicators and publish an annual trends linking projected changes to future mobility and freight demands to support informed planning decisions.	**Economic Development Agencies, Freight Roundtable**
Objective 3. Reduce travel times between the regional workforce and living-wage employment locations, as well as job training and educational opportunities, to support workforce attraction and retention.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Evaluate workforce accessibility across the region by developing multimodal accessibility and connectivity indices for existing and emerging employment hubs that provide well-paying jobs. Use these data to prioritize transportation investments that improve access to economic opportunity and support upward mobility.	**Parish and Municipal Governments, Economic Development Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Continually monitor and report on the number of jobs accessible within a 30-minute transit ride.	**Transit Agencies**
Project Development: Prioritize strategies that increase the number of jobs within a 30-minute transit ride, including enhanced service, transit priority infrastructure, and last-mile connectivity.	**Transit Agencies**
Project Development: Coordinate with transit providers, local governments, employers, public safety agencies, and other stakeholders to develop a coordinated strategy for expanding late-night transit service for hospitality and other shift workers, identifying service needs, funding opportunities, and partnerships.	**Parish and Municipal Governments, Public Safety Agencies, Transit Agencies**

Sustainability and Resilience Actions

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

Objective 1. Reduce the vulnerability of transportation facilities to natural hazards.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Project Development: Ensure RPC studies and plans consider the transportation vulnerability assessment, TRIP, CCAP and Flood Risk Management Plan when assessing needs and making recommendations.	**Parish and Municipal Governments**
Project Development: Identify and prioritize adaptation strategies that both protect transportation infrastructure and the surrounding environment from natural hazards that include both nature-based solutions (green infrastructure) and human-engineered solutions (gray infrastructure).	**Parish and Municipal Governments**
Project Development: Identify and track funding sources for resilience improvements.	**FHWA; DOTD; Other public and private funding partners**
Regional Plan: Update the TRIP to include additional transportation modes, hazards, and stakeholder input.	**State and Local Emergency Preparedness, Environmental Protection, and Public Works Departments**
Data & Analysis Tools: Explore opportunities to improve the transportation vulnerability assessment with new data sources and analysis methods.	**Federal Agencies, LACPRA, LDC&E**
Coordination & Collaboration: Identify opportunities to coordinate with entities leading resilience work, and where coordination gaps exist create new mechanisms for collaboration.	**State and Local Emergency Preparedness, Environmental Protection, and Public Works Departments**
Coordination & Collaboration: Track ongoing efforts to enhance resilience across the region and identify opportunities to coordinate work across agencies and reduce unnecessary redundancies.	**State and Local Emergency Preparedness, Environmental Protection, and Public Works Departments**
Objective 2. Reduce transportation-related emissions.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Project Development: Ensure vehicular traffic studies, plans, and projects prioritize congestion mitigation strategies that do not induce additional SOV use or VMT, including strategies identified in the CMP such as operational improvements and travel demand management.	**Local Planning, Transportation, and Public Works Departments; LADOTD**
Project Development: Identify and prioritize opportunities to increase transit ridership through enhanced service and amenities.	**Transit Operators; Local Planning, Transportation, and Public Works Departments; LADOTD**

Project Development: Increase biking and walking mode share regionwide through implementation of facilities that make non-motorized travel safer, easier, and more convenient.	**Local Planning, Transportation, and Public Works Departments; LADOTD**
Project Development: Identify mechanisms for increasing use of EVs, electric micromobility, and other alternative fuel vehicles, including fleet transitions and installation of EV charging and alternative fueling infrastructure.	**Local Transportation, Operations, and Facilities Departments; Private Fleets; DOTD; Louisiana Clean Fuels**
Coordination & Collaboration: Leverage the Southeast Louisiana Clean Fuels Partnership to identify opportunities to coordinate RPC efforts with SLCFP partners.	**SLCFP Partners; Louisiana Clean Fuels**
Objective 3. Reduce environmental risks to individuals and communities, with emphasis on disadvantaged communities.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Identify/Establish methods for assessing individual projects' impacts on resilience, the surrounding environment, and air quality, and incorporate those analyses into RPC's planning process.	
Coordination & Collaboration: Define RPC's role in evacuation, emergency response and recovery, including data sharing and regional coordination as well as leveraging federal infrastructure funds to enhance evacuation, emergency response, and recovery.	**State and Local Emergency Preparedness, Environmental Protection, and Public Works Departments**
Coordination & Collaboration: Examine ways in which regional transportation investments can better support more efficient land use patterns.	**Local Planning Departments**
Coordination & Collaboration: Regularly consult with partner agencies responsible for environmental protection and conservation, such as CPRA and LDC&E, to ensure transportation planning aligns with state and local environmental goals and priorities.	**CPRA, LDC&E**
Coordination & Collaboration: Develop mechanisms to consult with the SHPO and local cultural and historic preservation entities to ensure transportation planning supports cultural and historical resources.	**SHPO**
Data & Analysis Tools: Incorporate consideration of the SVI into RPC's planning process, including the transportation vulnerability assessment, studies, and plans.	

Community Impact Actions

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.

Objective 1. Remove mobility barriers including limited access to transit, lack of sidewalks and safe crossings, transportation cost burdens, inadequate service frequency, and barriers faced by older adults, people with disabilities, and no-vehicle households.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Project Development: Measure benefits and burdens of different types of transportation projects on the community, including effects on low-income and minority populations, and incorporate results into future planning and programming.	
Data & Analysis Tools: Study spatial mismatch between low-income neighborhoods and employment opportunities to identify areas for investment.	**Economic Development Agencies**
Regional Plan: Develop a Mobility and Accessibility Assessment that identifies community transportation needs using tools such as a Mobility Barriers Index, and guides investments and strategies to reduce barriers and improve access to transportation across the region, with an emphasis on transit-dependent populations outside of the urban core.	**Local Parishes and Municipalities, LADOTD**
Outreach & Engagement: Use analysis of past outreach activities to guide future engagement strategies by identifying priority populations and communities, refining outreach methods and procedures, and informing equity-based priority setting in the next MTP.	
Data & Analysis Tools: Enhance transit accessibility metrics by refining evaluation methods and analyses to better assess service quality and equity, including measures such as coverage, frequency, reliability, travel time, first- and last-mile access, and accessibility for people with disabilities and other vulnerable populations.	**Transit Agencies**
Project Development: Explore opportunities for long-term residents to benefit from transportation investments, including tools and programs like community benefits agreements, workforce development, and anti-displacement strategies.	
Objective 2. Increase opportunities for community members to meaningfully engage in planning and decision-making processes.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Outreach and Engagement: Develop and convene an RPC citizens advisory committee.	**Local parishes and municipalities**

Outreach & Engagement: Explore tools to eliminate barriers to public participation such as incentives and other methods to better involve members of historically underrepresented communities, including communities of color, low-income communities, youth, and people who have a disability.	
Outreach & Engagement: Train RPC staff to better engage community members and facilitate planning activities with the public and public officials.	
Outreach & Engagement: Explore planning and project development processes to ensure impacted communities can provide more meaningful feedback, be more involved in decision making, and better influence outcomes.	
Project Development: Continue refining the agency's project prioritization process to ensure that it is data driven and reflective of community needs.	
Coordination & Collaboration: Develop and provide tools, training, and best practices to local governments on equitable process development and project development.	**Parish and Municipalities**
Objective 3. Minimize accessibility barriers for persons with disabilities.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Project Development: Support and **assist in funding** efforts across the region to be compliant with the federal Americans with Disabilities Act minimum requirements.	**Transit Agencies, LADOTD**
Coordination & Collaboration: Collaborate with transit agencies to conduct ADA compliance assessments, prioritize necessary accessibility improvements, and secure funding to implement upgrades.	**Transit Agencies**
Coordination & Collaboration: Utilize input from Coordinated Human Services Committee, Technical Advisory Group, and other stakeholders to identify and prioritize transit connectivity to hospitals, clinics, dialysis centers, and other healthcare providers, and prioritize improvements where access barriers exist for older populations and persons with disabilities.	**Transit Service Providers, Transit Agencies, Parishes and Municipalities, Coordinated Human Services Committee**

Reliability & Connectivity Actions

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

Objective 1. Reduce delay on the region's roadway network	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Explore new quantitative and qualitative datasets and sources to further define and understand transportation/congestion issues and needs.	
Project Development: Ensure improvements to connectivity and reliability are responsive to their urban, suburban, and/or rural contexts.	**LADOTD, Parishes and Municipalities**
Project Development: Establish mechanisms that comprehensively consider the full suite of strategies described in the CMP in location-specific studies and plans	
Regional Plan: Partner with local jurisdictions and LADOTD to develop a truck parking plan with strategies to explore public private partnerships and incentives for private property owners to build and operate truck parking facilities	**LADOTD, Parishes and Municipalities**
Project Development: Identify freight bottlenecks and explore opportunities to implement congestion mitigation strategies at those locations.	**Freight Agencies, Freight Roundtable**
Project Development: Explore partnerships and funding opportunities to advance intercity transit services, including a rail service between New Orleans and Baton Rouge, and bus service between Northshore and Southshore communities.	**Amtrak, Parishes and Municipalities, Transit Agencies, Southern Rail Commission, New Orleans & Company**
Objective 2. Reduce trip travel times for users of public transit.	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Project Development: Study improvements to increase reliability and frequency of transit routes, including signal priorities, dedicated lanes, unified fare structures, and expedited boarding and deboarding strategies.	**Parishes and Municipalities, Transit Agencies**
Coordination & Collaboration: Convene the Transit Technical Advisory Group quarterly to improve service coordination between regional transit providers and strategize and implement changes to the transit system which would result in a more seamless user experience.	**Transit Service Providers**
Project Development: Require transportation studies to include transit elements as appropriate, considering the impact on transit connectivity, reliability, and accessibility of proposed projects.	**Parishes and Municipalities**
Project Development: Identify opportunities to improve transit service to areas outside of the urban core, focusing on communities with high shares of transit-dependent riders.	**Transit Service Providers, Transit Agencies, Parishes and Municipalities**

Project Development: Support the development of safe, convenient, and reliable first- and last-mile access to major transit stations and transit corridors, including a connected network of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.	**Transit Agencies, Parishes and Municipalities, local public works and land use planning agencies**
Objective 3. Increase non-motorized network connectivity.	
MPO Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Regional Plan: Develop a comprehensive Regional Active Transportation Plan.	**Parishes and Municipalities, LADOTD**
Coordination & Collaboration: Establish a regional partnership framework to coordinate planning, funding, branding, and implementation of the Louisiana Bootlace Trail Network.	**Parishes and Municipalities**
Data & Analysis Tools: Establish a regional bicycle and pedestrian monitoring program that utilizes permanent and short duration counts to identify active transportation travel patterns and inform planning and investment decisions.	**Parishes and Municipalities**
Data & Analysis Tools: Maintain and update RPC's regional active transportation database in collaboration with partner agencies to provide a comprehensive inventory of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, planned projects, and network gaps throughout the region.	**Parishes and Municipalities, LADOTD**
Coordination & Collaboration: Through parish surface transportation working groups, coordinate with LADOTD and local jurisdictions to identify, prioritize, and implement bicycle and pedestrian facilities along state-owned roadways that improve safety, close network gaps, and enhance access to transit and key destinations.	**Parishes and Municipalities, LADOTD**

System Preservation and Stewardship Actions

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

Objective 1. Increase the percentage of roads and bridges in good condition	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Work with state and local agencies that maintain pavement condition data and asset management systems to establish mechanisms to track related data and explore opportunities to establish such programs in jurisdictions where they do not exist.	**Parishes and Municipalities, LADOTD**
Coordination & Collaboration: Establish mechanisms to help local governments proactively identify upcoming maintenance needs and prepare related project for future MTP and TIP programming.	**Parishes and Municipalities**
Project Development: Create criteria to prioritize system preservation over capacity increases and only increase capacity when it is necessary.	
Project Development: Work with LADOTD to identify and track maintenance needs on state-owned routes.	**LADOTD**
Project Development: Prioritize pavement and bridge maintenance on the NHS.	
Objective 2. Increase the percentage of transit assets in good condition	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Coordination & Collaboration: Support fleet restoration and replacement efforts by partnering with transit agencies to maintain a state-of-good-repair, replace aging vehicles, and restore fleet capacity to support reliable service levels.	**Transit Agencies**
Coordination & Collaboration: Work with transit agencies to produce an annual report on fleet conditions.	**Transit Agencies**
Objective 3. Increase the percentage of walking and biking infrastructure in good condition	
Action	**Coordinating Agencies**
Data & Analysis Tools: Explore opportunities to collect and maintain condition data for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	**Parishes and Municipalities, LADOTD**
Project Development: Ensure that roadway maintenance projects also include repair and maintenance of associated non-motorized facilities.	**Parishes and Municipalities, LADOTD**

7.2 MTP Projects

Programming federal funds for transportation projects is the primary mechanism the RPC uses to implement the goals and objectives in the MTP. The majority of planning activities conducted by the RPC, including the actions listed in this chapter, are ultimately intended to result in tangible improvements to the transportation system. The fiscally constrained financial plan outlined in **Appendix A** describes how the RPC anticipates funding a program of projects that will be implemented over the next 30 years. Individual projects proposed for implementation are listed in **Appendix B**, first by the parish in which they are located and then by the fiscal year in which construction is anticipated to begin. Projects are further differentiated by tiers, as follows:

Tier I of the MTP is the TIP. It includes projects that are expected to be implemented in the next four fiscal years (FFY 2027 – FFY 2030). Project may only be included in the TIP if funds have been specifically identified and are expected to be available at the time of implementation. Amendments to the TIP, following the process detailed in that document, shall also apply to Tier I of the MTP.

Tier II includes projects that are anticipated to be implemented in five to ten fiscal years (FFY 2031 – FFY 2040). Many projects in Tier II are expected to be paid for using funds attributable to the MPO (i.e., STP funds) and are accounted for in the financial plan's fiscal constraint analysis. As allowed by federal legislation (23 CFR § 450.324(f)(11)(vii)), the MTP also includes projects listed for illustrative purposes that may be implemented if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan become available. Though funding has not yet been identified for these projects, they are regionally significant, have substantial potential benefits to the traveling public, and are supported by local and state partners. Illustrative projects in Tier II have also undergone some initial development such as feasibility studies, public input efforts, or initial environmental reviews.

Tier III projects are planned for implementation between FFY 2041 and FFY 2056. As in Tier II, Tier III includes projects that are expected to be financed through MPO-attributable funds and which are included in the fiscal constraint analysis, as well as illustrative projects that may require resources beyond those accounted for in the financial plan. Illustrative projects in Tier III are at an early stage of development and typically require substantial additional planning or complex funding arrangements.

MTP Projects and Goals

All projects in the MTP are evaluated for their relationship to each of the plan's goals. Each project is expected to contribute to the advancement at least one goal, and many contribute to multiple goals. See Table 27. Taken together, the program of projects holistically addresses the recommendations outlined in the plan.

Table 27. Percentage and Number of MTP Projects Contributing to MTP Goals

Transportation Projects Contributing to MTP Goals		
Performance Area	**Number of Projects**	**Percent of Total Projects**
Safety and Security	155	36%
Economic Opportunity	123	29%
Resilience	83	20%
Community Improvement	130	31%
Reliability and Connectivity	219	51%
System Preservation and Stewardship	228	51%
Total Projects	**431**	

A Appendix

Financial Plan and Fiscal Constraint Analysis

2056 MTP Financial Plan and Fiscal Constraint

The MTP, including the TIP in Tier I, has been fiscally constrained to reflect realistic and available levels of project funding. The plan only includes projects for which construction or operating funds are reasonably expected to be available. Projected future funding levels are based on past funding trends as well as ongoing coordination with LADOTD, transit operators, and local partners. The federal funding available to the Southeast Louisiana MPA and transit operators is determined by formula outlined in federal legislation, and specific amounts available are communicated to the RPC by LADOTD on a regular basis, at least once per fiscal year. Further, RPC and LADOTD conduct project reviews (termed "whiteboard meetings") to periodically review the program and make adjustments based on implementation progress. This ongoing process allows the RPC to develop an average estimated amount of both federal and non-federal financial resources that can be used as a benchmark in the prioritization process. In compliance with 23 CFR 450.326(m) the TIP does not distribute suballocated Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to individual jurisdictions or modes within the MPA by pre-determined formula; Tiers II and III of the MTP likewise do not suballocate funds.

Over time the region has experienced an overall increase in construction spending due to improved coordination of the planning and programming efforts of RPC and LADOTD. Fiscal constraint has resulted in a goals-oriented approach emphasizing traffic safety, transit reliability, and roadway system preservation.

The 2056 MTP does not include funding sources that were not also available in the previous MTP. If new funding sources are identified or created through local, state, or federal action after the plan has been adopted, the RPC will consult with local partners, LADOTD, and federal agencies to determine appropriate action for incorporating them into the plan. It is anticipated that if new funding sources are identified the overall process for determining available funding levels and ensuring fiscal constraint will remain similar to current practice.

Highway Funding

Surface Transportation Block Grants (STBG) are the primary form of federal funding made available to the Southeast Louisiana MPA for highway projects through the Surface Transportation Program (STP). The STP funds programmed by the RPC are further delineated as those made available for the New Orleans UA, which has a population over 200,000 (STP>200K), and for the Mandeville-Covington, Slidell, and South Tangipahoa UAs, which have populations between 50,000 and 200,000 (STP 50-200K). Under IIJA, these funds can be used for a variety of projects, including roadway maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, bridge and tunnel rehabilitation, lighting, resilience enhancements, and planning. STBG funds can also be "flexed" to public transportation, making them eligible for all the projects described in the next section.

The MPO also currently receives an annual apportionment of Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funds. These funds may be used for a variety of multi-modal projects that are specifically intended to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. As with STP funds, they are categorized based on the population of the UZA in which they will be utilized (50-200K or >200K). The program's continuation beyond IIJA is currently uncertain. As such, the MTP only includes projects to be funded by CRP in Tier I (the TIP), and this financial plan does not project CRP funding to be available in Tiers II or III. If the program does continue, funding may be reallocated or projects may be added to the plan as appropriate.

MPO attributable (STP & CRP) projects listed in the MTP are fiscally constrained, reflecting the annual attributable amount plus 20% non-federal match. The non-federal match is provided by a project sponsor, typically the owner of the transportation facility on which the project will be implemented. The most frequent project sponsors are LADOTD and local government agencies. In the case of local agencies, the availability of

matching funds is ensured through the contractual agreement the entity enters into with the state when it agrees to accept federal funds.

The region has a positive balance of attributable funds that may be utilized on occasion to cover an increase in project costs due to environmental, construction, or right-of-way needs. For the purposes of fiscal constraint, the MTP assumes that STP and CRP formula funding will increase 2% each year. Project construction costs are initially listed in 2026 dollars. To account for potential additional project costs, including inflation and Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I), a 15% contingency is added to all construction phase costs. This added contingency sufficiently reflects year-of-expenditures costs. Available attributable funds compared to project costs programmed in the MTP are summarized in Tables 1-3 below.

STP>200K				
	Tier I	**Tier II**	**Tier III**	**Total MTP FFY 27-56**
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 50,344,440	$ 33,461,461	$ 287,174,873	
Apportionment	$ 118,942,041	$ 342,036,492	$ 709,741,765	$ 1,170,720,297
Total Available	$ 169,286,481	$ 375,497,953	$ 996,916,637	$ 1,221,064,737
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 135,825,020	$ 88,323,080	$ -	$ 224,148,100
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 33,461,461	$ 287,174,873	$ 996,916,637	$ 996,916,637
STP50-200K				
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 9,000,000	$ 11,172,701	$ 41,075,255	
Apportionment	$ 37,836,361	$ 108,804,391	$ 225,774,215	$ 372,414,967
Total Available	$ 46,836,361	$ 119,977,092	$ 266,849,470	$ 381,414,967
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 35,663,660	$ 78,901,837	$ 5,855,800	$ 120,421,297
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 11,172,701	$ 41,075,255	$ 260,993,670	$ 260,993,670
Total STP				
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 59,344,440	$ 44,634,163	$ 328,250,128	
Apportionment	$ 156,778,403	$ 450,840,882	$ 935,515,980	$ 1,543,135,265
Total Available	$ 216,122,843	$ 495,475,045	$ 1,263,766,107	$ 1,602,479,705
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 171,488,680	$ 167,224,917	$ 5,855,800	$ 344,569,397

Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 44,634,163	$ 328,250,128	$ 1,257,910,307	$ 1,257,910,307

Table 1: STP Fiscal Constraint

CRP>200K				
	Tier I	**Tier II**	**Tier III**	**Total MTP FFY 27-56**
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 8,705,047	$ 13,606,516	$ 13,606,516	
Apportionment	$ 13,637,469	$ -	$ -	$ 13,637,469
Total Available	$ 22,342,516	$ -	$ -	$ 22,342,516
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 8,736,000	$ -	$ -	$ 8,736,000
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 13,606,516	$ 13,606,516	$ 13,606,516	$ 13,606,516
CRP50-200K				
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 3,352,809	$ 2,737,494	$ 2,737,494	
Apportionment	$ 3,934,260	$ -	$ -	$ 3,934,260
Total Available	$ 7,287,070	$ -	$ -	$ 7,287,070
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 4,549,576	$ -	$ -	$ 4,549,576
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 2,737,494	$ 2,737,494	$ 2,737,494	$ 2,737,494
Total CRP				
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 12,057,856	$ 16,344,010	$ 16,344,010	
Apportionment	$ 17,571,730	$ -	$ -	$ 17,571,730
Total Available	$ 29,629,586	$ -	$ -	$ 29,629,586
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 13,285,576	$ -	$ -	$ 13,285,576
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 16,344,010	$ 16,344,010	$ 16,344,010	$ 16,344,010

Table 2: CRP Fiscal Constraint

STP & CRP >200K				
	Tier I	**Tier II**	**Tier III**	**Total MTP FFY 27-56**

Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 59,049,487	$ 47,067,977	$ 300,781,389	
Apportionment	$ 132,579,510	$ 342,036,492	$ 709,741,765	$ 1,184,357,767
Total Available	$ 191,628,997	$ 375,497,953	$ 996,916,637	$ 1,243,407,254
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 144,561,020	$ 88,323,080	$ -	$ 232,884,100
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 47,067,977	$ 300,781,389	$ 1,010,523,154	$ 1,010,523,154
STP & CRP 50-200K				
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 12,352,809	$ 13,910,195	$ 43,812,749	
Apportionment	$ 41,770,622	$ 108,804,391	$ 225,774,215	$ 376,349,227
Total Available	$ 54,123,431	$ 119,977,092	$ 266,849,470	$ 388,702,037
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 40,213,236	$ 78,901,837	$ 5,855,800	$ 124,970,873
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 13,910,195	$ 43,812,749	$ 263,731,163	$ 263,731,163
Total STP & CRP				
Carried Forward from Previous Tier	$ 71,402,296	$ 60,978,172	$ 344,594,138	
Apportionment	$ 174,350,132	$ 450,840,882	$ 935,515,980	$ 1,560,706,994
Total Available	$ 245,752,428	$ 495,475,045	$ 1,263,766,107	$ 1,632,109,290
Federal Share Programmed in Tier	$ 184,774,256	$ 167,224,917	$ 5,855,800	$ 357,854,973
Projected Unobligated Balance	$ 60,978,172	$ 344,594,138	$ 1,274,254,317	$ 1,274,254,317

Table 3: STP & CRP Fiscal Constraint

In addition to MPO attributable funds, there are a variety of federal transportation programs that the state may use to fund transportation projects in the region. For example, the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System, Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds are dedicated for projects intended to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, and the IIJA introduced the Bridge Formula Program, which can be used to replace or rehabilitate bridges in poor condition. Though funding through these programs is apportioned to the state, their use in the MPA must still be approved by the MPO policy board and the projects they fund must be included in the TIP (Tier I of the MTP). As stated in 23 CFR 450.326(e):

> The TIP shall include capital and non-capital surface transportation projects (or phases of projects) within the boundaries of the metropolitan transportation area proposed for funding under 23 U.S.C.

> and 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 (including transportation alternatives, associated transit improvements; Tribal Transportation Program, Federal Lands Transportation Program, and Federal Lands Access Program projects; HSIP projects; trails projects; accessible pedestrian walkways; and bicycle facilities…

Local governments and other agencies that own and operate transportation infrastructure also use their own funds to maintain and improve the transportation system, including the Federal Aid Network. Revenue sources for such projects vary between jurisdictions. Funding is often generated through local taxes and fees, though each jurisdiction finances transportation projects through a unique combination of revenue streams. Similarly, local agencies use differing mechanisms to establish and track costs based on budgetary needs and administrative resources. In many cases, local agencies do not track whether their funds are being spent on or off the Federal Aid network, as this designation is primarily used to establish eligibility for the use of federal funding and unrelated to projects that are solely locally funded. The variety of accounting systems and budgeting processes among the MPA's parishes, municipalities, and other local agencies creates a complex funding mix that is difficult to track over time and at the regional level. To better understand the landscape of transportation revenues and funding across the region the RPC will strive to collect and track local budgetary data where possible. As information becomes available it will be added to this financial plan and in subsequent iterations of the MTP.

Finally, some funding sources are non-recurring, discretionary grants that fund large, complex projects that serve multiple modes of travel and have regional or national significance, such as Rebuilding American Infrastructure Sustainably and Equitably (RAISE). Other discretionary programs, such as the Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program and Safe Streets and Roads for All, focus specifically on removing community barriers and improving safety and mobility for bicyclists and walkers. The RPC will monitor such programs to determine their applicability to local priorities and assist local governments in discovering and applying for these opportunities.

Transit Funding

Most of the Federal funding for public transportation in the region is through guaranteed annual federal grants. To determine the amount apportioned to an urbanized area, these grants consider variables such as the population and population density, the size of the transit network, and the miles traveled by transit vehicles each year. Formula funding can be used by the region's transit agencies for many activities that are necessary to maintain and run their system. These investments can generally be divided into six categories: operating expenses, revenue vehicles, facilities, streetcar infrastructure, non-revenue vehicles, and miscellaneous expenses.

The majority of project funding is based on Section 5307 formula funds which are listed annually in the *Federal Register.* In the previous TIP (FFY23-26) Section 5307 funding averaged about $23 million annually for the New Orleans UA, $3.6 million for the St. Tammany UAs, and $1.3 in the South Tangipahoa UA.

Similar to highway projects, the transit projects described in the MTP are fiscally constrained. Projects are not included if funding cannot reasonable expected. For the purposes of fiscal constraint, the MTP assumes that Section 5307 transit formula funding will increase 2% each year. While it's impossible to predict how the federal transportation program might change in the future, this is a rate that is consistent with historical trends. Using this assumption, and using 2026 formula funding as a base, the projected Section 5307 funding for Tiers I-III is shown in Table 4.

	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Total MTP FFY 27-56
New Orleans UZA	$94,622,862.00	$ 272,102,877.67	$ 564,626,235.32	$931,351,974.99
St. Tammany UZAs (Combined)	$16,491,470.00	$ 47,423,806.44	$ 98,406,622.97	$162,321,899.41
Sout Tangipahoa UZA	$5,345,280.00	$ 15,371,190.31	$ 31,895,940.94	$52,612,411.25

Table 4: Projected 5307 Funding

Additional support may also come from Section 5339 funds for bus and bus facility replacement or rehabilitation, and Section 5337 for fixed guideway (streetcar and dedicated bus lane) improvements. These funds are programmed based on current or pending Congressional authorizations. Matching funds for transit projects come from dedicated local revenue sources, such as a 1% sales tax and a percentage of the Hotel/Motel Tax in Orleans Parish, and a property tax millage in Jefferson Parish.

Non-recurring, discretionary funds may also become available through future legislation or newly created programs. As with projections of highway funding, the MTP cannot reliably account for discretionary grant opportunities which transit agencies may seek to fund large capital projects. The RPC regularly coordinates with its partner transit agencies to monitor and access discretionary funding opportunities, and if they are awarded fiscal constraint will be assured using similar processes as existing fund sources.

B Appendix

MTP Highway Project List

Project: RPC_1350* MOTORIST ASSISTANCE PATROL (MAP)

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.	MOTORIST ASSISTANCE PATROL	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,730,000.00	$2,730,000.00	$2,184,000.00	CRP>200K	2030	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$2,730,000.00	$2,730,000.00	$2,184,000.00	CRP>200K	2029	
CONSTRUCTION	$2,730,000.00	$2,730,000.00	$2,184,000.00	CRP>200K	2028	
CONSTRUCTION	$2,730,000.00	$2,730,000.00	$2,184,000.00	CRP>200K	2027	
CONSTRUCTION	$1,047,993.00	$1,047,993.00	$838,394.00	CRP50-200K	2030	
CONSTRUCTION	$1,047,993.00	$1,047,993.00	$838,394.00	CRP50-200K	2029	
CONSTRUCTION	$1,047,993.00	$1,047,993.00	$838,394.00	CRP50-200K	2028	
CONSTRUCTION	$1,047,993.00	$1,047,993.00	$838,394.00	CRP50-200K	2027	
Total Cost:	**$15,111,972.00**	**$15,111,972.00**	**$12,089,576.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
MC, NO, SL, ST
Project Parish(es):
REGIONAL

Project: H.010116 LA 1088: SOULT AND TRINITY ROUNDABOUTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	SOULT STREET
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	TRINITY DRIVE
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	VIOLA STREET
LA 1088	852-11	1.40	1.80	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUTS & PED IMPROVEMENTS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ACCESS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$70,000.00	$70,000.00	$56,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD
UTILITY RELOCATION	$280,000.00	$280,000.00	$280,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	
CONSTRUCTION	$5,200,000.00	$5,980,000.00	$4,784,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	
CONSTRUCTION	$4,300,000.00	$4,945,000.00	$4,945,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	

Total Cost:	$9,850,000.00	$11,275,000.00	$10,065,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012662 LA 1088: I-12 ROUNDABOUTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1088	852-11	3.00	3.70	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ACCESS MANAGEMENT	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ACCESS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015405 KELLER STREET BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	KELLER ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (OFF SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$75,000.00	$86,250.00	$69,000.00	FBROFF	2027	ST. TAMMANY PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$678,000.00	$779,700.00	$623,760.00	FBROFF-E	2027	
Total Cost:	**$753,000.00**	**$865,950.00**	**$692,760.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015817 US 190 E SERVICE RD: J TANNER - US 190

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-11	1.24	2.57	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	THIN OVERLAY	PRESERVATION ROAD PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$400,000.00	$460,000.00	$368,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$400,000.00	$460,000.00	$368,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016388 LA 21: CONTINUOUS TURN LANE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 21	030-01	13.71	14.49	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 21	030-02	0.00	0.92	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	OVERLAY & WIDENING TO PROVIDE CENTER TURN LANE	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,498,000.00	$2,872,700.00	$2,872,700.00	HSIP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,498,000.00	$2,872,700.00	$2,872,700.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016591 US 190: RT TURN LN AT OAK ALLEY BLVD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	030-31	0.98	1.10	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	WESTBOUND RIGHT TURNLANE ON US 190 ONTO OAK ALLEY BLVD	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$351,000.00	$403,650.00	$322,920.00	NHPP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$351,000.00	$403,650.00	$322,920.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.017006 LA 22: TCHEFUNCTE R MB RH(MADISONVILLE)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 22	261-06	0.00	0.01	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MECHANICAL & STRUCTURAL	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE MOVABLE BRIDGE REHABILITATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,250,000.00	$1,437,500.00	$1,150,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,250,000.00	$1,437,500.00	$1,150,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012658 LA 59: KOOP DRIVE ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 59	281-03	4.00	4.10	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ROUNDABOUT	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ACCESS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,300,000.00	STPFLEX	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,300,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015943 LA 21: TYLER ST. SIDEWALK (COVINGTON)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 21	059-01	6.17	6.59	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF COVINGTON	PCC SIDEWALK	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,198,000.00	$1,377,700.00	$1,102,160.00	TAP50-200K	2028	CITY OF COVINGTON

Total Cost:	$1,198,000.00	$1,377,700.00	$1,102,160.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012633 LA 1088: TRINITY TO OAK ST - AM PHASE 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	FOREST BROOK BLVD
LA 1088	852-11	1.80	2.50	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	LA 1088 WIDENING FOR ACCESS MANAGEMENT	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ACCESS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,400,000.00	$3,910,000.00	$3,128,000.00	STPFLEX	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,400,000.00	$3,910,000.00	$3,128,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012660 LA 59: LITTLE CREEK, I-12, DOVE RNBT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 59	281-03	3.50	3.91	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ROUNDABOUTS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ACCESS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00	STPFLEX	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015006 SHARP ROAD SIDEWALK

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	SHARP ROAD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$804,000.00	$924,600.00	$739,680.00	TAP>200K	2029	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$804,000.00	$924,600.00	$739,680.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015555 LA 1077 & BREWSTER RD ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	BREWSTER RD
LA 1077	852-03	1.89	2.06	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	ROUNDABOUT INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$120,000.00	$120,000.00	$96,000.00	STP50-200K	2028	ST. TAMMANY PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$200,000.00	$200,000.00	$160,000.00	STP50-200K	2028	
CONSTRUCTION	$4,140,000.00	$4,761,000.00	$3,808,800.00	STP50-200K	2029	

Total Cost:	$4,460,000.00	$5,081,000.00	$4,064,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015712 LA 59 & HARRISON AVE ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	HARRISON AVE
LA 59	281-03	6.86	7.06	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	ROUNDABOUT INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	STP50-200K	2029	ST. TAMMANY PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	STP50-200K	2029	
CONSTRUCTION	$2,310,000.00	$2,656,500.00	$2,656,500.00	STP50-200K	2029	

Total Cost:	$2,500,000.00	$2,846,500.00	$2,846,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016488 I-12: TCHEFUNCTE RIVER BRIDGE DK OVRLAY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-12	454-04	7.97	8.24	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	BRIDGE DECK OVERLAY AND RESSEARL/REHAB EXPANSION JOINTS	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,700,000.00	$3,105,000.00	$2,484,000.00	FBRON/OFFE	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$310,500.00	NHPP	2029	
Total Cost:	**$3,000,000.00**	**$3,450,000.00**	**$2,794,500.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016883 LA 21: MADISONVILLE SW IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 21	059-01	0.31	0.68	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TOWN OF MADISONVILLE	RECONSTRUCTION OF APPROXIMATELY 4000' OF SIDEWALK	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$996,000.00	$1,145,400.00	$916,320.00	TAP50-200K	2029	TOWN OF MADISONVILLE

Total Cost:	$996,000.00	$1,145,400.00	$916,320.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.013872 LA 22 @ LA 1085 ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1085	852-02	0.00	0.20	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 22	261-05	0.54	1.00	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$4,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	STPFLEX	2026	DOTD
UTILITY RELOCATION	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$120,000.00	STP50-200K	2026	
CONSTRUCTION	$3,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00	$3,312,000.00	STP50-200K	2027	
Total Cost:	**$7,750,000.00**	**$8,290,000.00**	**$7,432,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014091 US 190: ST TAMMANY P/L TO LA 1077

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-10	0.00	2.641	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,315,000.00	$3,812,250.00	$3,049,800.00	NHPP	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,315,000.00	$3,812,250.00	$3,049,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016184 US 190 E SERV RD: N TERMINUS - J TANNER

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-11	3.33	4.43	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$700,000.00	$805,000.00	$644,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$700,000.00	$805,000.00	$644,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016185 US 190 W SERV RD: BROOKSIDE DR - FAIRWAY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-11	4.43	5.59	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,100,000.00	$1,265,000.00	$1,012,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,100,000.00	$1,265,000.00	$1,012,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016306 LA 1085: LA 22 - LA 1077 ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1085	852-02	0.11	4.40	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016307 LA 36: LA 21 - ABITA ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 36	280-01	0.00	2.98	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,100,000.00	$3,565,000.00	$2,852,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,100,000.00	$3,565,000.00	$2,852,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016416 DISTRICT 62 FYA PART 4

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	
	000-59	0.00	0.00	WASHINGTON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	FLASHING YELLOW ARROWS AND SIGNAL BACK PLATES	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,300,000.00	$3,795,000.00	$3,036,000.00	HSIPPEN	2030	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$330,000.00	$276,000.00	STP<5K	2030	
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	

Total Cost:	$6,600,000.00	$7,575,000.00	$6,072,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016971 ABITA SPRINGS NATURE TRAILS PHASE 3

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	HICKORY ST
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	LEVESON ST
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	PINE ST
LA 36	280-02	0.56	0.65	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 59	281-03	8.29	8.36	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TOWN OF ABITA SPRINGS	CONSTRUCTION OF BIKE/PED FACILITIES	RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$199,000.00	$228,850.00	$183,080.00	RTP	2030	TOWN OF ABITA SPRINGS

Total Cost:	$199,000.00	$228,850.00	$183,080.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014414 LA 22:BEDICO CREEK-PINE CREEK DR.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	PERRILLOUX RD
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	TRAPAGNIER RD
LA 22	261-04	10.55	11.92	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 22	261-05	0.00	3.01	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	WIDENING AND INTERSECTION IMPROVMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$750,000.00	$750,000.00	$600,000.00	STP50-200K	2030	DOTD
UTILITY RELOCATION	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$120,000.00	STP50-200K	2030	
CONSTRUCTION	$5,600,000.00	$6,440,000.00	$5,152,000.00	STP50-200K	2031	

Total Cost:	$6,500,000.00	$7,340,000.00	$5,872,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014710 CEDAR STREET EXT. TO LA22 AND ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	CEDAR STREET
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	CEDAR STREET
LA 22	261-05	5.74	5.80	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	EXTENSION OF CEDAR ST AND A ROUNDABOUT AT CEDAR AND LA22	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,200,000.00	$2,530,000.00	$2,024,000.00	STP50-200K	2031	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,200,000.00	$2,530,000.00	$2,024,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):

MC

Project Parish(es):

ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.010441 GRADE RAISING ON LA 1077

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1077	852-13			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	ROADWAY DRAINAGE	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$0.00	NFA	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012382 US 190: LA 25 - BOGUE FALAYA (PH 2B)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	059-30	0.00	1.79	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN TO 4 LANES 5 ROUNDABOUTS	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
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:
RIGHT OF WAY	$4,087,000.00	$4,087,000.00	$4,087,000.00	DEMO	FFY 27	DOTD
UTILITY RELOCATION	$2,013,000.00	$2,013,000.00	$1,610,400.00	STP50-200K	FFY 26	
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$1,500,000.00	$1,500,000.00	$1,200,000.00	DEMO	FFY 26	
CONSTRUCTION	$17,600,000.00	$20,240,000.00	$16,192,000.00	NFI	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$25,200,000.00	$27,840,000.00	$23,089,400.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015210 JUDGE TANNER BLVD SIDEWALK (ST TAMMANY)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	ROAD	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$159,163.64	$183,038.19	$0.00	LOCAL	TIER II	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$159,163.64	$183,038.19	$0.00

Project: RPC_0256* LA 1088: I 12 - LA 36

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,300,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,300,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0288* LA 21 @ US 190B (TYLER @ BOSTON STREET)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF COVINGTON

Total Cost:	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0810* LA22:CEDAR-MARINA DEL RAY (MADISONVILLE)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ENHANCED BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	UNKNOWN

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$920,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	TOWN OF MADISONVILLE

Total Cost:	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$920,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1063* LA 1077: I-12 TO US 190 PH. 1

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1077	852-03			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	CAPACITY(INCLUDES I-12 RAMP MODS)	CORRIDOR NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
ENVIRONMENTAL	$700,000.00	$700,000.00	$560,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 25	ST. TAMMANY PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$11,500,000.00	$13,225,000.00	$10,580,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$12,200,000.00	$13,925,000.00	$11,140,000.00

Project: RPC_1064* US 190: E. CAUSEWAY TO CLAUSEL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-02			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	MEDIAN INSTALLATION OF A 5 LANE SECTION	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE NON-INTERSTATE ON NHS & STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$250,000.00	$250,000.00	$200,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 26	CITY OF MANDEVILLE
UTILITY RELOCATION	$250,000.00	$250,000.00	$200,000.00	STP50-200K	FFY 26	
CONSTRUCTION	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,522.73	STP50-200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$2,500,000.00	$2,800,000.00	$2,240,522.73

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1148* US 190 AT SOULT ST.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,500,000.00	$4,025,000.00	$3,220,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,500,000.00	$4,025,000.00	$3,220,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1153* LA 1077: I-12 TO US 190 PH 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$21,100,000.00	$24,265,000.00	$19,412,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$21,100,000.00	$24,265,000.00	$19,412,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1318* US 190 (COLLINS BLVD) WIDENING, PH 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDENING FROM LA 437 (LEE RD.) TO LA 25	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,347,826.08	$4,999,999.99	$3,999,999.99	DEMO	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$65,217,391.30	$75,000,000.00	$60,000,000.00	NFI	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$69,565,217.38	$79,999,999.99	$63,999,999.99

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1319* E CAUSEWAY N SIDEWALK & CROSSINGS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	SIDEWALKS & PED. CROSSINGS, MONROE ST. - CAPT. VINCENT LIBERTO DR.	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$229,000.00	$229,000.00	$183,200.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF MANDEVILLE
CONSTRUCTION	$739,130.43	$849,999.99	$680,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	
Total Cost:	**$968,130.43**	**$1,078,999.99**	**$863,200.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1327* CAUSEWAY BEARING PAD REPLACEMENT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN CAUSEWAY BEARING PAD REPLACEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$240,000.00	$240,000.00	$192,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	GNOEC
CONSTRUCTION	$10,434,782.61	$12,000,000.00	$9,600,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$10,674,782.61	$12,240,000.00	$9,792,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1328* CAUSEWAY STEEL SPAN PAINTING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN CAUSEWAY STEEL SPAN PAINTING	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$120,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	GNOEC
CONSTRUCTION	$2,869,565.22	$3,300,000.00	$2,640,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$3,019,565.22	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1329* CAUSEWAY DECK REPARIS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	STRUCTURAL REPAIRS OF BRIDGE DECK	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$250,000.00	$250,000.00	$200,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	GNOEC
CONSTRUCTION	$4,347,826.09	$5,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$4,597,826.09	$5,250,000.00	$4,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1330* CAUSEWAY PILE ENCAPSULATION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN CAUSEWAY CONCRETE PILING ENCAPSULATION	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$250,000.00	$250,000.00	$200,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	GNOEC
CONSTRUCTION	$4,347,826.09	$5,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$4,597,826.09	$5,250,000.00	$4,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.002391 **LA 22 (TCHEFUNCTE RIVER - CAUSEWAY APP)**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN TO FOUR LANES	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$50,000,000.00	$57,500,000.00	$46,000,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$50,000,000.00	$57,500,000.00	$46,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012386 US 190: LA 437 - US 190B (PH 3)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	059-30			ST. TAMMANY	
US 190-X	013-10			ST. TAMMANY	
US 190-X	013-10			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN BRIDGE 4 ROUNDABOUTS	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED BRIDGE CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$55,000,000.00	$63,250,000.00	$50,600,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$55,000,000.00	$63,250,000.00	$50,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012398 US 190 @ LA 25 ROUNDABOUT (PH 2A)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	INDUSTRY DRIVE
LA 25	059-02	0.00	0.50	ST. TAMMANY	
US 190	030-31	1.25	1.524	ST. TAMMANY	
US 190	059-30	0.00	0.20	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	TWO LANE ROUNDABOUT	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$800,000.00	$800,000.00	$0.00	STBONDS	FFY 23	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$8,700,000.00	$10,005,000.00	$8,004,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	

Total Cost:	$9,500,000.00	$10,805,000.00	$8,004,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0239* I-12 @ US 190

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$45,000,000.00	$51,750,000.00	$41,400,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$45,000,000.00	$51,750,000.00	$41,400,000.00

Project: RPC_0240* I-12 @ LA 21

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$45,000,000.00	$51,750,000.00	$41,400,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$45,000,000.00	$51,750,000.00	$41,400,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0251* LA 1077: US 190 - LA 1078

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,300,000.00	$1,495,000.00	$1,196,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,300,000.00	$1,495,000.00	$1,196,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0252* LA 1077: BREWSTER RD - I-12

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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, W/ TURN LANES	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,300,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,300,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0253* LA 1078: LA 25 - LA 1077

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00	LOCAL	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0260* LA 1081: JCT LA 437 S - JCT LA 437 N

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,000,000.00	$6,900,000.00	$5,520,000.00	LOCAL	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$6,000,000.00	$6,900,000.00	$5,520,000.00

Project: RPC_0702* LA 25 (COVINGTON TO MS S L)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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 STP/WSH	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$150,000,000.00	$172,500,000.00	$138,000,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$150,000,000.00	$172,500,000.00	$138,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0704* I-12 (LA 21 TO LA 445)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN TO 6 LANES (STP/TANGI)	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000,000.00	$115,000,000.00	$103,500,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY, TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$100,000,000.00	$115,000,000.00	$103,500,000.00

Project: RPC_0724* LA 59 (I-12 TO LA 36)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$64,200,000.00	$73,830,000.00	$59,064,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$64,200,000.00	$73,830,000.00	$59,064,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0725* LA 59 (US 190 TO I-12)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$37,000,000.00	$42,550,000.00	$34,040,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$37,000,000.00	$42,550,000.00	$34,040,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0726* US 190 (LA 25 TO 1077)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$40,000,000.00	$46,000,000.00	$36,800,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$40,000,000.00	$46,000,000.00	$36,800,000.00

Project: RPC_0727* LA 36 (JCT 21 TO JCT LA 59)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$27,400,000.00	$31,510,000.00	$25,208,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$27,400,000.00	$31,510,000.00	$25,208,000.00

Project: RPC_0816* I-12 @ LA 1085

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$30,000,000.00	$34,500,000.00	$27,600,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION DOTD
Total Cost:	**$30,000,000.00**	**$34,500,000.00**	**$27,600,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1193* I-12 @ LA 1077

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$23,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$23,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0704* I-12 (LA 21 TO LA 445)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN TO 6 LANES (STP/TANGI)	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000,000.00	$115,000,000.00	$103,500,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
MC

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY, TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$100,000,000.00	$115,000,000.00	$103,500,000.00

Project: H.013711 NORTHSHORE PHASE 3 ITS DEPLOYMENT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-12	454-04			ST. TAMMANY	
US 190	013-11			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	NEW ITS EQUIPMENT, UPGRADE EQUIPMENT, FIBER OPTIC CABLE	UNKNOWN ITS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00	NHPP	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
MC, SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016836 DESTREHAN AVE. BIKE PATH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	DESTREHAN AVE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	CONSTRUCTION OF BIKE PATH APPROXIMATELY 3.1 MILES IN LENGTH	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,752,000.00	$7,764,800.00	$6,211,840.00	TAP>200K	2026	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$6,752,000.00	$7,764,800.00	$6,211,840.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.004359 HICKORY (LA 48 - MOUNES)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	POWERLINE RD
LA 3154	826-44	0.00	1.07	JEFFERSON	
LA 3154-P	826-65	0.00	1.01	JEFFERSON	
LA 48	006-30	1.14	1.31	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	RELOCATION AND 4 LANING	OTHER / MISCELLANEOUS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$16,840,000.00	$19,366,000.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2027	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$940,000.00	$1,081,000.00	$0.00	STBONDS	2027	
CONSTRUCTION	$931,000.00	$1,070,650.00	$0.00	STGEN	2027	

Total Cost:	$18,711,000.00	$21,517,650.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.007181 L&A ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	L AND A ROAD
LA 3139	430-01	0.00	0.11	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	NEW ROADWAY & ALIGNMENT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$7,600,000.00	$8,740,000.00	$6,992,000.00	STP>200K	2027	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$7,600,000.00	$8,740,000.00	$6,992,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.007208 HARVEY BLVD EXT (PETERS RD-MANHATTAN)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	HARVEY BLVD.
LA 3017	826-11	3.58	3.89	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	NEW ROADWAY EXTENSION	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$12,000,000.00	$13,800,000.00	$11,040,000.00	STP>200K	2027	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$12,000,000.00	$13,800,000.00	$11,040,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015009 W METAIRIE AVE OVER S SUBURBAN CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	002-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	W METAIRIE AVE

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,210,000.00	$1,391,500.00	$1,113,200.00	FBRON/OFFE	2027	JEFFERSON PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$134,000.00	$154,100.00	$107,200.00	STPFLEX	2027	
Total Cost:	**$1,344,000.00**	**$1,545,600.00**	**$1,220,400.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015496 SAUVAGE AVE AND CADDY DR BRIDGES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	SAUVAGE AVE
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	SAUVAGE AVE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	BRIDGE REPLACMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (OFF SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$331,000.00	$380,650.00	$304,520.00	FBROFF	2027	JEFFERSON PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$2,979,000.00	$3,425,850.00	$2,740,680.00	FBROFF-E	2027	
Total Cost:	**$3,310,000.00**	**$3,806,500.00**	**$3,045,200.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015561 VINTAGE DR EB: DUNCAN CANAL-POWER BLVD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	VINTAGE DR

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF KENNER	ASPHALT RESURFACING	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,697,000.00	$1,951,550.00	$1,561,240.00	STP>200K	2027	CITY OF KENNER

Total Cost:	$1,697,000.00	$1,951,550.00	$1,561,240.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016260 I-10 SERVICE RD AT ROSA (JEFFERSON)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	ROSA AVE
I-10	450-15	8.85	9.35	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS	SAFETY SAFE ROUTES TO PUBLIC PLACES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
FEASIBILITY	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	HSIPPEN	2027	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$9,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.007214 EAST AMES BOULEVARD IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	AMES BOULEVARD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH 742-26-0080; Oregon Dr. -Blanche Dr	WIDEN FROM 2 TO 3 LANES	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$11,800,000.00	$13,570,000.00	$10,856,000.00	STP>200K	2028	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$11,800,000.00	$13,570,000.00	$10,856,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.013347 LA 18: 4TH ST BIKE PATH JEFFERSON PARISH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 18	063-02	1.35	3.46	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	BIKE PATHS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(2) (3)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$517,000.00	$594,550.00	$475,640.00	TAP>200K	2028	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$517,000.00	$594,550.00	$475,640.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.013411 LA 48 PED. IMPROVEMENTS CITY OF HARAHAN

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 48	006-30	1.27	2.96	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	SIDEWALKS, DRAINAGE	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$423,000.00	$486,450.00	$338,400.00	TAP>200K	2028	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$423,000.00	$486,450.00	$338,400.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.013718 LA 23: 23RD ST - GRETNA BLVD PED IMPR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 23	062-01	1.17	1.52	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SIDEWALKS AND PED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	SAFETY SAFE ROUTES TO PUBLIC PLACES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$404,000.00	$464,600.00	$371,680.00	HSIP-VRU	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$404,000.00	$464,600.00	$371,680.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.013825 NOPB RR XINGS (JEFFERSON PARISH)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	DAKIN ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	MONTICELLO AVE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL RR ACTIVE WARNING	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$550,000.00	$550,000.00	HSIP	2028	DOTD

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

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.014316 LAPALCO BLVD: TANGLEWOOD TO VICTORY PH 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	LAPALCO BLVD.

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	WIDENING TO 4 LANES	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$120,000.00	STP>200K	2027	JEFFERSON PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$80,000.00	STP>200K	2027	
CONSTRUCTION	$13,000,000.00	$14,950,000.00	$11,960,000.00	STP>200K	2028	

Total Cost:	$13,250,000.00	$15,200,000.00	$12,160,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015392 LA 18: UP XING (WESTWEGO) - 797870D

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 18	063-03	3.03	3.04	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	UPGRADE RR CROSSING SURFACE	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$188,000.00	$216,200.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2028	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$313,000.00	$359,950.00	$287,960.00	STPFLEX	2028	
Total Cost:	**$501,000.00**	**$576,150.00**	**$287,960.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015796 VETERANS BLVD SHARED-USE PATH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	VETERANS BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	PCC SHARED-USE PATH, STREET FURNITURE, PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,477,000.00	$3,998,550.00	$3,198,840.00	TAPFLEX	2028	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$3,477,000.00	$3,998,550.00	$3,198,840.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015835 US 90 Z: JUNG BLVD - US 90

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90-Z	283-09	6.32	9.82	JEFFERSON	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,939,000.00	$6,829,850.00	$5,463,880.00	NHPP	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$5,939,000.00	$6,829,850.00	$5,463,880.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015931 BUCKTOWN MULTI-USE PATH-JEFFERSON PARISH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	METAIRIE HAMMOND HWY

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	MULTI-USE PATH, PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE AND RELATED WORK	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,163,000.00	$2,487,450.00	$1,989,960.00	TAP>200K	2028	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,163,000.00	$2,487,450.00	$1,989,960.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016392 VINTAGE DR WB:DUNCAN CANAL - POWER BLVD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	VINTAGE DR

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF KENNER	ASPHALT RESURFACING WITH ADA IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,676,000.00	$1,927,400.00	$1,541,920.00	STP>200K	2028	CITY OF KENNER

Total Cost:	$1,676,000.00	$1,927,400.00	$1,541,920.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016711 KEYHOLE CANAL GREENWAY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	AVENUE H

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF WESTWEGO	CONSTRUCT M/U PATH	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,650,000.00	$6,497,500.00	$5,198,000.00	STP>200K	2028	CITY OF WESTWEGO

Total Cost:	$5,650,000.00	$6,497,500.00	$5,198,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016769 LA 23 & LA 428 REPAIRS: GRETNA - ORLEANS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 23	826-46	0.05	1.06	JEFFERSON	
LA 428	826-46	1.06	1.53	JEFFERSON	
LA 428	826-47	0.00	0.40	JEFFERSON	
LA 428	836-12	0.00	0.42	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONCRETE PAVEMENT REHAB AND DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	ROAD TRANSFER

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,500,000.00	$4,025,000.00	$3,220,000.00	STPFLEX	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,500,000.00	$4,025,000.00	$3,220,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016935 WESTWEGO RIVER TO SWAMP TRAIL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	11TH ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	5TH ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	AVENUE A
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	AVENUE D
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	LAROUSSINI ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	SALA AVE
LA 18	063-03	2.83	2.89	JEFFERSON	
LA 18	063-03	3.56	3.72	JEFFERSON	
LA 541	823-13	3.83	4.18	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF WESTWEGO	TRAIL CONSTRUCTION AND ENHANCEMENT	RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$20,000.00	$23,000.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2028	CITY OF WESTWEGO
CONSTRUCTION	$127,000.00	$146,050.00	$116,840.00	RTP	2028	

Total Cost:	$147,000.00	$169,050.00	$116,840.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015833 LA 23: US 90 - BEHRMAN

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 23	062-01	0.58	3.38	JEFFERSON	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,300,000.00	$6,095,000.00	$4,876,000.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$5,300,000.00	$6,095,000.00	$4,876,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016060 US 90: HP LONG BRIDGE (NO) - REPAIRS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-01	1.07	1.52	JEFFERSON	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,700,000.00	$3,105,000.00	$2,484,000.00	FBR-ON/OFF	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00	NHPP	2029	
Total Cost:	**$3,000,000.00**	**$3,450,000.00**	**$2,760,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016097 BUNCHE ELEM & JOHN EHRET HS PED IM (JEF)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	CRESTON ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	FILMORE ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	IVY ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	MILAN ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	PATRIOT ST
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	SIMON ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SIDEWALKS, PED SIGNALS, CURB RAMPS	SAFETY SAFE ROUTES TO PUBLIC PLACES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$1,150,000.00	HSIPPEN	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$885,000.00	$1,017,750.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2029	
Total Cost:	**$1,885,000.00**	**$2,167,750.00**	**$1,150,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016282 WILLIAMS BOULEVARD CAP REPAIR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-15	2.24	2.42	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	FRP NEEDS TO BE REPLACED AT A BENT WHERE IT IS FAILING	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$900,000.00	$1,035,000.00	$828,000.00	FBR-ON/OFF	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000.00	$115,000.00	$103,500.00	NHPP	2029	
Total Cost:	**$1,000,000.00**	**$1,150,000.00**	**$931,500.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016508 I-10: LOYOLA DR APP SLAB REPAIR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-15	0.41	0.92	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	APPROACH SLAB REPAIR / REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$900,000.00	$1,035,000.00	$828,000.00	FBR-ON/OFF	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000.00	$115,000.00	$103,500.00	NHPP	2029	

Total Cost:	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$931,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016568 I-10: CLEARVIEW PKWY - I-610

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-15	5.35	9.35	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL AND OVERLAY OF ASPHALT PAVEMENT, PATCHING, GUARDRAIL	PRESERVATION INTERSTATE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$7,045,000.00	$8,101,750.00	$7,291,575.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$7,045,000.00	$8,101,750.00	$7,291,575.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016800 MS RIVER BRIDGE VESSEL COLL METHOD III

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-910	283-08	1.62	2.19	JEFFERSON	
I-910	283-08	2.42	2.99	JEFFERSON	
LA 3213	434-02	0.00	0.57	JEFFERSON	
LA 70	426-02	0.78	2.50	JEFFERSON	
US 90	006-01	1.07	1.52	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PERFORM VESSEL COLLISION STUDIES	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
FEASIBILITY	$748,000.00	$748,000.00	$598,400.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD
FEASIBILITY	$187,000.00	$187,000.00	$149,600.00	STPFLEX	2029	
Total Cost:	**$935,000.00**	**$935,000.00**	**$748,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016813 LAPALCO BLVD: TIMBERLANE DR. TO LA 23

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	LAPALCO BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	ASPHALT MILL AND OVERLAY	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,800,000.00	$5,520,000.00	$4,416,000.00	STP>200K	2029	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$4,800,000.00	$5,520,000.00	$4,416,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016837 LAPALCO BLVD: PETERS RD TO TIMBERLANE DR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	LAPALCO BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM JEFFERSON PARISH	ASPHALT MILL AND OVERLAY	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,500,000.00	$5,175,000.00	$4,140,000.00	STP>200K	2029	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$4,500,000.00	$5,175,000.00	$4,140,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.009884 SEVERAL NOGC XINGS(GRETNA)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	DELHONDE ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	RR CROSSING ENHANCEMENT	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.015827 LA 466: FRANKLIN - 4TH ST

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 18	063-02	0.85	1.16	JEFFERSON	
LA 466	063-02	0.58	0.84	JEFFERSON	
LA 466	063-02	0.84	0.85	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	2" MILL AND OVERLAY, PATCHING	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,300,000.00	$3,795,000.00	$3,036,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,300,000.00	$3,795,000.00	$3,036,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016104 LA 48: WILLIAMS - ST. CHARLES P/L

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 48	282-01	0.00	2.09	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	3.5" PATCH, 2" MILL AND OVERLAY	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,113,000.00	$2,429,950.00	$1,943,960.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,113,000.00	$2,429,950.00	$1,943,960.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016113 LA 18: RIVER RD - US 90

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 18	063-03	3.53	5.31	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	2" ASPHALT CONCRETE MILL AND OVERLAY	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,904,000.00	$2,189,600.00	$1,751,680.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,904,000.00	$2,189,600.00	$1,751,680.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016140 LA 45: AMES BLVD - FLOODWALL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 45	249-01	3.55	3.85	JEFFERSON	
LA 45	249-01	3.85	7.26	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL AND OVERLAY OF ASPHALT PAVEMENT AND RELATED WORK	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,700,000.00	$3,105,000.00	$2,484,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,700,000.00	$3,105,000.00	$2,484,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016151 US 90: LEFT TURN LANE @ JAMES BLVD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	005-10	3.85	4.43	JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ASPHALT WIDENING AND OVERLAY	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00	NHPP	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016832 POWER BLVD: W. ESPLANADE TO VINTAGE NB

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	POWER BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF KENNER	ASPHALT RESURFACING WITH ADA IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,564,000.00	STP>200K	2030	CITY OF KENNER

Total Cost:	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,564,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016833 **POWER BLVD: W. ESPLANADE TO VINTAGE SB**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	POWER BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF KENNER	ASPHALT RESURFACING WITH ADA IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,564,000.00	STP>200K	2030	CITY OF KENNER

Total Cost:	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,564,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016865 WEST LOYOLA MULTI-USE PATH KENNER

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	W ESPLANADE AVE
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	W LOYOLA DR

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF KENNER	4,500' OF PCC MULTI-USE PATH ALONG CITY ROUTES	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,788,000.00	$3,206,200.00	$2,564,960.00	TAP>200K	2030	CITY OF KENNER

Total Cost:	$2,788,000.00	$3,206,200.00	$2,564,960.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.003074 I 10: WILLIAMS BLVD - VETERANS BLVD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-15			JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	MAJOR WIDENING - ADD TRAVEL LANES	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$174,608,000.00	$200,799,200.00	$160,639,360.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$174,608,000.00	$200,799,200.00	$160,639,360.00

Project: H.004396 LAPALCO BRIDGE AT HARVEY CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	CAPACITY / NEW BRIDGE	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$95,652,173.91	$110,000,000.00	$88,000,000.00	NFI	TIER II	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$95,652,173.91	$110,000,000.00	$88,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.007223 HARVEY BLVD. (MANHATTAN - WALL BLVD.)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26			JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN TO 4 LANES SECTION	URBAN SYSTEMS NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$7,100,000.00	$8,165,000.00	$6,532,000.00	NFI	TIER II	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$7,100,000.00	$8,165,000.00	$6,532,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.010325 **LA 1: LA 3090 - CAMINADA BAY**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	RAISING ROADWAY GRADE	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE ROADWAY FLOODING

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$350,000.00	$402,500.00	$322,000.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$400,000.00	$460,000.00	$368,000.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$750,000.00	$862,500.00	$690,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.011309 MACARTHUR INTERCHANGE COMPLETION PH. II

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90-Z	283-09			JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	RELOCATE THE EXIT RAMP AND CONSTRUCT AN ENTRANCE RAMP	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$60,000,000.00	$69,000,000.00	$55,200,000.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$60,000,000.00	$69,000,000.00	$55,200,000.00

Project: H.013339 US 90: IC, NOPB RR XING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	RR XING SAFETY	UNKNOWN

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$19,000.00	$21,850.00	$21,850.00	RR	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$134,000.00	$154,100.00	$123,280.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$153,000.00	$175,950.00	$145,130.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.016985 LAPALCO OVER HARVEY CANAL BRIDGE REHAB

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26	0.00	0.00	JEFFERSON	LAPALCO BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	MILL, HYDRO-BLAST, REPLACE JOINTS, OVERLAY	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$362,600.00	$362,600.00	$289,600.00	STP>200K	TIER II	JEFFERSON PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$11,800,000.00	$13,570,000.00	$10,856,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$12,162,600.00	$13,932,600.00	$11,145,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: RPC_1161* CAUSEWAY: OVERPASS OF US 90 (SHREWSBURY)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$20,000,000.00	$23,000,000.00	$18,400,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$20,000,000.00	$23,000,000.00	$18,400,000.00

Project: RPC_1207* W. ESPLANADE @ CANAL NO. 17

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$564,585.00	$649,272.75	$519,418.41	BIP	TIER II	JEFFERSON PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$564,585.00	$649,272.75	$519,418.41

Project: RPC_1208* 6TH STREET @ KEYHOLE CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$648,375.00	$745,631.25	$596,505.00	BIP	TIER II	JEFFERSON PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$648,375.00	$745,631.25	$596,505.00

Project: RPC_1209* CAUSEWAY @ AIRLINE TRAFFIC CIRCLE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION BRIDGE CONDITION	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$40,869,565.22	$47,000,000.00	$37,600,000.00	NFI	TIER II	JEFFERSON PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$40,869,565.22	$47,000,000.00	$37,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1331* JEFFERSON PARISH EASTBANK SMART TERMINAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (3) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,043,478.26	$1,200,000.00	$960,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	JEFFERSON PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$1,043,478.26	$1,200,000.00	$960,000.00

Project: RPC_1340* RESTORATION OF GRETNA FERRY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	RESTORED FERRY SERVICE TO GRETNA TERMINAL	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,000,000.00	$1,000,000.00	$800,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$2,000,000.00	$2,000,000.00	$1,600,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$26,956,521.74	$31,000,000.00	$24,800,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$29,956,521.74	$34,000,000.00	$27,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.006513 US 61 CORRIDOR PRESERVATION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-26			JEFFERSON	
	000-36			ORLEANS	
	000-45			ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	ABANDONED RR R/W ACQ	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$6,750,000.00	$6,750,000.00	$5,400,000.00	DEMO	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$6,750,000.00	$6,750,000.00	$5,400,000.00

Project: H.009087 I-10: LOYOLA DR. TO WILLIAMS BLVD.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-15			JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDENING, ADD TRAVEL LANES	PRESERVATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00

Project: RPC_1160* HARVEY BLVD EXT (PETERS-MANHATTAN) PH 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	FOUR LANE OF TWO LANE SECTION	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: RPC_1162* LAPALCO (SEGNETTE TO TANGLEWOOD)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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, WIDEN BRIDGE	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$23,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	JEFFERSON PARISH

Total Cost:	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$23,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
JEFFERSON

Project: H.011221 I-10: NO CBD3 POYDRAS - CHEF MENTEUR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-90	5.12	8.22	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SIGNING & SIGNING STRUCTURES REPLACEMENT AND UPGRADE IN NO CBD	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,254,000.00	$9,492,100.00	$8,542,890.00	NHPP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$8,254,000.00	$9,492,100.00	$8,542,890.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.013150 ANDREW HIGGINS: MAGAZINE TO CONVENTION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	ANDREW HIGGINS ST.

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	ROADWAY REHABILITATION; SIDEWALK, LIGHTING IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,158,000.00	$2,481,700.00	$1,985,360.00	STP>200K	2027	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$2,158,000.00	$2,481,700.00	$1,985,360.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.014283 US 90: IHNC MB REHAB PH. 2 (DANZIGER)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-90	0.80	1.80	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	STRUCTURAL, MECHANICAL, AND ELECTRICAL REHABILITATION WORK	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$36,500,000.00	$41,975,000.00	$33,580,000.00	NHPP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$36,500,000.00	$41,975,000.00	$33,580,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.014752 LA 3021: DUAL TURN LANES @ LA 39

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3021	419-01	0.00	0.10	ORLEANS	
LA 39	046-02	0.00	0.07	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ADD DUAL LEFT TURN LANES FROM LA 3021 TO LA 39	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$600,000.00	$690,000.00	$552,000.00	NHPP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$600,000.00	$690,000.00	$552,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.014886 US 90: LAFITTE AVE TO FRANCE RD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-03	7.838	9.165	ORLEANS	
US 90	006-90	0.00	1.004	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PATCH, MILL ,OVERLAY, TURN LANES, SIGNALS & PED IMPROVEMENT	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON NHS SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,350,000.00	$3,852,500.00	$3,467,250.00	HSIP-VRU	2027	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$8,100,000.00	$9,315,000.00	$7,452,000.00	NHPP	2027	
Total Cost:	**$11,450,000.00**	**$13,167,500.00**	**$10,919,250.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.015498 PARK ROAD OVER LAGOON

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	PARK RD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (OFF SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$168,000.00	$193,200.00	$154,560.00	FBROFF	2027	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$1,512,000.00	$1,738,800.00	$1,391,040.00	FBROFF-E	2027	

Total Cost:	$1,680,000.00	$1,932,000.00	$1,545,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016032 I10: TWIN SPAN BR PAVEMENT MARKINGS REPL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-17	0.00	5.55	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PAVEMENT MARKING IMPROVEMENTS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,200,000.00	$1,380,000.00	$1,242,000.00	NHPP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,200,000.00	$1,380,000.00	$1,242,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016518 LAFITTE GREENWAY CONNECTIONS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	CONTI ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	CONSTRUCTION OF 2500' OF CONNECTING INFRASTRUCTURE	RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$375,000.00	$431,250.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2027	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$125,000.00	$143,750.00	$115,000.00	RTP	2027	
Total Cost:	**$500,000.00**	**$575,000.00**	**$115,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016659 LA 46: ST CLAUDE AVE PED SAFETY IMPROV

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 46	046-02	0.35	3.19	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL AND SIGN IMPROVEMENTS	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$950,000.00	$1,092,500.00	$1,092,500.00	HSIPPEN	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$950,000.00	$1,092,500.00	$1,092,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016728 ALMONASTER AVE & JOURDAN RD: NOPB XINGS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	ALMONASTER AVE
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	ALMONASTER AVE
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	ALMONASTER AVE
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	JOURDAN RD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL/UPGRADE ACTIVE WARNING DEVICES	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,200,000.00	$1,380,000.00	$1,104,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,200,000.00	$1,380,000.00	$1,104,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016991 LA 1264 IHNC MB SPAN MTR RH(TED HICKEY)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1264	836-15	0.26	0.27	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ELECTRICAL	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE MOVABLE BRIDGE REHABILITATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$450,000.00	$517,500.00	$414,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$450,000.00	$517,500.00	$414,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.011222 I-10: NO CBD4 LOUISA - I-510

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-90	8.22	15.90	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SIGNING AND SIGNING STRUCTURES REPLACEMENT & UPGRADE IN NO CBD	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,800,000.00	$6,670,000.00	$6,003,000.00	NHPP	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$5,800,000.00	$6,670,000.00	$6,003,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.011836 NEW ORLEANS: LAKE VISTA SIDEWALKS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	LAKE VISTA AREA

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM NON FLOOD PROT. ASSET MNGMT AUTH.	SIDEWALKS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(2)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$499,000.00	$573,850.00	$459,080.00	TAP>200K	2028	NON FLOOD PROT. ASSET MNGMT AUTH.

Total Cost:	$499,000.00	$573,850.00	$459,080.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.011969 LA 1264: IHNC MB REHAB (TED HICKEY)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1264	836-15	0.19	0.70	ORLEANS	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$24,750,000.00	$28,462,500.00	$22,770,000.00	FBRON/OFFE	2028	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$2,750,000.00	$3,162,500.00	$2,530,000.00	STPFLEX	2028	

Total Cost:	$27,500,000.00	$31,625,000.00	$25,300,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.013364 CITY PARK PALM DRIVE SIDEWALKS (NO)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	GOLF DR.
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	GOLF DR.
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	PALM DR.

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK	SIDEWALKS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$229,000.00	$263,350.00	$210,680.00	TAP>200K	2028	NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK

Total Cost:	$229,000.00	$263,350.00	$210,680.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.015863 UNO LAKEFRONT CAMPUS CONNECTOR PHASE 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	UNO LAKEFRONT CAMPUS CONNECTOR PHASE 2

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS	SHARED-USE PATH CONNECTING SIDEWALKS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$232,000.00	$266,800.00	$213,440.00	TAP>200K	2028	UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$232,000.00	$266,800.00	$213,440.00

Project: H.016041 I-610: I-10W TO I-10 E PAVEMENT PKGS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-610	450-34	0.00	4.92	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PAVEMENT STRIPING AND RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,759,500.00	NHPP	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,759,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016088 US90 (TULANE AV) & GALVEZ ST PED IMP(NO)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	N GALVEZ ST
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	S GALVEZ ST
US 90	006-03			ORLEANS	
US 90	006-03			ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SHARED USE PATH, PED SIGNALS, STRIPING, ROAD DIET	SAFETY SAFE ROUTES TO PUBLIC PLACES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$575,000.00	HSIPPEN	2028	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$150,000.00	$172,500.00	$155,250.00	HSIP-VRU	2028	
CONSTRUCTION	$1,200,000.00	$1,380,000.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2028	
Total Cost:	**$1,850,000.00**	**$2,127,500.00**	**$730,250.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016732 LA 46: ST CLAUDE VRU CORRIDOR STUDY (NO)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 46	046-02	0.32	3.51	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	TRAFFIC/SAFETY STUDY FOR POTENTIAL VRU ENHANCEMENTS	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
FEASIBILITY	$285,000.00	$285,000.00	$256,500.00	HSIP-VRU	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$285,000.00	$285,000.00	$256,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016818 LA 39: RR OVERPASS SURFACE ABRASION (NO)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 39	046-31	1.07	1.40	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SURFACE ABRASION, STRIPING, TRAFFIC SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$193,000.00	$221,950.00	$221,950.00	HSIPPEN	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$193,000.00	$221,950.00	$221,950.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.000304 I-10 - US 61 OVERPASS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 61	007-01	1.06	1.33	ORLEANS	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.011219 I-10: NO CBD1 BONNABEL - CARROLLTON

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-15	8.25	9.35	ORLEANS	
I-10	450-90	0.00	2.09	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SIGNING AND SIGNING STRUCTURES REPLACEMENT & UPGRADE IN NO CBD	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.011964 LA 39: INDUSTRIAL CANAL BRIDGE REHAB

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 39	046-31	2.50	2.66	ORLEANS	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,271,000.00	$2,611,650.00	$2,089,320.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,271,000.00	$2,611,650.00	$2,089,320.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.015198 S. CARROLLTON AVE PED & BIKE IMPR (NO)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	S. CARROLLTON AVE.

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	SIDEWALKS, CURB RAMPS, DRAINAGE AND STRIPING	SAFETY SAFE ROUTES TO PUBLIC PLACES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$575,000.00	HSIPPEN	2029	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$1,850,000.00	$2,127,500.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2029	
Total Cost:	**$2,350,000.00**	**$2,702,500.00**	**$575,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.015645 LA 47 HAYNE BLVD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 47	148-03	0.85	6.70	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	SAFETY & OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	DEMO	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1307* CARROLLTON AVE: US 61 TO ORLEANS AVE.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$12,000,000.00	$13,800,000.00	$11,040,000.00	STP>200K	2029	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$12,000,000.00	$13,800,000.00	$11,040,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.015808 US 90: DANZIGER BR - I510

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-90	1.67	7.16	ORLEANS	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,794,000.00	$10,113,100.00	$8,090,480.00	NHPP	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$8,794,000.00	$10,113,100.00	$8,090,480.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016108 LA 47 & 1264: BULLARD AVE - ARMY CENTER

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1264	836-15	0.00	0.82	ORLEANS	
LA 47	148-03	2.90	6.70	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONCRETE PATCHING AND STRIPING: BRIDGE CLEAN AND RESEAL	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,750,000.00	$3,162,500.00	$2,530,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,750,000.00	$3,162,500.00	$2,530,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016864 ZACHARY TAYLOR DR., PHASE 1 CITY PARK

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	ZACHARY TAYLOR DR

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK	CONSTRUCT WALKS & BIKE PATHS ALONG ZACHARY TAYLOR DRIVE	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00	TAP>200K	2030	NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK

Total Cost:	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016873 NEW BASIN CANAL TRAIL EXTENSION, PH. VI

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	PONTCHARTRAIN BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	CONSTRUCT PCC WALKING TRAIL AND RELATED WORK	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$392,000.00	$450,800.00	$360,640.00	TAP>200K	2030	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$392,000.00	$450,800.00	$360,640.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016970 I-10: I-910 - I-610 PAVEMENT MARKINGS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-90	0.00	3.43	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PAVEMENT STRIPING AND RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$350,000.00	$402,500.00	$362,250.00	NHPP	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$350,000.00	$402,500.00	$362,250.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.016979 LAFITTE GREENWAY GALVEZ EXTENSION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	N GALVEZ ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	CONSTRUCTION OF A 1200 LF CONCRETE BIKE TRAIL	RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$350,000.00	$402,500.00	$322,000.00	RTP	2030	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$350,000.00	$402,500.00	$322,000.00

Project: H.017010 US 90 CHEF PASS MB MACH. RH(CHEF)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-05	0.00	0.01	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MECHANICAL	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE MOVABLE BRIDGE REHABILITATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.017011 LA 39 MB SPAN RH(JUDGE SEEBER)(HBI)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 39	046-31	2.33	2.34	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MECHANICAL & STRUCTURAL	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE MOVABLE BRIDGE REHABILITATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$242,000.00	$242,000.00	$193,600.00	STPFLEX	2028	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$1,150,000.00	$1,322,500.00	$1,058,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	
Total Cost:	**$1,392,000.00**	**$1,564,500.00**	**$1,251,600.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1313* I-10 E SERVICE RDS. BIKE/PED IMPRV. PH 1

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS *Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,100,000.00	$7,015,000.00	$5,612,000.00	STP>200K	2030	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$6,100,000.00	$7,015,000.00	$5,612,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.014344 LA 428 PHASE 1: BEHRMAN AVE TO MERILL ST

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 428	409-01	0.00	0.70	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	BIKE LANES	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$40,000.00	STP>200K	2031	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$2,810,000.00	$3,231,500.00	$2,585,200.00	STP>200K	2031	
Total Cost:	**$2,860,000.00**	**$3,281,500.00**	**$2,625,200.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.014345 LA 428 PHASE 2: MERRILL ST TO WILTZ LN

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 428	409-01	0.70	1.24	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	ACCESS MANAGEMENT FOR BIKE/PED/TRANSIT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	$60,000.00	STP>200K	2031	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$2,700,000.00	$3,105,000.00	$2,484,000.00	STP>200K	2031	
Total Cost:	**$2,775,000.00**	**$3,180,000.00**	**$2,544,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.014346 LA 428 PHASE 3: WILTZ LN TO WOODLAND DR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 428	409-01	1.24	2.96	ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF NEW ORLEANS	BIKE/PED LANES	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	$60,000.00	STP>200K	2031	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$5,200,000.00	$5,980,000.00	$4,784,000.00	STP>200K	2031	
Total Cost:	**$5,275,000.00**	**$6,055,000.00**	**$4,844,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.000263 CHEF MENTEUR PASS BRIDGE & APPROACH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-05	0.00	0.719	ORLEANS	
US 90	006-90	15.834	16.477	ORLEANS	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,775,000.00	$1,775,000.00	$1,420,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 24	DOTD
UTILITY RELOCATION	$163,000.00	$163,000.00	$130,400.00	STPFLEX	FFY 24	
CONSTRUCTION	$99,727,000.00	$109,699,700.00	$91,748,840.00	NFI	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$101,665,000.00	$111,637,700.00	$93,299,240.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.007274 MAGAZINE ST: (EAST DRIVE - NASHVILLE)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36	0.00	0.00	ORLEANS	MAGAZINE STREET

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	REHABILITATION	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$13,000,000.00	$14,950,000.00	$11,960,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$13,000,000.00	$14,950,000.00	$11,960,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_0821* US 90 PORT OF NO ACCESS IMP.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	PORT OF N.O.

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00

Project: RPC_1167* LA 46 ST. CLAUDE BRIDGE OVER IHNC

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	HISTORIC BRIDGE REHABILITATION	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$30,000,000.00	$34,500,000.00	$31,050,000.00	BIP	TIER II	PORT OF N.O.

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$30,000,000.00	$34,500,000.00	$31,050,000.00

Project: RPC_1168* LIVABLE CLAIBORNE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION	(1) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000,000.00	$115,000,000.00	$92,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$100,000,000.00	$115,000,000.00	$92,000,000.00

Project: RPC_1170* PALMETTO ST. BRIDGE @ AIRLINE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1171* S. BROAD STREET BRIDGE @ I-10/RAIL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1172* S. NC FRANCIS PKWY BRIDGE @ I-10/RAIL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1173* WALL BLVD. BRIDGE @ MAGELLAN CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1174* E. 6TH STREET BRIDGE @ HWY 406

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1175* MURL STREET BRIDGE @ MAGELLAN CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1176* PEOPLE'S AVE BRIDGE @ FLORIDA CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1177* N. GALVEZ RD/ BRIDGE @ RAILYARD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1178* FRANKLIN AVE. BRIDGE @ FLORIDA CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1179* ALMONASTER AVE. BRIDGE @ FLORIDA CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1180* ALVAR STREET BRIDGE @ FLORIDA CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1183* MORRISON RD. BRIDGE @ ST. CHARLES CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1184* LAKE FOREST BLVD. BRIDGE @ BENSON CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1185* LAKE FOREST BLVD BRIDGE @ LAWRENCE CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1188* LAKE FOREST BLVD. BRIDGE @ BERG CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1191* LAKE FOREST BLVD. BRIDGE @ CITRUS CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	BIP	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1311* LAKE MARINA PATH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,400,000.00	$3,910,000.00	$3,128,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$3,400,000.00	$3,910,000.00	$3,128,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1315* LA 47 / LINCOLN BEACH BLVD. IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ROAD DIET AND COMPLETE STREETS IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,217,391.30	$2,550,000.00	$2,040,000.00	DEMO	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$10,826,086.96	$12,450,000.00	$9,960,000.00	NFI	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$13,043,478.26	$15,000,000.00	$12,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1320* FILMORE BRIDGE AT BAYOU ST. JOHN

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,782,608.70	$5,500,000.01	$4,400,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$4,782,608.70	$5,500,000.01	$4,400,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1321* SEABROOK BRIDGE AT IHNC

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,608,695.65	$3,000,000.00	$2,400,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$2,608,695.65	$3,000,000.00	$2,400,000.00

Project: RPC_1322* BAYOU SAUVAGE NWR ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (3)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,478,260.87	$4,000,000.00	$3,200,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$3,478,260.87	$4,000,000.00	$3,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1323* NO EAST LOGISTICS HUB

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,347,826.09	$5,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$4,347,826.09	$5,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1334* RTA SELECT SERVICE TRANSIT PRIORITY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	SYSTEMWIDE TRANSIT PRIORITY AND CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (3) (4) (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	FTA DISC	TIER II	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
CONSTRUCTION	$43,478,260.87	$50,000,000.00	$40,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$48,478,260.87	$55,000,000.00	$44,000,000.00

Project: RPC_1335* LOYOLA STREETCAR HOWARD AVE. EXT.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	STREETCAR EXTENSION AND MODERNIZATION	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,500,000.00	$1,500,000.00	$1,200,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$18,000,000.00	$18,000,000.00	$14,400,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$108,695,652.17	$125,000,000.00	$100,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$128,195,652.17	$144,500,000.00	$115,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1336* RIVERFRONT STREETCAR UPTOWN EXTENSION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,750,000.00	$1,750,000.00	$1,400,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$17,500,000.00	$17,500,000.00	$14,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$152,173,913.04	$175,000,000.00	$140,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$171,423,913.04	$194,250,000.00	$155,400,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1337* STREETCAR MODERNIZATION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	SYSTEMWIDE STREETCAR MODERNIZATION	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (3) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$30,000,000.00	$30,000,000.00	$24,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
CONSTRUCTION	$260,869,565.22	$300,000,000.00	$240,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$290,869,565.22	$330,000,000.00	$264,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1338* RTA MOBILITY HUBS PHASE 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	TRANSIT MOBILITY HUBS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,500,000.00	$1,500,000.00	$1,200,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$5,000,000.00	$5,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$43,478,260.87	$50,000,000.00	$40,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$49,978,260.87	$56,500,000.00	$45,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1339* RTA STOP ADA AND BUS SHELTER PROGRAM

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	TRANSIT STOP ADA AND BUS SHELTER IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$1,500,000.00	$1,500,000.00	$1,200,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
CONSTRUCTION	$13,043,478.26	$15,000,000.00	$12,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER II	

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$14,543,478.26	$16,500,000.00	$13,200,000.00

Project: RPC_1351* NEW ORLEANS TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPGRADES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	CITYWIDE TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPGRADES	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,695,652.17	$10,000,000.00	$8,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$8,695,652.17	$10,000,000.00	$8,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1355* I-10 E SERVICE RDS. BIKE/PED IMPRV. PH 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$17,391,304.00	$20,000,000.00	$16,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$17,391,304.00	$20,000,000.00	$16,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.005720 FLORIDA AVE EXPRESSWAY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	TIMED PROJECTS	CAPACITY NON-INTERSTATE ON NHS SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$400,000,000.00	$460,000,000.00	$368,000,000.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$400,000,000.00	$460,000,000.00	$368,000,000.00

Project: H.007272 HOWARD AVE EXTENSION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-36			ORLEANS	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	NEW 2-LANE ROADWAY	DEMO / HIGH PRIORITY NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$267,000.00	$267,000.00	$213,600.00	DEMO	FFY 23	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
CONSTRUCTION	$4,097,000.00	$4,506,700.00	$3,769,240.00	DEMO	TIER III	

Total Cost:	$4,364,000.00	$4,773,700.00	$3,982,840.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: LSTP32 **I-10: BULLARD - ELYSIAN FIELDS AVE**

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$225,000,000.00	$258,750,000.00	$207,000,000.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$225,000,000.00	$258,750,000.00	$207,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_0014* BR - NO RAIL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	FREIGHT AND PASSENGER RAIL IMPROVEMENTS	RAILROADS RPC OTHER

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$265,000,000.00	$304,750,000.00	$243,800,000.00	NFI	TIER III	BRAF CRPC REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Total Cost:	**$265,000,000.00**	**$304,750,000.00**	**$243,800,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_0778* NOIA TO CBD FIXED GUIDEWAY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	FIXED GUIDEWAY TRANSIT	CONGESTION MITIGATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$700,000,000.00	$805,000,000.00	$644,000,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	REGION

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$700,000,000.00	$805,000,000.00	$644,000,000.00

Project: RPC_0784* I-10 HIGH RISE IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED BRIDGE CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$120,000,000.00	$138,000,000.00	$124,200,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$120,000,000.00	$138,000,000.00	$124,200,000.00

Project: RPC_1296* RTA BUS RAPID TRANSIT PHASE 1

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	EAST-WEST BANK BRT CORRIDOR	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,558,000.00	$1,558,000.00	$126,400.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$29,007,000.00	$29,007,000.00	$23,205,600.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	
CONSTRUCTION	$261,748,521.74	$301,010,800.00	$240,808,640.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	

Total Cost:	$292,313,521.74	$331,575,800.00	$264,140,640.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1332* RTA BUS RAPID TRANSIT PHASE 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WEST BANK EXTENSION OF BRT	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$280,000.00	$280,000.00	$224,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$5,200,000.00	$5,200,000.00	$4,160,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	
CONSTRUCTION	$49,565,217.39	$57,000,000.00	$45,600,000.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$55,045,217.39	$62,480,000.00	$49,984,000.00

Project: RPC_1333* RTA BUS RAPID TRANSIT PHASE 3

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	EAST BANK EXTENSION OF BRT	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$1,558,000.00	$1,558,000.00	$1,246,400.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$29,007,000.00	$29,007,000.00	$23,205,600.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	
CONSTRUCTION	$261,748,521.74	$301,010,800.00	$240,808,640.00	FTA DISC	TIER III	

Total Cost:	$292,313,521.74	$331,575,800.00	$265,260,640.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: RPC_1356* I-10 E SERVICE RDS. BIKE/PED IMPRV. PH 3

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$32,173,913.00	$37,000,000.00	$29,600,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Total Cost:	$32,173,913.00	$37,000,000.00	$29,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ORLEANS

Project: H.015050 GRAVOLET ROAD OVER DRAINAGE CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-38	0.00	0.00	PLAQUEMINES	GRAVOLET ROAD

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,680,000.00	$1,932,000.00	$1,545,600.00	FBROFF	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,680,000.00	$1,932,000.00	$1,545,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.015500 ADEMA LN OVER DRAINAGE CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-38	0.00	0.00	PLAQUEMINES	ADEMA LANE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM PLAQUEMINES PARISH	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (OFF SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$252,000.00	$289,800.00	$231,840.00	FBROFF	2027	PLAQUEMINES PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$2,268,000.00	$2,608,200.00	$2,086,560.00	FBROFF-E	2027	

Total Cost:	$2,520,000.00	$2,898,000.00	$2,318,400.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.016358 COAST GUARD ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-38	0.00	0.00	PLAQUEMINES	COAST GUARD ROAD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM PLAQUEMINES PARISH	STABILIZE BASE AND ASPHALT OVERLAY	DEMO / HIGH PRIORITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,625,000.00	$5,318,750.00	$4,255,000.00	DEMO	2027	PLAQUEMINES PARISH

Total Cost:	$4,625,000.00	$5,318,750.00	$4,255,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.016656 LA 46: ST BERNARD HWY@ CENTER ST SAF IMP

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 46	046-03	0.24	0.60	ST. BERNARD	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL, OVERLAY, HFST, ENHANCED SIGNAGE AND IN GEMOETRY MOD	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$508,000.00	$584,200.00	$467,360.00	HSIPPEN	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$508,000.00	$584,200.00	$467,360.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.016753 PLAQUEMINES PARISH FERRY RD IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-38	0.00	0.00	PLAQUEMINES	POINT A LA HACHE FERRY RD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	THREE-LANE CONCRETE ROADWAY & NEW FERRY LANDING TERMINAL	DEMO / HIGH PRIORITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,374,000.00	$1,580,100.00	$1,264,080.00	DEMO	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,374,000.00	$1,580,100.00	$1,264,080.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.015051 MARTIN LANE OVER DRAINAGE CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-38	0.00	0.00	PLAQUEMINES	MARTIN LANE

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,344,000.00	$1,545,600.00	$1,236,480.00	FBROFF	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,344,000.00	$1,545,600.00	$1,236,480.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.015802 LA 23: HWY 11 - DOULLUT CANAL BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 23	062-05	2.25	9.05	PLAQUEMINES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL AND OVERLAY, PCCP PATCHING AND NEW PAVEMENT MARKINGS	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,390,000.00	$11,948,500.00	$9,558,800.00	STP<5K	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$10,390,000.00	$11,948,500.00	$9,558,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.008068 PETERS ROAD BRIDGE & EXTENSION PHASE 2B

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1261	826-63	0.00	0.95	JEFFERSON	
LA 3017	826-11	4.51	5.08	JEFFERSON	
LA 3017	838-01	0.00	0.32	PLAQUEMINES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	APPROACHES FOR NEW BRIDGE	OTHER / MISCELLANEOUS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,489,000.00	$5,162,350.00	$4,129,880.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$9,882,000.00	$11,364,300.00	$9,091,440.00	STBONDS	TIER II	PLAQUEMINES PARISH

Total Cost:	$14,371,000.00	$16,526,650.00	$13,221,320.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.008069 PETERS ROAD BRIDGE & EXTENSION (PHASE 3)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1261	826-63			JEFFERSON	
LA 1261	838-07			PLAQUEMINES	
LA 3017	829-11			JEFFERSON	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	CONSTRUCT NEW BRIDGE	CONGESTION MITIGATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$7,363,098.00	$7,363,098.00	$7,363,098.00	RAISE	FFY 25	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$119,200,000.00	$137,080,000.00	$109,664,000.00	NFI	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$126,563,098.00	$144,443,098.00	$117,027,098.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.015002 LA 23 RAISING @ LAREUSSITE LEVEE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 23	062-02	14.71	14.994	PLAQUEMINES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	RAISING @ LAREUSSITE LEVEE	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(2)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$800,000.00	$920,000.00	$736,000.00	PROTECT	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Total Cost:	$800,000.00	$920,000.00	$736,000.00

Project: RPC_1158* RAIL RELOCATION FROM LA 23 TO LA 3017

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$350,000,000.00	$402,500,000.00	$322,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$350,000,000.00	$402,500,000.00	$322,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: RPC_1200* SCARSDALE FERRY LANDING BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,950,200.00	$2,242,730.00	$1,794,184.00	BIP	TIER II	PLAQUEMINES PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Total Cost:	$1,950,200.00	$2,242,730.00	$1,794,184.00

Project: RPC_1201* SUBURBAN RD. BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$811,300.00	$932,995.00	$746,396.00	BIP	TIER II	PLAQUEMINES PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Total Cost:	$811,300.00	$932,995.00	$746,396.00

Project: RPC_1203* TABONY LN. BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$649,040.00	$746,396.00	$597,116.80	BIP	TIER II	PLAQUEMINES PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Total Cost:	$649,040.00	$746,396.00	$597,116.80

Project: H.001399 LA 23: HAPPY JACK - N. PORT SULPHUR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 23	062-04			PLAQUEMINES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN TO FOUR LANES	CAPACITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$62,385,000.00	$71,742,750,000.00	$57,394,200.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$62,385,000.00	$71,742,750,000.00	$57,394,200.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Project: H.006226 POINTE-A-LA-HACHE FERRY LANDING REPLACEM

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-38			PLAQUEMINES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT NEW FERRY LANDINGS AND DOLPHINS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE FERRY PROJECTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	FB DISCR	TIER III	PLAQUEMINES PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	NFI	TIER III	

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
PLAQUEMINES

Total Cost:	$6,000,000.00	$6,900,000.00	$5,520,000.00

Project: H.015428 ST. BERNARD TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	LOWER ST BERNARD LIT RD NETWORK STUDY

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM PORT OF N.O.	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING	DEMO / HIGH PRIORITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
ENVIRONMENTAL	$500,000.00	$500,000.00	$400,000.00	DEMO	2026	PORT OF N.O.
CONSTRUCTION	$833,500,000.00	$958,525,000.00	$768,820,000.00	NFI	2036	

Total Cost:	$834,000,000.00	$959,025,000.00	$769,220,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.013936 40 ARPENT TRAIL BIKE/PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	40 ARPENT TRAIL BIKE/PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. BERNARD PARISH	GRADE SEPARATION TRAIL - BIKE/PED BRIDGE	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00	STP>200K	2027	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.014031 MELVYN PEREZ PKWY AT LA 46: NSRR PREEMP

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	MELVYN PEREZ PKWY

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	CONNECT CROSSING WITH TRAFFIC SIGNAL FOR PRE-EMPTION	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$30,000.00	$34,500.00	$27,600.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$30,000.00	$34,500.00	$27,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.014412 JEAN LAFITTE PKWY: LA 39 - HERMITAGE DR.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	JEAN LAFITTE PKWY
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	JEAN LAFITTE PKWY

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. BERNARD PARISH	ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00	STP>200K	2027	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Total Cost:	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.015017 PATRICIA ST OVER CHALMETTE VISTA CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	PATRICIA ST

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$101,000.00	$116,150.00	$92,920.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$101,000.00	$116,150.00	$92,920.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.015499 CHARLES DR OVER 20 ARPENT CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	CHARLES DR

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000.00	$115,000.00	$92,000.00	FBROFF	2027	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$900,000.00	$1,035,000.00	$828,000.00	FBROFF-E	2027	

Total Cost:	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$920,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.013343 ST. BERNARD MISS. RIVER TRAIL PH IV

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	MOBIL OIL ACCESS RD.

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. BERNARD PARISH	SHARED USE PATH	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$728,000.00	$837,200.00	$669,760.00	TAP>200K	2028	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Total Cost:	$728,000.00	$837,200.00	$669,760.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.015219 PORT OF ST BERNARD LA46-LA39 CONNECTOR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	ST BERNARD PORT RD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. BERNARD PARISH	NEW PORT CONNECTOR ROAD	DEMO / HIGH PRIORITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$9,654,000.00	$11,102,100.00	$8,873,400.00	DEMO	2028	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Total Cost:	$9,654,000.00	$11,102,100.00	$8,873,400.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.014421 JACKSON BLVD.: LA 39 - W. GENIE DR.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	JACKSON BLVD.

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. BERNARD PARISH	ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,400,000.00	$7,360,000.00	$5,888,000.00	STP>200K	2029	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Total Cost:	$6,400,000.00	$7,360,000.00	$5,888,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.017009 LA 46 B. LA LOUTRE MB RH(YSCLOSKEY)(HBI)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 46	284-02	4.64	4.65	ST. BERNARD	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL, STRUCTURAL	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE MOVABLE BRIDGE REHABILITATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$452,000.00	$452,000.00	$361,600.00	STPFLEX	2028	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$2,150,000.00	$2,472,500.00	$1,978,000.00	STPFLEX	2029	
Total Cost:	**$2,602,000.00**	**$2,924,500.00**	**$2,339,600.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.014778 LA 46: LA 39-LA 300

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 46	284-01	0.00	5.76	ST. BERNARD	
LA 46	284-01	5.76	8.04	ST. BERNARD	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,750,000.00	$6,612,500.00	$5,290,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$5,750,000.00	$6,612,500.00	$5,290,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.016872 40 ARPENT TRAIL - GUERRA DR TO LA 46

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	40 ARPENT CANAL & VIOLET CANAL
	000-44	0.00	0.00	ST. BERNARD	PACKENHAM RD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. BERNARD PARISH	ASPHALT MULTI-USE PATH AND BICYCLE ROUTE SIGNAGE	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,962,000.00	$2,256,300.00	$1,805,040.00	TAP>200K	2031	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,962,000.00	$2,256,300.00	$1,805,040.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: RPC_1164* REALIGN LA 46 FOR LIT, VIOLET

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ROADWAY REALIGNMENT FOR LOUISIANA INTERNATIONAL TERMINAL	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$12,500,000.00	$14,375,000.00	$11,500,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	PORT OF N.O.
CONSTRUCTION	$12,500,000.00	$14,375,000.00	$11,500,000.00	TOLLS	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$23,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: RPC_1314* ST. BERNARD THREE BRIDGES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	REPLACE BRIDGES PATRICIA ST. AT AYCOCK ST., ARABI, LA; GENIE ST. @ GOLDEN DR.	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,913,043.48	$6,800,000.00	$5,440,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Total Cost:	$5,913,043.48	$6,800,000.00	$5,440,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: RPC_1316* LA 46 GRADE SEPARATION AT NS RR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATION	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$43,478,260.87	$50,000,000.00	$40,000,000.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$43,478,260.87	$50,000,000.00	$40,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: RPC_1317* LA 46 AT PALMISANO BLVD. ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$14,173,913.04	$16,300,000.00	$13,040,000.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$14,173,913.04	$16,300,000.00	$13,040,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: RPC_1345* W. ST. BERNARD HWY (LA 46) SIDEPATH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	MULTI-USE SIDEPATH, LA 46 FROM CENTER ST. TO LA 47	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,913,043.48	$4,500,000.00	$3,600,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Total Cost:	$3,913,043.48	$4,500,000.00	$3,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1346* JEAN LAFITTE TRAIL SOUTH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	0.8 MILE MULTI-USE SIDEPATH	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$956,521.74	$1,100,000.00	$880,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. BERNARD PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Total Cost:	$956,521.74	$1,100,000.00	$880,000.00

Project: RPC_0819* LA 300 REHAB (SYLVIA BLVD - LA 46)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$0.00	OTHER	TIER III	

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$3,680,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. BERNARD

Project: H.012532 LA 631: DRAIN CANAL BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 631	845-06	5.44	5.62	ST. CHARLES	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,498,000.00	$1,722,700.00	$1,378,160.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,498,000.00	$1,722,700.00	$1,378,160.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.013495 LA 52: (PH2) US 90 - BLUEBERRY HILL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 52	845-03	0.00	0.98	ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. CHARLES PARISH	BIKE/PED - COMPLETE STREETS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$12,000,000.00	$13,800,000.00	$11,040,000.00	STP>200K	2027	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Total Cost:	$12,000,000.00	$13,800,000.00	$11,040,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.013567 I-310: PAVEMENT MARKING REPLACEMENT I

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-310	450-36	0.00	7.12	ST. CHARLES	
I-310	450-38	0.00	4.07	ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PAVEMENT MARKING REPLACEMENT	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,200,000.00	$1,380,000.00	$1,242,000.00	NHPP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,200,000.00	$1,380,000.00	$1,242,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.015831 US 90: LA 52 - BARTON

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	005-09	0.20	3.02	ST. CHARLES	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,809,000.00	$4,380,350.00	$3,504,280.00	NHPP	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,809,000.00	$4,380,350.00	$3,504,280.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.016779 LA 632 AT DRAINAGE CANAL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 632	845-09	0.00	0.10	ST. CHARLES	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$800,000.00	$920,000.00	$0.00	STGEN	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$800,000.00	$920,000.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.011801 ST. CHARLES WB LEVEE PATH PH IV AND V

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-45	0.00	0.00	ST. CHARLES	WESTBANK LEVEE TOP

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. CHARLES PARISH	SHARED USE PATH	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,602,000.00	$2,992,300.00	$2,393,840.00	TAP>200K	2028	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,602,000.00	$2,992,300.00	$2,393,840.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.013496 LA 52 (PH3): ANGUS DR - LA 18

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 52	845-03	1.85	2.73	ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. CHARLES PARISH	BIKE/PED - COMPLETE STREETS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$13,200,000.00	$15,180,000.00	$12,144,000.00	STP>200K	2028	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Total Cost:	$13,200,000.00	$15,180,000.00	$12,144,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.015837 US 61: LA50-ST. JOHN P/L

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 61	007-03	1.68	11.23	ST. CHARLES	
US 61	007-03	11.23	11.30	ST. CHARLES	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$22,000,000.00	$25,300,000.00	$20,240,000.00	NHPP	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$22,000,000.00	$25,300,000.00	$20,240,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.016859 LOCAL RD SIGNS & STRIPING (ST. CHARLES)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-45	0.00	0.00	ST. CHARLES	GOODHOPE ST
	000-45	0.00	0.00	ST. CHARLES	ORMOND BLVD
	000-45	0.00	0.00	ST. CHARLES	PAUL FREDRICK ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. CHARLES PARISH	FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR SIGNING AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS	SAFETY LOCAL ROADS SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
FEASIBILITY	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	HSIPPEN	2028	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Total Cost:	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$6,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.010753 US 90/I-310 INTERCHANGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-310	450-38	0.00	0.13	ST. CHARLES	
US 90	005-08	7.20	8.42	ST. CHARLES	
US 90	005-09	0.00	0.19	ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ACCESS MANAGEMENT, TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00	STP>200K	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: RPC_1308* LAKEWOOD DR./ US 90 SIGNALS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00	STP>200K	2029	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Total Cost:	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.014368 IC RR XINGS (NEW SARPY)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-45	0.00	0.00	ST. CHARLES	TERRACE ST
	000-45	0.00	0.00	ST. CHARLES	VANS LN
	000-45	0.00	0.00	ST. CHARLES	W HARDING ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. CHARLES PARISH	UPGRADE RR CROSSINGS TO GATES	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$750,000.00	$862,500.00	$862,500.00	STP>200K	2030	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Total Cost:	$750,000.00	$862,500.00	$862,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.014797 LA 3142: LA 3127 - LA 18

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3142	845-20	0.02	4.54	ST. CHARLES	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,433,000.00	$1,647,950.00	$1,318,360.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,433,000.00	$1,647,950.00	$1,318,360.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.015800 LA 631: LA 52 - LA 306

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 631	845-06	4.90	8.54	ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL & OVERLAY, PATCHING, NEW PAVEMENT MARKINGS, & GUARDRAIL	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,810,000.00	$3,231,500.00	$2,585,200.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,810,000.00	$3,231,500.00	$2,585,200.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: H.015820 LA 635: US 90 - LA 631

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 635	845-11	0.00	0.26	ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	2" MILL AND 2" OVERLAY, PATCHING	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$330,000.00	$379,500.00	$303,600.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$330,000.00	$379,500.00	$303,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: RPC_1156* JUDGE DUFRESNE EXTENSION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ROADWAY EXTENSION TO LA 3127	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$15,000,000.00	$17,250,000.00	$13,800,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Total Cost:	$15,000,000.00	$17,250,000.00	$13,800,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: RPC_1157* US 90 LULING: STREETSCAPING/ LIGHTING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Total Cost:	$5,000,000.00	$5,750,000.00	$4,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1347* HALE BOGGS BRIDGE LIGHTING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,434,782.61	$12,000,000.00	$9,600,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Total Cost:	$10,434,782.61	$12,000,000.00	$9,600,000.00

Project: RPC_1348* BARTON AVE. IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	COMPLETE STREETS IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,956,521.74	$8,000,000.00	$6,400,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Total Cost:	$6,956,521.74	$8,000,000.00	$6,400,000.00

Project: H.012531 I-310: LULING BRIDGE REHABILITATION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-310	450-36			ST. CHARLES	
I-310	450-37			ST. CHARLES	
I-310	450-38			ST. CHARLES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	CLEANING, PAINTING, AND STRUCTURAL REHABILITATION	PRESERVATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$62,228,000.00	$68,450,800.00	$54,760,640.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$62,228,000.00	$68,450,800.00	$54,760,640.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: RPC_0785* LA 3127 WIDENING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$20,000,000.00	$23,000,000.00	$18,400,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES, ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Total Cost:	$20,000,000.00	$23,000,000.00	$18,400,000.00

Project: RPC_0803* WILLOWDALE EXT: US 90 - LA 18

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$15,000,000.00	$17,250,000.00	$13,800,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	ST. CHARLES PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Total Cost:	$15,000,000.00	$17,250,000.00	$13,800,000.00

Project: RPC_0813* I-49 SOUTH (I-310 - LAFOURCHE P.L.)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$200,000,000.00	$230,000,000.00	$184,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$200,000,000.00	$230,000,000.00	$184,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Project: RPC_1197* I-49 SOUTH (I-310 - US 90B)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION BRIDGE CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$200,000,000.00	$230,000,000.00	$184,000,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES

Total Cost:	$200,000,000.00	$230,000,000.00	$184,000,000.00

Project: H.015173 LEGION ST: IC XING(ST JAMES)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	LEGION ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL RR ACTIVE WARNING	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00	RAIL PD	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.015174 REV SAMUEL JONES RD: IC XING(ST JAMES)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	REV DR SAMUEL JONES ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL RR ACTIVE WARNING	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00	RAIL PD	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$276,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.016273 N KING AVENUE REHABILITATION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	N KING AVENUE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TOWN OF LUTCHER	RAISE AND REPLACE ASPHALT WITH CONCRETE	DEMO / HIGH PRIORITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$625,000.00	$718,750.00	$575,000.00	DEMO	2027	TOWN OF LUTCHER
CONSTRUCTION	$130,000.00	$149,500.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2027	

Total Cost:	$755,000.00	$868,250.00	$575,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.015021 I-10: LA 641 (GRAMERCY) INTCHG LIGHTING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-12	4.38	5.38	ST. JAMES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. JAMES PARISH	INSTALL NEW INTERSTATE LIGHTING SYSTEM	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE INTERSTATE LIGHTING

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,500,000.00	$1,725,000.00	$1,552,500.00	NHPP	2028	ST. JAMES PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,500,000.00	$1,725,000.00	$1,552,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.015116 ST JAMES WESTBANK SHARED-USE PATH PH II

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. JAMES PARISH	CONSTRUCTION OF ASPHALT SHARED-USE PATH ON LEVEE CROWN	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$878,000.00	$1,009,700.00	$807,760.00	TAPFLEX	2028	ST. JAMES PARISH

Total Cost:	$878,000.00	$1,009,700.00	$807,760.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.015117 ST JAMES EASTBANK SHARED-USE PATH PH III

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	EASTBANK MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEE CROWN

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. JAMES PARISH	CONSTRUCTION OF SHARED-USE PATH	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,780,000.00	$2,047,000.00	$1,637,600.00	TAP<50K	2028	ST. JAMES PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,780,000.00	$2,047,000.00	$1,637,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.016486 I-10: BLIND RIVER BRIDGE DECK OVERLAY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-12	2.61	3.13	ST. JAMES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	BRIDGE DECK OVERLAY AND RESEAL/REHAB EXPANSION JOINTS	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,890,000.00	$2,173,500.00	$1,738,800.00	FBR-ON/OFF	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$210,000.00	$241,500.00	$217,350.00	NHPP	2029	
Total Cost:	**$2,100,000.00**	**$2,415,000.00**	**$1,956,150.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.014441 IC RR XINGS (HESTER)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	HESTER ST
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	KAHN ST
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	PACKING HOUSE ST
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	STARLONE ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	IMPROVE APPROACHES AND CLOSE CROSSINGS	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$200,000.00	$230,000.00	$184,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$200,000.00	$230,000.00	$184,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.014469 HESTER,JOE ACCARDO,KAHN:IC XINGS(HESTER)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	HESTER ST
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	JOE ACCARDO ST
	000-47	0.00	0.00	ST. JAMES	KAHN ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL F/L'S AND GATES, CLOSE ONE CROSSING	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.012066 LA 3213: GRAMERCY BRIDGE REHABILITATION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3213	434-01	2.65	3.12	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
LA 3213	434-02	0.00	0.57	ST. JAMES	
LA 3213	434-03	0.00	0.44	ST. JAMES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	MAJOR BRIDGE REHABILITATION	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$46,903,000.00	$53,938,450.00	$43,150,760.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$5,212,000.00	$5,993,800.00	$4,795,040.00	STP<50K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$52,115,000.00	$59,932,250.00	$47,945,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.014416 LA 3125 @ LA 3274 ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3125	426-31			ST. JAMES	
LA 3274	256-32			ST. JAMES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	CONSTRUCT A ROUNDABOUT, MILL AND OVERLAY	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,962,000.00	$3,406,300.00	$2,725,040.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$1,990,000.00	$2,288,500.00	$1,830,800.00	STBONDS	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$365,000.00	$419,750.00	$335,800.00	STGEN	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$5,317,000.00	$6,114,550.00	$4,891,640.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.016223 LA 3127: LA 70 - ST. JAMES CANAL BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3127	428-01			ST. JAMES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	MILL, PATCH, OVERLAY	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,939,000.00	$10,279,850.00	$8,223,880.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$8,939,000.00	$10,279,850.00	$8,223,880.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.016941 LA 3127 @ LA 3213 ROADWAY LIGHTING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3127	428-01			ST. JAMES	
LA 3213	434-04			ST. JAMES	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	ROADWAY LIGHTING	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$700,000.00	$805,000.00	$644,000.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Total Cost:	$700,000.00	$805,000.00	$644,000.00

Project: H.009483 LA HIGHWAY 44 RE-ROUTE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	ADDING TURN LANES ON LA 3125 AND REALIGNING LA 44	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,395,000.00	$1,534,500.00	$0.00	LOCAL	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,395,000.00	$1,534,500.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JAMES

Project: H.015416 CARDINAL DR: IC XING (LAPLACE)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	CARDINAL DR

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH	CLOSE IC CROSSING	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$50,000.00	$57,500.00	$46,000.00	RAIL HE	2027	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Total Cost:	$50,000.00	$57,500.00	$46,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.016597 LA 53: LA 44 TO US 61

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 53	256-30	0.00	1.63	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	THIN OVERLAY	PRESERVATION ROAD PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$700,000.00	$805,000.00	$644,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$700,000.00	$805,000.00	$644,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.016604 LA 44: MAIN ST - COTTONWOOD ST

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 44	256-01			ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
LA 44	256-01			ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL, PATCH, WITH A THIN OVERLAY	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$400,000.00	$460,000.00	$368,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$400,000.00	$460,000.00	$368,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.015137 BONNET CARRE ITS UPGRADES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-13	9.00	14.72	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
I-10	450-14	0.00	9.65	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
I-10	450-15	0.00	1.50	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ITS UPGRADES	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00	NHPP	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.015901 LA 628: ST. JOHN PARISH SIDEWALK, PH. 1

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 44	256-01	0.33	0.42	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
LA 628	848-07	0.10	0.73	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH	PCC SIDEWALKS, ASPHALT RAMP, RELATED WORK	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$985,000.00	$1,132,750.00	$906,200.00	TAP>200K	2028	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Total Cost:	$985,000.00	$1,132,750.00	$906,200.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.016734 LA 628: ST. JOHN PARISH SIDEWALK, PH. 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 44	256-01	0.31	0.33	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
LA 628	848-07	0.00	0.10	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH	CONSTRUCT PCC SIDEWALKS	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$225,000.00	$258,750.00	$207,000.00	TAPFLEX	2028	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Total Cost:	$225,000.00	$258,750.00	$207,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.016401 I-10: I-55 & US 51 INTCHG LTG. (LAPLACE)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-13	12.23	13.53	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
I-55	452-01	0.00	1.12	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,564,000.00	CRPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,700,000.00	$1,955,000.00	$1,564,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO
Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.010076 IC (RESERVE) W. 19TH ST.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	RR W. 19TH ST.

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	RAILROAD SIGNALIZATION	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$345,000.00	HSIP	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$300,000.00	$345,000.00	$345,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.013017 IC RR CORRIDOR (ST JOHN THE BAPTIST)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	APRICOT ST.
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	E. 12TH ST.
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	SPRUCE ST.
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	W. 19TH ST.
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	W. 2ND ST.
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	W. 3RD ST.
	000-48	0.00	0.00	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	WALNUT ST.
LA 3217	848-17	0.30	0.32	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	
LA 636-1	848-05	0.14	0.16	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	INSTALL F/L'S, GATES AND BELLS	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00	RAIL PD	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$500,000.00	$575,000.00	$460,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):

NO

Project Parish(es):

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: RPC_1154* US 51 CORRIDOR, US 61 TO I-10

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BIKE/PED ACCESS- MRT TO MANCHAC GREENWAY PH 1	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Total Cost:	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: RPC_1155* US 51 CORRIDOR, I-10 TO SUNSET PARK

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BIKE/PED ACCESS- MRT TO MANCHAC GREENWAY PH 2	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Total Cost:	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00

Project: RPC_1165* NO - BR STATION STOP, LAPLACE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,500,000.00	$1,725,000.00	$1,380,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,500,000.00	$1,725,000.00	$1,380,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: RPC_1166* MRT TO US 61

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	BIKE/PED ACCESS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,318,000.00	$2,665,700.00	$2,132,560.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Total Cost:	$2,318,000.00	$2,665,700.00	$2,132,560.00

Project: RPC_1341* AIRLINE HWY & BELLE TERRE BLVD CROSSING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$20,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$112,500.00	$112,500.00	$90,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$543,478.26	$625,000.00	$500,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$680,978.26	$762,500.00	$610,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: RPC_1342* AIRLINE HWY & US 51 CROSSING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$20,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$112,500.00	$112,500.00	$90,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$543,478.26	$625,000.00	$500,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$680,978.26	$762,500.00	$610,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: RPC_1343* AIRLINE HWY & CARROLLWOOD CROSSING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$20,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$112,500.00	$112,500.00	$90,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$543,478.26	$625,000.00	$500,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$680,978.26	$762,500.00	$610,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: RPC_1344* BELLE TERRE BLVD. & FAIRWAY DR. CROSSING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENT	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$20,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$112,500.00	$112,500.00	$90,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$534,478.26	$614,650.00	$491,720.00	STP>200K	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$671,978.26	$752,150.00	$601,720.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.002960 LA 3213:GRAMERCY BRIDGE OVER UP RAILROAD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 3213	434-01			ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	GRADE SEPARATE EXISTING AT GRADE CROSSING	RAILROADS GRADE SEPARATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$15,700,000.00	$18,055,000.00	$14,444,000.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$15,700,000.00	$18,055,000.00	$14,444,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: H.004891 RESERVE TO I-10 CONNECTOR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	US 61 TO I-10 CONNECTOR	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$278,260,869.57	$320,000,000.01	$256,000,000.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$278,260,869.57	$320,000,000.01	$256,000,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Project: RPC_0785* LA 3127 WIDENING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$20,000,000.00	$23,000,000.00	$18,400,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
NO

Project Parish(es):
ST. CHARLES, ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Total Cost:	$20,000,000.00	$23,000,000.00	$18,400,000.00

Project: H.013984 LA 16, LA 1074, LA 1075: BRIDGES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1075	859-18	1.15	1.22	WASHINGTON	
LA 16	058-03	0.06	0.13	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 16	058-03	1.16	1.22	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 16	058-03	2.65	2.86	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 16	058-03	4.45	4.52	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 16	058-04	1.18	1.25	WASHINGTON	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,508,000.00	$9,784,200.00	$7,827,360.00	FBRON/OFFE	2027	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$582,000.00	$669,300.00	$535,440.00	STP<5K	2027	
Total Cost:	**$9,090,000.00**	**$10,453,500.00**	**$8,362,800.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015563 US 190B: INTERSECTION IMPROV @ SUMMIT DR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	SUMMIT BLVD
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	TOWN CENTER PKWY
US 190-Y	013-13	1.51	1.57	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	TURNING LANES, TRUCK APRONS AND CURBING INSTALLATIONS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$750,000.00	$862,500.00	$690,000.00	STP50-200K	2027	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$750,000.00	$862,500.00	$690,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015889 US 190 (GAUSE BLVD) SIDEWALK IMPVT PH II

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	852-24	0.65	1.53	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	SIDEWALKS AND CROSSWALKS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,265,000.00	$1,454,750.00	$1,163,800.00	STP50-200K	2027	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$1,265,000.00	$1,454,750.00	$1,163,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016326 LA 36: DRAIN BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 36	280-03	0.20	4.70	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	REPLACE STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT BRIDGES WITH BOX CULVERTS	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,864,000.00	$2,143,600.00	$0.00	STGEN	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,864,000.00	$2,143,600.00	$0.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.009793 SLIDELL OLDE TOWNE STREETSCAPING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	1ST, 2ND, COUSIN, BOUSCAREN, ELAGN

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	SIDEWALKS W/LIGHTING LANDSCAPING & RELATED WORK	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$954,000.00	$1,097,100.00	$877,680.00	TAP50-200K	2028	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$954,000.00	$1,097,100.00	$877,680.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012567 LA 36: ICG RAILROAD BRIDGE (HBI)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 36	280-03	3.20	3.40	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD HISTORIC BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT (HBI)	REMOVE STRUCTURE CONSTRUCT ROADWAY	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,141,000.00	$1,312,150.00	$1,049,720.00	STPFLEX	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,141,000.00	$1,312,150.00	$1,049,720.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014362 LAKE ROAD - BIG BRANCH MARSH NWR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	LAKE ROAD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING AGGREGATE ROAD AND BRIDGE REPAIR	OTHER / MISCELLANEOUS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$15,000.00	$17,250.00	$13,800.00	FLH	2028	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$15,000.00	$17,250.00	$13,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014374 US 11 @ SPARTAN DRIVE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	SPARTAN DRIVE
US 11	018-03	2.85	2.86	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	ROUNDABOUT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,500,000.00	$6,325,000.00	$5,060,000.00	STP50-200K	2028	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$5,500,000.00	$6,325,000.00	$5,060,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015204 TOWN CENTER PKWY SIDEPATH (SLIDELL)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	TOWN CENTER PKWY

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	SHARED-USE PATH, DRAINAGE, SIGNAGE AND RELATED WORK	SAFETY SAFE ROUTES TO PUBLIC PLACES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$786,000.00	$903,900.00	$903,900.00	HSIPPEN	2028	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$786,000.00	$903,900.00	$903,900.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.015887 7TH ST ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS (SLIDELL)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	7TH ST

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	ASPHALT RESURFACING	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00	STP50-200K	2028	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016523 SLIDELL TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPGRADE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	NATCHEZ DR
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	NORTHSHORE BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	TRAFFIC SIGNAL UPGRADES	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,300,000.00	$1,495,000.00	$1,196,000.00	CRP50-200K	2028	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$1,300,000.00	$1,495,000.00	$1,196,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.011799 SPARTAN DRIVE SHARED USE PATH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	SPARTAN DRIVE

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	SHARED USE PATH	ENHANCEMENTS

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

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$986,000.00	$1,133,900.00	$907,120.00	TAP50-200K	2029	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	**$986,000.00**	**$1,133,900.00**	**$907,120.00**

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016777 US 190: NS RR XING (SLIDELL)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-12	21.22	21.23	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL/UPGRADE ACTIVE WARNING DEVICES	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$688,000.00	$791,200.00	$632,960.00	RAIL PD	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$688,000.00	$791,200.00	$632,960.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016962 I-10: I-12/I-59 - TWIN SPAN BR. PAVE MKG

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-10	450-18	0.00	0.55	ST. TAMMANY	
I-10	450-18	0.55	7.77	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PAVEMENT STRIPING AND RAISED PAVEMENT MARKERS	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$505,000.00	$580,750.00	$522,675.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$505,000.00	$580,750.00	$522,675.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.010387 US 90: LA 433 - US 190

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-07	0.30	4.73	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,323,000.00	$3,821,450.00	$3,057,160.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,323,000.00	$3,821,450.00	$3,057,160.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.013008 DIST62:ABC BR REPLACE ST TAM,WASH PARS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 36	280-03	0.20	4.70	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 434	852-12	5.90	6.00	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 436	859-08	10.60	10.70	WASHINGTON	
LA 438	275-02	6.00	6.15	WASHINGTON	
LA 450	852-07	1.30	1.40	ST. TAMMANY	
LA 59	852-09	0.60	0.70	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,240,000.00	$7,176,000.00	$5,740,800.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$6,240,000.00	$7,176,000.00	$5,740,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014845 US 190: CANE BAYOU - LA 434

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-12	6.97	11.24	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,550,000.00	$4,082,500.00	$3,266,000.00	NHPP	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,550,000.00	$4,082,500.00	$3,266,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014848 LA 21: JCT LA 16 - LM 0.413

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 21	030-02	3.00	4.445	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,743,000.00	$4,304,450.00	$3,443,560.00	NHPP	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$3,743,000.00	$4,304,450.00	$3,443,560.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016761 CARROLL ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	CARROLL RD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	SUPER-ELEVATION CORRECTION, SHOULDER WIDENIG, DRAINAGE IMP	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$405,000.00	$405,000.00	$324,000.00	STP50-200K	2030	ST. TAMMANY PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$54,000.00	$54,000.00	$43,200.00	STP50-200K	2030	
CONSTRUCTION	$1,073,000.00	$1,233,950.00	$987,160.00	STP50-200K	2030	

Total Cost:	$1,532,000.00	$1,692,950.00	$1,354,360.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012812 US 190 @ NORTHSHORE & CAMP VILLERE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	CAMP VILLERE RD
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	NORTHSHORE BLVD
US 190	013-12	18.18	19.05	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ROUNDABOUT INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$8,900,000.00	$8,900,000.00	$7,120,000.00	STP50-200K	2031	DOTD

Total Cost:	$8,900,000.00	$8,900,000.00	$7,120,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014375 US 190W ROUNDABOUTS, SLIDELL

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	CARROLL RD.
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	MARIS STELLA ST.
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	SUNSET DR
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	WESTMINSTER DR.
US 190	013-12	19.59	19.74	ST. TAMMANY	
US 190	013-12	19.86	19.99	ST. TAMMANY	
US 190	013-12	20.14	20.23	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM ST. TAMMANY PARISH	CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUTS	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$3,710,000.00	$3,710,000.00	$2,968,000.00	STP50-200K	2029	ST. TAMMANY PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$1,000,000.00	$1,000,000.00	$800,000.00	STP50-200K	2030	
CONSTRUCTION	$6,075,000.00	$6,986,250.00	$5,589,000.00	STP50-200K	2031	

Total Cost:	$10,785,000.00	$11,696,250.00	$9,357,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.017058 ROBERT BL @ COUNTRY CLUB BL ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	COUNTRY CLUB BLVD
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	ROBERT BLVD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM CITY OF SLIDELL	ROUNDABOUT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,200,000.00	$4,830,000.00	$3,864,000.00	STP50-200K	2032	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$4,200,000.00	$4,830,000.00	$3,864,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL
Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.000284 US 90: PEARL RIVER BRIDGES (HBI)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-07	5.00	8.00	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
006-07-0048; PRIORITY BRIDGE PROJECT. HISTORIC BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT (HBI)	NEW BRIDGES	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$442,320.00	$442,320.00	$353,856.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$60,869,565.22	$70,000,000.00	$56,000,000.00	NFI	TIER II	

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$61,311,885.22	$70,442,320.00	$56,353,856.00

Project: H.000286 US 90 E PEARL RIVER MB REPLACEMENT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-07	8.25	8.44	ST. TAMMANY	
US 90	006-08	0.00	0.18	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
006-08-0031; STAGE 0 PROJECT, MS TO FUND DETAIL LINE 4	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON NHS SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$257,260.00	$257,260.00	$205,808.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	MDOT
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$5,486,200.00	$5,486,200.00	$4,388,960.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$252,173,913.04	$290,000,000.00	$232,000,000.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$257,917,373.04	$295,743,460.00	$236,594,768.00

Project: H.000688 US 11 NORFOLK SOUTHERN RR OVERPASS (HBI)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 11	018-04	0.40	0.81	ST. TAMMANY	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION BRIDGE CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
RIGHT OF WAY	$4,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	$3,200,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 25	DOTD
UTILITY RELOCATION	$500,000.00	$500,000.00	$400,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 25	
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$7,000,000.00	$7,000,000.00	$5,600,000.00	DEMO	FFY 26	
CONSTRUCTION	$8,695,652.17	$10,000,000.00	$8,000,000.00	DEMO	TIER II	
CONSTRUCTION	$78,260,869.57	$90,000,000.00	$72,000,000.00	NFI	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$98,456,521.74	$111,500,000.00	$89,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.012737 LA 433: BAYOU BONFOUCA MB REHABILITATION

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 433	852-12			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR BRIDGE REHABILITATION	PRESERVATION NON-INTERSTATE ON STP SYSTEM

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
DESIGN (ENGINEERING)	$2,000,000.00	$2,000,000.00	$1,600,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 25	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	STPFLEX	TIER II	
RPC STUDY	$120,000.00	$120,000.00	$96,000.00	STPFLEX	FFY 21	

Total Cost:	$12,120,000.00	$13,120,000.00	$10,896,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016729 US 190 SLIDELL CLEAR AND GRUB

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	CARROL RD
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	MARIS STELLA ST
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	SUNSET DR
	000-52	0.00	0.00	ST. TAMMANY	WESTMINSTER DR
US 190	013-12	19.59	19.74	ST. TAMMANY	
US 190	013-12	19.86	19.99	ST. TAMMANY	
US 190	013-12	20.14	20.23	ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	CLEARING AND GRUBBING	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000.00	$115,000.00	$92,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$100,000.00	$115,000.00	$92,000.00

Project: RPC_0342* US 190 AT LA 433

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ROUNDABOUT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$5,636,363.64	$6,481,818.19	$5,185,454.55	STP50-200K	TIER II	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$5,636,363.64	$6,481,818.19	$5,185,454.55

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0344* US190:US11-LA433 PH5 N.HARRISON-ST.TAM.A

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ACCESS MANAGEMENT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,000,000.00	$6,900,000.00	$5,520,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$6,000,000.00	$6,900,000.00	$5,520,000.00

Project: RPC_0345* US190: US11 - LA433 PH6 ST.TAM AVE-US11

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	ACCESS MANAGEMENT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,500,000.00	$7,475,000.00	$5,980,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$6,500,000.00	$7,475,000.00	$5,980,000.00

Project: RPC_0701* I-10 @ GAUSE BLVD (US 190)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$50,000,000.00	$57,500,000.00	$46,000,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER II	DOTD
						LOCAL
Total Cost:	**$50,000,000.00**	**$57,500,000.00**	**$46,000,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1150* US 190 @ LA 433

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,750,000.00	$3,162,500.00	$2,530,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,750,000.00	$3,162,500.00	$2,530,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1196* BAYOU VINCENT POND RD.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,000,000.00	$2,300,000.00	$1,840,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1324* NORTHSHORE BLVD. ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	REPLACING ASPHALT WITH CONCRETE, OVERPASS TO US 190	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,043,478.26	$1,200,000.00	$960,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF SLIDELL

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$1,043,478.26	$1,200,000.00	$960,000.00

Project: RPC_1325* WEST HALL IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	REPLACING ASPHALT WITH CONCRETE, CARROLL RD. TO US 11	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,521,739.13	$2,900,000.00	$2,320,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF SLIDELL

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$2,521,739.13	$2,900,000.00	$2,320,000.00

Project: RPC_1326* ROBERT RD. IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	REPLACE CONCRETE PANELS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,173,913.04	$2,500,000.00	$2,000,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF SLIDELL

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$2,173,913.04	$2,500,000.00	$2,000,000.00

Project: RPC_1349* US 11 (FRONT ST.) SIDEWALKS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	NEW SIDEWALKS - E SIDE OF FRONT STREET BAYOU LIBERTY RD. TO FREMAUX	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,565,217.39	$1,800,000.00	$1,440,000.00	STP>200K	TIER II	CITY OF SLIDELL

Total Cost:	$1,565,217.39	$1,800,000.00	$1,440,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_1353* FREMAUX AVE. (US 190B) SIDEWALKS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	SIDEWALKS US 11 - TOWN CTR. PWY.	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,665,630.00	$3,065,475.00	$2,452,380.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF SLIDELL

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$2,665,630.00	$3,065,475.00	$2,452,380.00

Project: RPC_1354* US 11 (FRONT ST.) WEST PATH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	SHARED USE PATH: BOYOU LIBERTY RD. - FREMAUX AVE.	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,391,304.00	$1,600,000.00	$1,280,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF SLIDELL

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$1,391,304.00	$1,600,000.00	$1,280,000.00

Project: H.000494 US 190: LA 433 - US 11

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-12			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	CORRIDOR

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(2) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$80,000,000.00	$92,000,000.00	$73,600,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$80,000,000.00	$92,000,000.00	$73,600,000.00

Project: H.004983 US HWY 11 WIDENING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 11	018-03			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	WIDEN W/ BIKE PATH	DEMO / HIGH PRIORITY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED ROAD CONDITION	(1) (2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$19,346,000.00	$22,247,900.00	$17,798,320.00	NFI	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$19,346,000.00	$22,247,900.00	$17,798,320.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.016138 US 90: PEARL RIVER BRIDGE REMOVAL (HBI)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 90	006-07			ST. TAMMANY	
US 90	006-07			ST. TAMMANY	
US 90	006-07			ST. TAMMANY	
US 90	006-07			ST. TAMMANY	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	REMOVAL OF EXISTING BRIDGES	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00

Project: RPC_0235* I-12: LA 59 - NORTHSHORE BLVD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$120,000,000.00	$138,000,000.00	$110,400,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$120,000,000.00	$138,000,000.00	$110,400,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0238* I-12 @ LA 434

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$25,875,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$25,875,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0263* I-12: SERVICE RD S: LA 1088 - LA 434

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0264* I-12 SERVICE RD S: LA 434 - AIRPORT RD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$9,200,000.00

Project: RPC_0266* I-12:SERVICE RD N:LA1088 FISHHATCHERY RD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$8,000,000.00	$9,200,000.00	$7,360,000.00

Project: RPC_0723* US 190B (I-10 TO LA 1090, SLIDELL)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$15,000,000.00	$17,250,000.00	$13,800,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$15,000,000.00	$17,250,000.00	$13,800,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0811* I-12 @ NORTHSHORE BLVD.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	WIDEN/IMPROVE INTERCHANGE	CONGESTION MITIGATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$45,000,000.00	$51,750,000.00	$41,400,000.00	NFI	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Total Cost:	$45,000,000.00	$51,750,000.00	$41,400,000.00

Project: RPC_0812* I-12 @ SALMEN-FRITCHIE, E. LACOMBE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$30,000,000.00	$34,500,000.00	$27,600,000.00	NFI	TIER III	ST. TAMMANY PARISH REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION DOTD

Total Cost:	$30,000,000.00	$34,500,000.00	$27,600,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: RPC_0817* US190 (GAUSE) I-10EB OFFRAMP TO TYLER ST

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*Project is listed for information only and not included in STIP until Stage 0 is complete and/or project number is assigned.	OPS/CAPACITY/SAFETY IMPROVEENT	CONGESTION MITIGATION

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,600,000.00	$2,990,000.00	$2,392,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,600,000.00	$2,990,000.00	$2,392,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
SL

Project Parish(es):
ST. TAMMANY

Project: H.014265 NORTH RIVER ROAD OVER IRVING BRANCH

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	N RIVER RD

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,344,000.00	$1,545,600.00	$1,236,480.00	FBROFF	2027	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,344,000.00	$1,545,600.00	$1,236,480.00

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:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	E. MINNESOTA PARK
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	S. RANGE ROAD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

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	2027	TANGIPAHOA PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$92,000.00	$92,000.00	$73,600.00	STP50-200K	2027	
CONSTRUCTION	$2,550,000.00	$2,932,500.00	$2,346,000.00	STP50-200K	2027	

Total Cost:	$2,717,000.00	$3,099,500.00	$2,479,600.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.015013 SIBLEY RD AND CHAPPEPEELA RD BRIDGES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	CHAPPEPEELA RD
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	SIBLEY RD

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,016,000.00	$2,318,400.00	$1,854,720.00	FBROFF	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,016,000.00	$2,318,400.00	$1,854,720.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.015014 STATELINE RD OVER CREEK

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	STATELINE RD

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,344,000.00	$1,545,600.00	$1,236,480.00	FBROFF	2027	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,344,000.00	$1,545,600.00	$1,236,480.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.015403 W YELLOW WATER ROAD BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	W YELLOW WATER ROAD

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH	BRIDGE REPAIR/ REPLACEMENT	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (OFF SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$101,000.00	$116,150.00	$92,920.00	FBROFF	2027	TANGIPAHOA PARISH
CONSTRUCTION	$907,000.00	$1,043,050.00	$834,440.00	FBROFF-E	2027	

Total Cost:	$1,008,000.00	$1,159,200.00	$927,360.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.015862 US 51: AMITE PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	ARENA DR.
US 51	017-05	6.27	6.57	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH	PCC SIDEWALKS, DRAINAGE STRUCTURES, RELATED WORK	ENHANCEMENTS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$899,000.00	$1,033,850.00	$827,080.00	TAP<50K	2027	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$899,000.00	$1,033,850.00	$827,080.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016270 LA 445: TURN LANES AT US 190

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 445	278-01	4.82	5.02	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 445	278-02	0.00	0.20	TANGIPAHOA	
US 190	013-09	7.07	7.39	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL, PATCH, OVERLAY, ADD TURN LANE	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,055,000.00	$1,213,250.00	$970,600.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	**$1,055,000.00**	**$1,213,250.00**	**$970,600.00**

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016559 KENTWOOD SRA UPGRADES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-55	452-90	50.12	50.60	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MODERNIZE RESTROOMS, CONVERT TO 3 PHASE POWER, INSTALL A/C	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE REST AREAS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,025,000.00	$1,178,750.00	$943,000.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,025,000.00	$1,178,750.00	$943,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016589 US 51: LEFT TURN LANE SB AT LA 40

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 51	017-04	11.79	11.96	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL, PATCH, OVERLAY, & PAVEMENT WIDENING	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$522,000.00	$600,300.00	$480,240.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$522,000.00	$600,300.00	$480,240.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016590 LA 22: TURN LANE AT LEE'S LANDING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 22	261-04	7.06	7.41	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	LEFT TURN LANE WESTBOUND ON LA 22 AT LEE'S LANDING	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$977,000.00	$1,123,550.00	$898,840.00	STPFLEX	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$977,000.00	$1,123,550.00	$898,840.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016623 WB US 190: MOONEY - E PONCHATOULA CREEK

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
US 190	013-09	0.00	0.86	TANGIPAHOA	
US 51-X	013-08	5.63	6.43	TANGIPAHOA	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,120,000.00	$1,288,000.00	$1,030,040.00	STGEN	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,120,000.00	$1,288,000.00	$1,030,040.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016838 MCMICHAEL & PONDERS QUART: IC RR XINGS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	MCMICHAEL CHURCH RD
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	PONDERS QUARTERS LN

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD RAILROAD UNIT TRACKING NUMBER: 714-53-0138	INSTALL RR ACTIVE WARNING DEVICES	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$600,000.00	$690,000.00	$552,000.00	RAIL HE	2027	DOTD

Total Cost:	$600,000.00	$690,000.00	$552,000.00

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	0.00	0.11	TANGIPAHOA	
US 51-X	853-36	2.00	2.18	TANGIPAHOA	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
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	$2,003,300.00	$1,602,640.00	TAP50-200K	2028	CITY OF PONCHATOULA

Total Cost:	$1,742,000.00	$2,003,300.00	$1,602,640.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.015706 US 190 AT INDUSTRIAL PARK ROAD IMPROV

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	INDUSTRIAL PARK RD
LA 3158	853-39	2.37	2.47	TANGIPAHOA	
US 190	013-09	2.87	3.46	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM TANGIPAHOA PARISH TANGIPAHOA PARISH TO PROVIDE MATCH FOR TURNING LANE	ROUNDABOUT AND TURNING LANES	URBAN SYSTEMS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$128,000.00	$128,000.00	$128,000.00	STP50-200K	2028	TANGIPAHOA PARISH
UTILITY RELOCATION	$32,000.00	$32,000.00	$25,600.00	STP50-200K	2028	
CONSTRUCTION	$2,300,000.00	$2,645,000.00	$2,116,000.00	STP50-200K	2028	
CONSTRUCTION	$5,300,000.00	$6,095,000.00	$6,095,000.00	STP50-200K	2028	
Total Cost:	**$7,760,000.00**	**$8,900,000.00**	**$8,364,600.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016390 LA 16: ROAD DIET

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 16	262-07	1.42	1.59	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 16	262-07	1.59	2.06	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	ROAD DIET - OVERLAY AND STRIPING	SAFETY

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,250,000.00	$2,587,500.00	$2,587,500.00	HSIPPEN	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,250,000.00	$2,587,500.00	$2,587,500.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016594 LA 10: US 51 TO LA 1054

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 10	277-01	0.00	4.71	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL, PATCH, THIN OVERLAY	PRESERVATION ROAD PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,900,000.00	$2,185,000.00	$1,748,000.00	STP<5K	2028	DOTD

Total Cost:	$1,900,000.00	$2,185,000.00	$1,748,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.009425 LA 16: N 2ND ST TO E. OF DUNCAN AVE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 16	047-01	0.00	0.62	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 16	262-07	3.41	3.59	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, PATCH, MILL AND OVERLAY	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE PROTECT (FORMERLY ROADWAY FLOODING)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (2) (3) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$7,500,000.00	$8,625,000.00	$6,900,000.00	STPFLEX	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$7,500,000.00	$8,625,000.00	$6,900,000.00

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:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	HAZEL STREET
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	MAGNOLIA STREET
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	OAK STREET
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	PINE STREET
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	SPRUCE STREET

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	INSTALL F/L'S & GATES AT SEVERAL IC CROSSINGS IN HAMMOND	RAILROADS

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(3)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$600,000.00	$690,000.00	$690,000.00	HSIP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$600,000.00	$690,000.00	$690,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

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	3.69	4.03	TANGIPAHOA	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,515,000.00	$5,192,250.00	$4,153,800.00	STPFLEX	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,515,000.00	$5,192,250.00	$4,153,800.00

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:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000.00	$115,000.00	$0.00	LOCAL	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$400,000.00	$460,000.00	$368,000.00	RAIL HE	2029	
Total Cost:	**$500,000.00**	**$575,000.00**	**$368,000.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016489 I-12: US 51 BUS BRIDGE DECK OVERLAY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-12	454-03	5.99	6.08	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	BRIDGE DECK OVERLAY AND RESEAL/REHAB EXPANSION JOINTS	PRESERVATION BRIDGE (ON SYSTEM)

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$900,000.00	$1,035,000.00	$828,000.00	FBR-ON/OFF	2029	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$100,000.00	$115,000.00	$103,500.00	NHPP	2029	
Total Cost:	**$1,000,000.00**	**$1,150,000.00**	**$931,500.00**			

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016708 I-12: LIVINGSTON P/L - ST TAMMANY P/L

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-12	454-03	0.00	8.81	TANGIPAHOA	
I-12	454-03	8.81	18.74	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	PERMANENT SIGNING AND RELATED WORK	OPER EFFICIENCY/MOTORIST ASSISTANCE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,924,000.00	$2,212,600.00	$1,991,340.00	NHPP	2029	DOTD

Total Cost:	**$1,924,000.00**	**$2,212,600.00**	**$1,991,340.00**

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 38	263-03	0.20	0.30	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 40	415-02	1.60	1.70	TANGIPAHOA	
LA 442	269-04	4.70	4.80	TANGIPAHOA	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
BRIDGE CONDITION	(1) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,600,000.00	$2,990,000.00	$2,392,000.00	STPFLEX	2030	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,600,000.00	$2,990,000.00	$2,392,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST
Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.015828 US 51X: PONCH CREEK - JCT I-12

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	4.07	5.58	TANGIPAHOA	
US 51-X	853-36	5.58	5.89	TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
MATCH FROM DOTD	MILL, PATCH AND OVERLAY	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$340,000.00	$391,000.00	$312,800.00	NHPP	2030	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$1,360,000.00	$1,564,000.00	$1,251,200.00	STPFLEX	2030	
Total Cost:	**$1,700,000.00**	**$1,955,000.00**	**$1,564,000.00**			

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:
	ROADWAY EXTENSION	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$27,500,000.00	$31,625,000.00	$25,300,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$27,500,000.00	$31,625,000.00	$25,300,000.00

Project: H.011519 LA 1063: GLENDALE DR. - US 51 DRAINAGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
LA 1063	853-34			TANGIPAHOA	

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(1) (2) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
UTILITY RELOCATION	$280,000.00	$280,000.00	$224,000.00	PROTECT	FFY 25	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$216,000.00	$248,400.00	$198,720.00	PROTECT	TIER II	

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$496,000.00	$528,400.00	$422,720.00

Project: H.015609 LA22: HOOVER RD ROUNDABOUT

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
	000-53	0.00	0.00	TANGIPAHOA	HOOVER RD
LA 22	261-04			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	ROUNDABOUT AND INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$6,000,000.00	$6,900,000.00	$5,520,000.00	NFI	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$6,000,000.00	$6,900,000.00	$5,520,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.015734 AMITE CITY BYPASS

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	CONSTRUCT BYPASS	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:
CONSTRUCTION	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$23,000,000.00	NFI	TIER II

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$23,000,000.00

Project: H.016713 I-55: ST JOHN P/L - LA 1064

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-55	452-90			TANGIPAHOA	
I-55	452-90			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	PERMANENT SIGNING & RELATED WORK	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,259,000.00	$2,597,850.00	$2,338,065.00	NHPP	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$2,259,000.00	$2,597,850.00	$2,338,065.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: H.016960 I-55: LA 1064 - MISS S/L SIGNING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☑

Route:	Cntrl Section:	Beg. Log Mile:	End Log Mile:	Parish:	Non-State Road:
I-55	452-90			TANGIPAHOA	
I-55	452-90			TANGIPAHOA	
I-55	452-90			TANGIPAHOA	

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
	PERMANENT SIGNING & RELATED WORK	

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY	

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00	NHPP	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$4,140,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0001* I-12: LA 1249 - LA 445, WIDENING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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	CORRIDOR

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$50,000,000.00	$57,500,000.00	$51,750,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$50,000,000.00	$57,500,000.00	$51,750,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0305* US 51 @ LA 442 (TICKFAW)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$4,000,000.00	$4,600,000.00	$3,680,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0691* LA 1040 (KLEIN DR. TO US 51)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$612,000.00	$703,800.00	$563,040.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF HAMMOND

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$612,000.00	$703,800.00	$563,040.00

Project: RPC_0732* RANGE RD. AT OLD COVINGTON HWY

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED	(1) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,875,000.00	LRSP	TIER II	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,500,000.00	$2,875,000.00	$2,875,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0733* US 51 (YELLOW WATER CREEK TO LA 1064)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER II	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$3,000,000.00	$3,450,000.00	$2,760,000.00

Project: RPC_0743* HAMMOND BIKE ROUTES

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$920,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	CITY OF HAMMOND

Total Cost:	$1,000,000.00	$1,150,000.00	$920,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1067* OLD COV HWY IMPR: CYPRESS - CHESTNUT PH1

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$455,000.00	$523,250.00	$418,600.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$455,000.00	$523,250.00	$418,600.00

Project: RPC_1069* OLD COV HWY IMPR:PON. CRK. BR - LA 3158

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,821,000.00	$3,244,150.00	$2,595,320.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$2,821,000.00	$3,244,150.00	$2,595,320.00

Project: RPC_1104* LA 445 IMPROVEMENTS, LA 22 -US 190

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$38,200,000.00	$43,930,000.00	$35,144,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER II	DOTD

Total Cost:	$38,200,000.00	$43,930,000.00	$35,144,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1105* LA 3158 (AIRPORT RC.) AT I-12

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$4,347,826.09	$5,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00	DEMO	TIER II	DOTD
CONSTRUCTION	$13,043,478.27	$15,000,000.01	$12,000,000.01	NFI	TIER II	

Total Cost:	$17,391,304.36	$20,000,000.01	$16,000,000.01

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1231* S TANGIPAHOA RDS. PAVEMENT REHAB PH 3

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,550,000.00	$2,805,000.00	$2,244,000.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$2,550,000.00	$2,805,000.00	$2,244,000.00

Project: RPC_1232* S TANGIPAHOA RDS. PAVEMENT REHAB PH 4

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,560,000.00	$2,816,000.00	$2,252,800.00	STP50-200K	TIER II	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,560,000.00	$2,816,000.00	$2,252,800.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0309* I-55: US 190 TO LA 3234

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY MOTORIZED CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(1) (2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$10,350,000.00	NHPP	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$10,350,000.00

Project: RPC_0734* FIRETOWER RD INTERCHANGE @ I-12

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$19,100,000.00	$21,965,000.00	$17,572,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$19,100,000.00	$21,965,000.00	$17,572,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0735* LA 445 IMPROVEMENTS, US 190 TO LA 40

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(2) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$42,000,000.00	$48,300,000.00	$38,640,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$42,000,000.00	$48,300,000.00	$38,640,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0736* I-55 @ I-12 INTERCHANGE REHAB

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$50,000,000.00	$57,500,000.00	$51,750,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$50,000,000.00	$57,500,000.00	$51,750,000.00

Project: RPC_0737* I-55@ LA 22 INTERCHANGE REHAB

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$25,875,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$25,000,000.00	$28,750,000.00	$25,875,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_0739* I-55 AT US 190

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$10,350,000.00	FED/STATE	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$10,000,000.00	$11,500,000.00	$10,350,000.00

Project: RPC_1068* OLD COV HWY IMPR:CHESTNUT - PON. CRK. BR

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
SAFETY NON-MOTORIZED	(1) (2) (4) (5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$3,765,000.00	$4,329,750.00	$3,463,800.00	STP50-200K	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$3,765,000.00	$4,329,750.00	$3,463,800.00

Project: RPC_1103* I-12: LA 445 - LA 1077 WIDENING

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION CONGESTION RELIABILITY FREIGHT RELIABILITY	(4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$74,300,000.00	$85,445,000.00	$68,356,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$74,300,000.00	$85,445,000.00	$68,356,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1106* FIRETOWER RD WIDENING (LA 22 TO US 190)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

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

FHWA Performance Category:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$34,000,000.00	$39,100,000.00	$31,280,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$34,000,000.00	$39,100,000.00	$31,280,000.00

Project: RPC_1107* LA 22 (LA 1085- 3RD ST. PONCHATOULA)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$89,000,000.00	$102,350,000.00	$81,880,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$89,000,000.00	$102,350,000.00	$81,880,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1109* I-12 SERVICE RD: LA 445 TO FIRETOWER RD

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(5)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$40,800,000.00	$46,920,000.00	$37,536,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Total Cost:	$40,800,000.00	$46,920,000.00	$37,536,000.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1110* NARRETTO ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$264,600.00	$304,290.00	$273,861.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$264,600.00	$304,290.00	$273,861.00

Project: RPC_1111* PALMER LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$303,800.00	$349,370.00	$314,433.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$303,800.00	$349,370.00	$314,433.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1112* HINSON ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$362,600.00	$416,990.00	$375,291.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$362,600.00	$416,990.00	$375,291.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1113* V. LAMBERT ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$362,600.00	$416,990.00	$375,291.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$362,600.00	$416,990.00	$375,291.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1114* RABORN ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$372,400.00	$428,260.00	$385,434.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$372,400.00	$428,260.00	$385,434.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1115* WALNUT STREET OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$372,400.00	$428,260.00	$385,434.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$372,400.00	$428,260.00	$385,434.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1116* WEST CHESTNUT STREET OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$372,400.00	$428,260.00	$385,434.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$372,400.00	$428,260.00	$385,434.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1117* LANIER LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00

Project: RPC_1119* CAMPBELL LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00

Project: RPC_1120* BERRY BOWL ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1121* NORTH JACKSON ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$420,420.00	$483,483.00	$386,786.40	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$420,420.00	$483,483.00	$386,786.40

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1122* ANDERSON ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00

Project: RPC_1124* BROCK ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1125* KENTWOOD FIRESTATION OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$382,200.00	$439,530.00	$395,577.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1126* FANNIE POWELL ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$411,600.00	$473,340.00	$426,006.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$411,600.00	$473,340.00	$426,006.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1127* SINGING WATER FALLS RD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$421,400.00	$484,610.00	$436,149.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$421,400.00	$484,610.00	$436,149.00

Project: RPC_1129* ILLINOIS JONES RD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$499,800.00	$574,770.00	$517,293.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$499,800.00	$574,770.00	$517,293.00

Project: RPC_1130* COLEMAN ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$499,800.00	$574,770.00	$517,293.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$499,800.00	$574,770.00	$517,293.00

Project: RPC_1131* TRAVIS LANE OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$509,600.00	$586,040.00	$527,436.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$509,600.00	$586,040.00	$527,436.00

Project: RPC_1132* BYERS ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$558,600.00	$642,390.00	$578,151.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$558,600.00	$642,390.00	$578,151.00

Project: RPC_1136* BENNETT ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$578,200.00	$664,930.00	$598,437.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$578,200.00	$664,930.00	$598,437.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1137* NUCCIO RD. OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$735,000.00	$845,250.00	$760,725.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$735,000.00	$845,250.00	$760,725.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1138* STATE LINE ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE (2)

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$744,800.00	$856,520.00	$770,868.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$744,800.00	$856,520.00	$770,868.00

Project: RPC_1139* SHINGLE MILL ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$754,600.00	$867,790.00	$781,011.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$754,600.00	$867,790.00	$781,011.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1140* STEIN ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,185,800.00	$1,363,670.00	$1,227,303.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$1,185,800.00	$1,363,670.00	$1,227,303.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1141* LAROCK RD BR OV NAT. CRK OFF SYSTEM BR.

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,195,600.00	$1,374,940.00	$1,237,446.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$1,195,600.00	$1,374,940.00	$1,237,446.00

Project: RPC_1142* WALSH ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,215,200.00	$1,397,480.00	$1,257,732.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$1,215,200.00	$1,397,480.00	$1,257,732.00

Project: RPC_1143* BEACH ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE 1

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$1,509,200.00	$1,735,580.00	$1,562,022.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$1,509,200.00	$1,735,580.00	$1,562,022.00

Project: RPC_1144* BEACH ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE 2

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$2,058,000.00	$2,366,700.00	$2,130,030.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Total Cost:	$2,058,000.00	$2,366,700.00	$2,130,030.00

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Project: RPC_1146* HARVEY LAVIGNE ROAD OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
	(6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$568,400.00	$653,660.00	$588,294.00	BIP	TIER III	TANGIPAHOA PARISH

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$568,400.00	$653,660.00	$588,294.00

Project: RPC_1194* US 190: ST. TAMMANY P/L TO HAMMOND

Project is in a STIP Line Item ☐

Remarks:	Type Improvement:	Work Type:
*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:	MTP Goal(s):
ROAD CONDITION	(2) (4) (5) (6)

Project Phase:	Project Cost:	Tot.Cost (w/Contingency):	Federal Share:	Fund:	Year:	Sponsor:
CONSTRUCTION	$97,600,000.00	$112,240,000.00	$89,792,000.00	FHWA Discr.	TIER III	DOTD

Project Urban Area(s):
ST

Project Parish(es):
TANGIPAHOA

Total Cost:	$97,600,000.00	$112,240,000.00	$89,792,000.00

C Appendix

MTP Transit Project List

2027 Transportation Improvement Program - New Orleans UA Transit Element

Project	Parish	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5337 (Rail)	Section 5337 (HOV)	Section 5339	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Demand Response Vehicles	Region	1,562.5					1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Transit Security 1%	Jefferson	200,000.0	160,000.0					160,000.0	40,000.0	EQ
Transit Safety .75	Jefferson	137,500.0	110,000.0					110,000.0	27,500.0	EQ
Preventative Maintenance	Jefferson	3,189,337.5	2,324,754.0		226,716.0			2,551,470.0	637,867.5	RS
Operating Assistance - Fixed Route	Jefferson	5,400,000.0	2,700,000.0					2,700,000.0	2,700,000.0	
Capital Project Management - 3rd Party	Jefferson	218,750.0	175,000.0					175,000.0	43,750.0	
Planning	Jefferson	343,750.0	275,000.0					275,000.0	68,750.0	
Shop Equipment	Jefferson	53,750.0	43,000.0					43,000.0	10,750.0	FA
New Fixed Route Vehicles	Jefferson	1,147,592.5	400,000.0			518,074.0		918,074.0	229,518.5	RS
Total Jefferson		10,690,680.0	6,187,754.0	0.0	226,716.0	518,074.0	0.0	6,932,544.0	3,758,136.0	
Total Jefferson		10,690,680.0	6,187,754.0	0.0	226,716.0	518,074.0	0.0	6,932,544.0	3,758,136.0	
Transit Security 1%	Orleans (RTA)	225,000.0	180,000.0					180,000.0	45,000.0	EQ
Transit Safety .75	Orleans (RTA)	168,750.0	135,000.0					135,000.0	33,750.0	EQ
Preventative Maintenance (Bus)	Orleans (RTA)	17,150,000.0	13,720,000.0					13,720,000.0	3,430,000.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (Rail)	Orleans (RTA)	8,875,000.0		7,100,000.0				7,100,000.0	1,775,000.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (HOV)	Orleans (RTA)	453,432			226,716			226,716.0	226,716	RS
Shop Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	75,000.0	60,000.0					60,000.0	15,000.0	EQ
Security Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	118,750.0	95,000.0					95,000.0	23,750.0	EQ
New Vehicles	Orleans (RTA)	250,000.0	200,000.0					200,000.0	50,000.0	RS
Streetcar Equipment, Facility	Orleans (RTA)	437,500.0	350,000.0					350,000.0	87,500.0	FA
Streetcar Track Repairs	Orleans (RTA)	362,500.0	290,000.0					290,000.0	72,500.0	IN
Support Vehicle	Orleans (RTA)	1,567,432.5				1,253,946.0		1,253,946.0	313,486.5	RS
Planning	Orleans (RTA)	150,000.0	120,000.0					120,000.0	30,000.0	
Ferry Maintenance	Orleans (RTA)	812,500.0	650,000.0					650,000.0	162,500.0	RS
Total Orleans		30,645,864.5	15,800,000.0	7,100,000.0	226,716.0	1,253,946.0	0.0	24,380,662.0	6,265,202.5	
Total Orleans		30,645,864.5	15,800,000.0	7,100,000.0	226,716.0	1,253,946.0	0.0	24,380,662.0	6,265,202.5	
Operating Assistance	St Bernard	120,000.0	60,000.0					60,000.0	60,000.0	
Preventative Maintenance	St Bernard	186,250.0	149,000.0					149,000.0	37,250.0	RS
Security Equipment	St Bernard	13,750.0	11,000.0					11,000.0	2,750.0	
Total St. Bernard		320,000.0	220,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	220,000.0	100,000.0	
Total St. Bernard		320,000.0	220,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	220,000.0	100,000.0	
Operating Assistance	St. John/St. Charles	170,000.0	85,000.0					85,000.0	85,000.0	
Preventive Maintenance	St. John/St. Charles	125,000.0	100,000.0					100,000.0	25,000.0	RS
Project Administration	St. John/St. Charles	50,000.0	40,000.0					40,000.0	10,000.0	
New Vehicles	St. John/St. Charles	187,500.0	150,000.0					150,000.0	37,500.0	RS
Total St. John/St. Charles		532,500.0	375,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	375,000.0	157,500.0	
Total St. John/St. Charles		532,500.0	375,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	375,000.0	157,500.0	
Ferry Preventative Maintenance		468,750.0	375,000.0					375,000.0	93,750.0	RS
Total Plaquemines		468,750.0	375,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	375,000.0	93,750.0	
Total Plaquemines		468,750.0	375,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	375,000.0	93,750.0	
TOTAL		42,659,357.0	22,957,754.0	7,100,000.0	453,432.0	1,772,020.0	1,250.0	32,284,456.0	10,374,901.0	
TOTAL		42,659,357.0	22,957,754.0	7,100,000.0	453,432.0	1,772,020.0	1,250.0	32,284,456.0	10,374,901.0	

** Dollars are in Thousands*

*** State of Good Repair Abbreviations: RS (Rolling Stock); FA (Facilities); EQ (Equipment); IN (Infrastructure)*

2028 Transportation Improvement Program - New Orleans UA Transit Element

Project	Parish	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5337 (Rail)	Section 5337 (HOV)	Section 5339	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Demand Response Vehicles	Region	1,562.5					1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	RS
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Transit Security 1%	Jefferson	206,250.0	165,000.0					165,000.0	41,250.0	
Transit Safety .75	Jefferson	143,750.0	115,000.0					115,000.0	28,750.0	
Project Administration	Jefferson	312,500.0	250,000.0					250,000.0	62,500.0	
Preventative Maintenance	Jefferson	2,772,365.0	1,988,909.0		228,983.0			2,217,892.0	554,473.0	RS
Operating Assistance - Fixed Route	Jefferson	5,500,000.0	2,750,000.0					2,750,000.0	2,750,000.0	
Capital Project Management - 3rd party	Jefferson	225,000.0	180,000.0					180,000.0	45,000.0	
Planning	Jefferson	343,750.0	275,000.0					275,000.0	68,750.0	
Shop Equipment	Jefferson	53,750.0	43,000.0					43,000.0	10,750.0	FA
New Fixed Route Vehicles	Jefferson	625,000.0	500,000.0					500,000.0	125,000.0	RS
Total Jefferson		10,182,365.0	6,266,909.0	0.0	228,983.0	0.0	0.0	6,495,892.0	3,686,473.0	
Total Jefferson		10,182,365.0	6,266,909.0	0.0	228,983.0	0.0	0.0	6,495,892.0	3,686,473.0	
Transit Security 1%	Orleans (RTA)	231,250.0	185,000.0					185,000.0	46,250.0	EQ
Transit Safety .75	Orleans (RTA)	175,000.0	140,000.0					140,000.0	35,000.0	EQ
Preventative Maintenance (Bus)	Orleans (RTA)	17,667,500.0	14,134,000.0					14,134,000.0	3,533,500.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (Rail)	Orleans (RTA)	9,000,000.0		7,200,000.0				7,200,000.0	1,800,000.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (HOV)	Orleans (RTA)	457,966			228,983			228,983.0	228,983	RS
Shop Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	1,250.0	1,000.0					1,000.0	250.0	EQ
Security Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	112,500.0	90,000.0					90,000.0	22,500.0	EQ
New Vehicles	Orleans (RTA)	300,000.0	240,000.0					240,000.0	60,000.0	RS
Streetcar Equipment, Facility	Orleans (RTA)	237,500.0	190,000.0					190,000.0	47,500.0	FA
Streetcar Track Repairs	Orleans (RTA)	500,000.0	400,000.0					400,000.0	100,000.0	IN
Support Vehicle	Orleans (RTA)	1,584,932.5				1,267,946.0		1,267,946.0	316,986.5	RS
Planning	Orleans (RTA)	150,000.0	120,000.0					120,000.0	30,000.0	
Ferry Maintenance	Orleans (RTA)	825,000.0	660,000.0					660,000.0	165,000.0	RS
Total Orleans		31,242,898.5	16,160,000.0	7,200,000.0	228,983.0	1,267,946.0	0.0	24,856,929.0	6,385,969.5	
Total Orleans		31,242,898.5	16,160,000.0	7,200,000.0	228,983.0	1,267,946.0	0.0	24,856,929.0	6,385,969.5	
Operating Assistance	St Bernard	130,000.0	65,000.0					65,000.0	65,000.0	
Preventative Maintenance	St Bernard	191,250.0	153,000.0					153,000.0	38,250.0	RS
Security Equipment	St Bernard	15,000.0	12,000.0					12,000.0	3,000.0	
Total St. Bernard		336,250.0	230,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	230,000.0	106,250.0	
Total St. Bernard		336,250.0	230,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	230,000.0	106,250.0	
Operating Assistance	St. John/St. Charles	170,000.0	85,000.0					85,000.0	85,000.0	
Preventive Maintenance	St. John/St. Charles	127,500.0	102,000.0					102,000.0	25,500.0	RS
Project Administration	St. John/St. Charles	50,000.0	40,000.0					40,000.0	10,000.0	
New Vehicles	St. John/St. Charles	191,250.0	153,000.0					153,000.0	38,250.0	RS
Total St. John/St. Charles		538,750.0	380,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	380,000.0	158,750.0	
Total St. John/St. Charles		538,750.0	380,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	380,000.0	158,750.0	
Ferry Preventative Maintenance		475,000.0	380,000.0					380,000.0	95,000.0	RS
Total Plaquemines FY-22		475,000.0	380,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	380,000.0	95,000.0	
Total Plaquemines		475,000.0	380,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	380,000.0	95,000.0	
TOTAL FY-22		42,776,826.0	23,416,909.0	7,200,000.0	457,966.0	1,267,946.0	1,250.0	32,344,071.0	10,432,755.0	
TOTAL		42,776,826.0	23,416,909.0	7,200,000.0	457,966.0	1,267,946.0	1,250.0	32,344,071.0	10,432,755.0	

** Dollars are in Thousands*

*** State of Good Repair Abbreviations: RS (Rolling Stock); FA (Facilities); EQ (Equipment); IN (Infrastructure)*

2029 Transportation Improvement Program - New Orleans UA Transit Element

Project	Parish	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5337 (Rail)	Section 5337 (HOV)	Section 5339	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Demand Response Vehicles	Region	1,562.5					1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	RS
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Transit Security 1%	Jefferson	212,500.0	170,000.0					170,000.0	42,500.0	EQ
Transit Safety .75	Jefferson	150,000.0	120,000.0					120,000.0	30,000.0	EQ
Project Administration	Jefferson	325,000.0	260,000.0					260,000.0	65,000.0	
Preventative Maintenance	Jefferson	2,573,150.0	1,827,247.0		231,273.0			2,058,520.0	514,630.0	RS
Operating Assistance - Fixed Route	Jefferson	5,800,000.0	2,900,000.0					2,900,000.0	2,900,000.0	
Capital Project Management	Jefferson	375,000.0	300,000.0					300,000.0	75,000.0	
Planning	Jefferson	343,750.0	275,000.0					275,000.0	68,750.0	
Shop Equipment	Jefferson	53,750.0	43,000.0					43,000.0	10,750.0	EQ
New Fixed Route Vehicles	Jefferson	1,240,863.8	450,000.0			542,691.0		992,691.0	248,172.8	RS
Total Jefferson		11,074,013.8	6,345,247.0	0.0	231,273.0	542,691.0	0.0	7,119,211.0	3,954,802.8	
Total Jefferson		11,074,013.8	6,345,247.0	0.0	231,273.0	542,691.0	0.0	7,119,211.0	3,954,802.8	
Transit Security 1%	Orleans (RTA)	237,500.0	190,000.0					190,000.0	47,500.0	EQ
Transit Safety .75	Orleans (RTA)	181,250.0	145,000.0					145,000.0	36,250.0	EQ
Preventative Maintenance (Bus)	Orleans (RTA)	17,812,500.0	14,250,000.0					14,250,000.0	3,562,500.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (Rail)	Orleans (RTA)	9,125,000.0		7,300,000.0				7,300,000.0	1,825,000.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (HOV)	Orleans (RTA)	462,546			231,273			231,273.0	231,273	RS
Shop Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	1,250.0	1,000.0					1,000.0	250.0	EQ
Security Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	250,000.0	200,000.0					200,000.0	50,000.0	EQ
New Vehicles	Orleans (RTA)	306,250.0	245,000.0					245,000.0	61,250.0	RS
Streetcar Equipment, Facility	Orleans (RTA)	555,000.0	444,000.0					444,000.0	111,000.0	FA
Streetcar Track Repairs	Orleans (RTA)	312,500.0	250,000.0					250,000.0	62,500.0	IN
Support Vehicle	Orleans (RTA)	1,582,432.5				1,265,946.0		1,265,946.0	316,486.5	RS
Planning	Orleans (RTA)	156,250.0	125,000.0					125,000.0	31,250.0	
Ferry Maintenance	Orleans (RTA)	837,500.0	670,000.0					670,000.0	167,500.0	RS
Total Orleans		31,819,978.5	16,520,000.0	7,300,000.0	231,273.0	1,265,946.0	0.0	25,317,219.0	6,502,759.5	
Total Orleans		31,819,978.5	16,520,000.0	7,300,000.0	231,273.0	1,265,946.0	0.0	25,317,219.0	6,502,759.5	
Operating Assistance	St Bernard	140,000.0	70,000.0					70,000.0	70,000.0	
Preventative Maintenance	St Bernard	196,250.0	157,000.0					157,000.0	39,250.0	RS
Security Equipment	St Bernard	16,250.0	13,000.0					13,000.0	3,250.0	
Total St. Bernard		352,500.0	240,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	240,000.0	112,500.0	
Total St. Bernard		352,500.0	240,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	240,000.0	112,500.0	
Operating Assistance	St. John/St. Charles	230,000.0	115,000.0					115,000.0	115,000.0	
Preventive Maintenance	St. John/St. Charles	187,500.0	150,000.0					150,000.0	37,500.0	RS
Vehicle Replacement	St. John/St. Charles	150,000.0	120,000					120,000.0	30,000.0	RS
Project Administration	St. John/St. Charles	6,250.0	5,000.0					5,000.0	1,250.0	
Total St. John/St. Charles		573,750.0	390,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	390,000.0	183,750.0	
Total St. John/St. Charles		573,750.0	390,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	390,000.0	183,750.0	
Ferry Preventative Maintenance		487,500.0	390,000.0					390,000.0	97,500.0	RS
Total Plaquemines		487,500.0	390,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	390,000.0	97,500.0	
Total Plaquemines		487,500.0	390,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	390,000.0	97,500.0	
TOTAL		44,309,304.8	23,885,247.0	7,300,000.0	462,546.0	1,808,637.0	1,250.0	33,457,680.0	10,851,624.8	
TOTAL		44,309,304.8	23,885,247.0	7,300,000.0	462,546.0	1,808,637.0	1,250.0	33,457,680.0	10,851,624.8	

** Dollars are in Thousands*

*** State of Good Repair Abbreviations: RS (Rolling Stock); FA (Facilities); EQ (Equipment); IN (Infrastructure)*

2030 Transportation Improvement Program - New Orleans UA Transit Element

Project	Parish	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5337 (Rail)	Section 5337 (HOV)	Section 5339	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Demand Response Vehicles	Region	1,562.5					1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Total Region		1,562.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		1,250.0	1,250.0	312.5	
Transit Security 1%	Jefferson	218,750.0	175,000.0					175,000.0	43,750.0	EQ
Transit Safety .75	Jefferson	156,250.0	125,000.0					125,000.0	31,250.0	EQ
Project Administration	Jefferson	362,500.0	290,000.0					290,000.0	72,500.0	
Preventative Maintenance	Jefferson	2,416,982.5	1,700,000.0		233,586.0			1,933,586.0	483,396.5	RS
Operating Assistance - Fixed Route	Jefferson	5,600,000.0	2,800,000.0					2,800,000.0	2,800,000.0	
Capital Project Management - 3rd Party	Jefferson	312,500.0	250,000.0					250,000.0	62,500.0	
Planning	Jefferson	356,250.0	285,000.0					285,000.0	71,250.0	
Transit Associated Improvements	Jefferson	81,250.0	65,000.0					65,000.0	16,250.0	RS
New Fixed Route Vehicles	Jefferson	1,702,141.3	810,000.0			551,713.0		1,361,713.0	340,428.3	RS
Total Jefferson		11,206,623.8	6,500,000.0	0.0	233,586.0	551,713.0	0.0	7,285,299.0	3,921,324.8	
Total Jefferson		11,206,623.8	6,500,000.0	0.0	233,586.0	551,713.0	0.0	7,285,299.0	3,921,324.8	
Transit Security 1%	Orleans (RTA)	243,750.0	195,000.0					195,000.0	48,750.0	EQ
Transit Safety .75	Orleans (RTA)	187,500.0	150,000.0					150,000.0	37,500.0	EQ
Preventative Maintenance (Bus)	Orleans (RTA)	18,000,000.0	14,400,000.0					14,400,000.0	3,600,000.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (Rail)	Orleans (RTA)	9,250,000.0		7,400,000.0				7,400,000.0	1,850,000.0	RS
Preventative Maintenance (HOV)	Orleans (RTA)	467,172			233,586			233,586.0	233,586	RS
Shop Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	875.0	700.0					700.0	175.0	EQ
Security Equipment	Orleans (RTA)	131.3	105.0					105.0	26.3	EQ
New Vehicles	Orleans (RTA)	93,750.0	75,000.0					75,000.0	18,750.0	RS
Streetcar Equipment, Facility	Orleans (RTA)	1,140,000.0	912,000.0					912,000.0	228,000.0	FA
Streetcar Track Repairs	Orleans (RTA)	318,933.8	255,147.0					255,147.0	63,786.8	IN
Support Vehicle	Orleans (RTA)	1,593,750.0				1,275,000.0		1,275,000.0	318,750.0	RS
Planning	Orleans (RTA)	187,500.0	150,000.0					150,000.0	37,500.0	
Ferry Maintenance	Orleans (RTA)	843,750.0	675,000.0					675,000.0	168,750.0	RS
Total Orleans		32,327,112.0	16,812,952.0	7,400,000.0	233,586.0	1,275,000.0	0.0	25,721,538.0	6,605,574.0	
Total Orleans		32,327,112.0	16,812,952.0	7,400,000.0	233,586.0	1,275,000.0	0.0	25,721,538.0	6,605,574.0	
Operating Assistance	St Bernard	120,000.0	60,000.0					60,000.0	60,000.0	
Preventative Maintenance	St Bernard	112,500.0	90,000.0					90,000.0	22,500.0	RS
Vehicle replacement	St Bernard	125,000.0	100,000.0					100,000.0	25,000.0	
Total St. Bernard		357,500.0	250,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	250,000.0	107,500.0	
Total St. Bernard		357,500.0	250,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	250,000.0	107,500.0	
Operating Assistance	St. John/St. Charles	240,000.0	120,000.0					120,000.0	120,000.0	
Preventive Maintenance	St. John/St. Charles	143,750.0	115,000.0					115,000.0	28,750.0	RS
Project Administration	St. John/St. Charles	18,750.0	15,000.0					15,000.0	3,750.0	
New Vehicles	St. John/St. Charles	187,500.0	150,000.0					150,000.0	37,500.0	RS
Total St. John/St. Charles		590,000.0	400,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	400,000.0	190,000.0	
Total St. John/St. Charles		590,000.0	400,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	400,000.0	190,000.0	
Ferry Preventative Maintenance		500,000.0	400,000.0					400,000.0	100,000.0	RS
Total Plaquemines		500,000.0	400,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	400,000.0	100,000.0	
Total Plaquemines		500,000.0	400,000.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	400,000.0	100,000.0	
TOTAL		44,982,798.3	24,362,952.0	7,400,000.0	467,172.0	1,826,713.0	1,250.0	34,058,087.0	10,924,711.3	
TOTAL		44,982,798.3	24,362,952.0	7,400,000.0	467,172.0	1,826,713.0	1,250.0	34,058,087.0	10,924,711.3	

** Dollars are in Thousands*

*** State of Good Repair Abbreviations: RS (Rolling Stock); FA (Facilities); EQ (Equipment); IN (Infrastructure)*

2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan New Orleans Urbanized Area Transit Element		
	Tier II	Tier III
Operating Expenses	$57.9 million	$108.8 million
Revenue Vehicles	$450 million	$846.1 million
Facilities	$64.3 million	$120.9 million
Streetcar Infrastructure	$32.2 million	$60.4 million
Support Vehicles	$9.7 million	$18.1 million
Miscellaneous	$30 million	$54.4 million

2027 Transportation Improvement Program - St. Tammany UA Transit Element

Project	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5311	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Urban Operating Assistance	5,652,444	2,826,222			2,826,222	2,826,222	
Preventive Maintenance	343,750	275,000			275,000	68,750	EQ
Capital Improvement/Vehicle Procurement	1,125,000	900,000			900,000	225,000	RS
Total	**7,121,194**	**4,001,222**	**0**		**4,001,222**	**3,119,972**	

2028 Transportation Improvement Program - St. Tammany UA Transit Element

Project	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5311	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Urban Operating Assistance	5,692,494	2,846,247			2,846,247	2,846,247	
Preventive Maintenance	387,500	310,000			310,000	77,500	EQ
Capital Improvement/Vehicle Procurement	1,156,250	925,000			925,000	231,250	RS
Total	**7,236,244**	**4,081,247**	**0**		**4,081,247**	**3,154,997**	

2029 Transportation Improvement Program - St. Tammany UA Transit Element

Project	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5311	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Urban Operating Assistance	5,775,744	2,887,872			2,887,872	2,887,872	
Preventive Maintenance	406,250	325,000			325,000	81,250	EQ
Capital Improvement/Vehicle Procurement	1,187,500	950,000			950,000	237,500	RS
Total	**7,369,494**	**4,162,872**	**0**		**4,162,872**	**3,206,622**	

2030 Transportation Improvement Program - St. Tammany UA Transit Element

Project	Total Cost	Section 5307	Section 5311	Section 5310	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Urban Operating Assistance	5,842,258	2,921,129			2,921,129	2,921,129	
Preventive Maintenance	437,500	350,000			350,000	87,500	EQ
Capital Improvement/Vehicle Procurement	1,218,750	975,000			975,000	243,750	RS
Total	**7,498,508**	**4,246,129**	**0**		**4,246,129**	**3,252,379**	

2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan St. Tammany Urbanized Areas Transit Element		
	Tier II	Tier III
Operating Expenses	$28.6 million	$43.4 million
Revenue Vehicles	$14.3 million	$13.7 million
Facilities	$4.8 million	$7.2 million

2027 Transportation Improvement Program - South Tangipahoa UA Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Operating Assistance (Urban)	840,000	420,000			420,000	420,000	
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	231,250	185,000			185,000	46,250	FA
Transit Associated Improvements	387,500	310,000			310,000	77,500	EQ
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	477,365	381,892			381,892	95,473	RS
Total	**$1,936,115.0**	**$1,376,272.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,296,892.0**	**$639,223.0**	

2028 Transportation Improvement Program - South Tangipahoa UA Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Operating Assistance (Urban)	860,000	430,000			430,000	430,000	
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	237,500	190,000			190,000	47,500	FA
Transit Associated Improvements	393,750	315,000			315,000	78,750	EQ
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	484,788	387,830			387,830	96,958	RS
Total	**$1,976,037.5**	**$1,322,830.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,322,830.0**	**$653,207.5**	

2029 Transportation Improvement Program - South Tangipahoa UA Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Operating Assistance (Urban)	880,000	440,000			440,000	440,000	
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	243,750	195,000			195,000	48,750	FA
Transit Associated Improvements	400,000	320,000			320,000	80,000	EQ
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	492,858	394,286			394,286	98,572	RS
Total	**$2,016,607.5**	**$1,349,286.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,349,286.0**	**$667,321.5**	

2030 Transportation Improvement Program - South Tangipahoa UA Transit Element

Project	Cost	Section 5307	Section 5310	Section 5311	Total Federal	Local Match	Comments
Operating Assistance (Urban)	900,000	450,000			450,000	450,000	
Bus Stop and Bus Facilities	250,000	200,000			200,000	50,000	FA
Transit Associated Improvements	437,500	350,000			350,000	87,500	EQ
Preventive Maintenance/ Vehicle Replacement	277,500	376,272			376,272	94,068	RS
Total	**$1,865,000.0**	**$1,376,272.0**	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$1,376,272.0**	**$681,568.0**	

2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan South Tangipahoa Urbanized Area Transit Element		
	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

D Appendix

MTP Call for Projects Application and Criteria



2056 MTP Call for Projects

Application Guidelines and Evaluation Checklist

February 9, 2026

NEW ORLEANS REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

2056 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

CALL FOR PROJECTS

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

for Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard,

St. Charles, St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa Parishes

10 VETERANS BOULEVARD

NEW ORLEANS, LA 70124

www.norpc.org

https://www.norpc.org/transportation/projects/metropolitantransportationplanning/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents 604
Overview 605
MTP Project Tiers & Project Funding 605
Important Dates 606
Eligibility 606
Submission Requirements 608
Evaluation 611
For More Information 612
Appendix: MTP Project Evaluation Checklists 613

OVERVIEW

The Regional Planning Commission (RPC), as the federally designated metropolitan planning organization for the nine-parish region comprising southeast Louisiana, is responsible for developing a comprehensive long-range transportation plan to guide regional policy and transportation investments. This long-range plan, known as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), is updated every four years as required by federal law. The RPC is currently preparing the next update which will cover a 30-year planning horizon from 2027-2056.

The MTP Call for Projects is an opportunity intended for sponsors of proposed multi-modal transportation projects to submit proposals for inclusion in the 2056 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. It serves as one of multiple avenues through which stakeholders can offer formal input on long-term investment priorities and will assist the RPC in identifying priority corridors for improvement in the region.

This Call for Projects is an important component of the 2056 MTP which will not only outline transportation goals and policies to guide transportation planning through the next 30 years but also contain a fiscally constrained program of projects to support the achievement of those objectives. This solicitation is primarily for projects with anticipated development within the next 10 to 20 years. Developing a comprehensive inventory of medium- and long-term projects will enable the RPC to prepare these projects for implementation through upcoming short-range programs, specifically the next two to three Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) cycles for federal fiscal years 2031–2042, as funding becomes available.

MTP PROJECT TIERS & PROJECT FUNDING

The RPC's primary source of transportation project funding comes from the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program. Under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), these funds can be used for a variety of projects, including roadway maintenance, bicycling and pedestrian facilities, bridge and tunnel rehabilitation, lighting, electric vehicle charging equipment, green infrastructure, and planning. STBG funds can also be "flexed" to public transportation. However, most of the funding for public transportation in the region comes through guaranteed annual federal apportionments based on factors such as population and population density, the size of the transit network, and the miles traveled by transit vehicles each year. In addition, some projects are awarded funding through discretionary grant opportunities which can sometimes help fund larger, more complex projects.

The MTP is required to be fiscally constrained, meaning projects can only be included if it can be reasonably assumed that funding will be available in the year in which it is programmed to be implemented. The RPC bases its future project funding allocations on a projection of formula funds assumed to be available over the next 30 years. Projects that may rely on funding from discretionary grants may be included, but these funds are less predictable and expected to vary with future federal transportation bills. Proposals received through this Call for Projects will be programmed in the MTP based on this financial analysis. However, inclusion in the MTP does not guarantee funding, except for those committed within the short-range program (i.e., TIP).

Projects in the MTP will be organized into the following three tiers:

- **Tier I (FY 27-30):** Covers projects expected to advance to construction in the next four years. These projects comprise the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). As most projects in the TIP have already been identified and progressed through the project development process, this Call for Projects is not seeking proposals for inclusion in the TIP.
- **Tier II (FY 31-40):** Lays out projects currently in the planning and development phase that are expected to advance in the medium-term once funding is made available.
- **Tier III (FY 41-56):** Long-range projects that are more complex to implement due to funding availability or other factors. These projects may be illustrative.

IMPORTANT DATES

DATE	EVENT
February 9, 2026	MTP Call for Projects application posted
February 25, 2026	Webinar: MTP Call for Projects Presentation for Local Public Agencies
March 30, 2026	Applications due by 5 p.m. CST
April 6, 2026	RPC Completeness Review Deadline
April 20, 2026	Deadline for applicants to answer requests for more information
May 8, 2026	Presentation of 2056 MTP Projects to the Technical Advisory Group
June 9, 2026	Presentation of 2056 MTP Projects to Transportation Policy Committee

ELIGIBILITY

Eligible Applicants

The MTP Call for Projects is open to all local public agencies within the metropolitan planning area that wish to sponsor a proposed multimodal transportation project(s). A local public agency refers to a government entity at the local level, such as a city, parish, transit agency, or other political subdivision of the State of Louisiana.

Eligible Projects

Projects considered eligible for the 2056 MTP are any of those outlined under Title 23 U.S.C. § 133 or Title 49 U.S.C. § 5307 of U.S. Code. Projects may be at varying stages of development or study; projects in the conceptual planning stage are eligible. Any questions about eligibility can be directed to Tom Haysley, Principal Planner, at thaysley@norpc.org, or Jeff Roesel, Executive Director, at jroesel@norpc.org.

Metropolitan Planning Area

All proposed projects must be within the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) served by the RPC. A general overview of the MPA can be seen in the map below and more detailed maps are available at the RPC's Regional Transportation Layers App (https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/47a2aac16f094b589d908e881162dcc1).



Federal Aid Network

All proposed roadway projects must be on the Federal Aid Network, which generally includes roadways designated as FHWA Functional Classification Collector or higher. A map of the current Federal Aid Network can be found at the RPC's Regional Transportation Layers App (https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/47a2aac16f094b589d908e881162dcc1).

For proposed projects that include off street non-motorized facilities, new roadways, or potential upgrade of a roadway to a Federal Aid eligible facility, please contact RPC for guidance.

Transit Geography

All proposed transit projects must be within, or in the case of transit corridors, have stops within one of the MPA's four urbanized areas (New Orleans, South Tangipahoa, Mandeville-Covington, or Slidell (refer to map above or on the RPC's Regional Transportation Layers App (https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/47a2aac16f094b589d908e881162dcc1).

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

MTP project proposals may be submitted any time before 5 p.m. CST on March 30, 2026. Applications and all attachments must be emailed to Tom Haysley, Principal Planner at thaysley@norpc.org.

A complete application will include the following items:

1. A completed MTP Project Request Excel spreadsheet. The workbook can be downloaded on RPC's website here.
2. A completed "Complete Streets Form." This form is included in the Project Request spreadsheet.
3. (Optional) Any supplementary information regarding the project (i.e., designs, maps, plans, etc.), including information verifying the project meets certain evaluation criteria. Refer to the Appendix of this document.

Projects listed in the previous 2052 MTP can be found in the MTP documents, and an updated spreadsheet of MTP projects will be available on the RPC website shortly after the application period opens. If agencies would like those projects to carry over into the 2056 plan, then applicants shall include them in the application, updating any information which may have changed (i.e., cost, scope of work, etc.). Projects carried over from the 2052 to the 2056 MTP will be evaluated in the same manner as new proposals.

Completeness Review

The RPC staff will review applications for completion and will notify applicants within one week if any items are incomplete. Applicants will have until April 20, 2026, to respond to requests for more information. The RPC will not consider incomplete proposals.

Excel Spreadsheet Instructions

The MTP Project Request Excel file has two tabs. The first tab includes the instructions for inputting project information. All project information should be input on the second tab or sheet. If there are multiple projects being submitted, each additional project should be added on the same sheet in a separate column. All application inputs are described in the table below. Required fields are in noted in bold print.

FIELD	DESCRIPTION
Name (Required)	Short name of project (40 characters max).
MTP Status (Required)	State whether the project is in the previous 2052 MTP (refer to list provided on RPC website) or if it is a new project. If it is in the previous MTP, note whether it requires modification or if it should be carried forward into the new MTP as is. For existing projects that do not require modification, you may enter the project name and RPC ID and leave other fields blank.
RPC ID	RPC ID, if applicable, for projects in previous 2052MTP (refer to list provided on RPC website).
Short Description (Required)	A 1-2 sentence description of project.
Need (Required)	Describe the transportation issue that this project aims to resolve.
Long Description	As needed, provide additional detail about the proposed project. Information may include project purpose, current status, or any other relevant information not covered in other fields.
Project Type (Required)	There are three types of projects being considered: Roadway, Public Transit, or Other Transportation Related Project. Roadway projects include most projects that can be funded with STBG program funds, while transit projects are generally those funded via §5307. If you are unsure of the project type, choose the "Other Transportation Related Project."
Parish (Required)	Parish in which project is located.
City	City in which project is located, if applicable.
Location (Required)	Describe the road(s) and/or areas where the project will be implemented, including beginning and end points where applicable.
Federal Aid	If the project is on a roadway, is it on the Federal Aid Network? See the RPC's Transportation Layers App for more info.
SPN	State Project Number assigned by DOTD, if applicable.
Right of Way Cost	Estimated cost for Right of Way Acquisition, if needed and cost is available.
Right of Way FFY	Federal Fiscal Year of proposed Right of Way Acquisition. FFY begins on October 1 and ends September 30 of the next year, e.g., FFY 2031 begins on 10/1/2030 and ends on 9/30/2031.
Utilities Cost	Estimated cost for Utility Relocation, if needed and cost is available.
Utilities FFY	Federal Fiscal Year of proposed Utility Relocation. FFY begins on October 1 and ends September 30 of the next year, e.g., FFY 2031 begins on 10/1/2030 and ends on 9/30/2031.
Design Cost	Estimated cost for Design/Engineering, if needed and cost is available.

FIELD	DESCRIPTION
Design FFY	Federal Fiscal Year of proposed Design/Engineering. FFY begins on October 1 and ends September 30 of the next year, e.g., FFY 2031 begins on 10/1/2030 and ends on 9/30/2031.
Other Cost(s)	Estimated Other Cost(s), if needed and cost is available.
Construction Cost (Required)	Estimated cost of Construction. Cost should be based on current dollar amount.
Construction FFY (Required)	Federal Fiscal Year of Construction. FFY begins on October 1 and ends September 30 of the next year, e.g., FFY 2031 begins on 10/1/2030 and ends on 9/30/2031.
Total Cost (Required)	*Automatically Calculated.*
Local Match Sponsor (Required)	Entity that will provide the local match to federal funds.
Submitting Entity (Required)	Entity that is submitting the project for consideration.
Project Point of Contact Name (Required)	Name of the person RPC should contact about this project.
Project Point of Contact Email (Required)	Email address of the person RPC should contact about the project.
Planning History (Required)	Has the project been vetted through a public planning process? Provide name of plan and applicable page numbers referencing the project.
LADOTD Process (Required)	Has the project gone through any stages of the LADOTD project delivery process? If yes, describe.
COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST	
Complete Streets Planning History (Required)	Does an adopted plan and/or study recommend transit, pedestrian, or bicycle access and/or facilities along, crossing, or adjacent to the proposed project? If yes, list the applicable plan and page number.
Multi-Modal Trip Generators (Required)	Describe existing and future trip generators (within a 1/4 mile) that may attract transit riders, pedestrians, or bicyclists.
Existing Bike/Ped/Transit Connectivity (Required)	Does the project connect to existing transit, pedestrians, and bicycles facilities? If yes, list existing facilities.
Proposed Bike/Ped/Transit Facilities (Required)	Are transit, pedestrian, and/or bicycle facilities included in the project? If yes, list proposed facilities.
Complete Streets Policy Exemption (Required)	"RPC's Complete Streets Policy shall apply to all phases of project development except under one or more of the following exception conditions: •Projects along facilities, such as interstates, where pedestrians and bicyclists are prohibited from using the roadway. •Projects where the cost of providing pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use (cost exceeding 20% of project cost). •Projects with a documented absence of current and future need or use of the affected area by pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. •For preservation projects, RPC will only consider improvements that do not require ROW acquisition, utility relocation or major reconstruction, such as

FIELD	DESCRIPTION
	relocating or enclosing drainage, to provide bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Is the project exempt from the Complete Streets Policy? (Select exemptions in the dropdown menu).

EVALUATION

The MTP Call for Projects is a key component of the RPC's performance-based planning process, in which project programming decisions are guided by progress toward established performance targets and the broader goals outlined in the long-range plan. To ensure that submitted projects align with regional long-term objectives, RPC staff will evaluate each proposal using a checklist that assesses the project's ability to advance MTP goals or influence federally required performance measures. Projects must meet at least one of these objectives to be considered for inclusion in the MTP. Applicants are also required to submit a Complete Streets Form for each proposal in accordance with RPC's Complete Streets Policy.

MTP Goals

The MTP goals are centered around six main themes which support the federal planning factors as described in the IIJA.[1] The MTP goals and objectives include:

1. **Safety and Security:** 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.
2. **Resilience:** The transportation system will minimize negative environmental impacts while also enhancing the region's ability to withstand and recover from natural hazards.
3. **Community Improvement:** 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.
4. **Economic Opportunity:** The transportation system will provide residents with access to employment, facilitate the movement of goods, and connect businesses with customers.
5. **Reliability and Connectivity:** Travel times throughout the region will be predictable, and the transportation system will be easy to use.
6. **System Preservation and Stewardship:** Emphasis should be placed on maintaining and enhancing the multimodal functionality of existing infrastructure before investing in the addition of new roadway capacity.

Initial Screening

Upon receipt of a complete project application, the RPC will initially screen applications to ensure that the proposals are eligible for funding per 23 U.S.C. § 133 or 49 U.S.C. § 5307. If a project's eligibility cannot be determined, RPC staff will contact the applicant for more information or ask the applicant to resubmit the proposal with changes.

[1] 23 § U.S.C. 134(h)(1)

Evaluation

After the initial screening, eligible projects will be evaluated using the applicable checklist for "roadway" or "transit" projects. The checklists are designed to help RPC determine the level to which a proposal may advance the region's long-term objectives. All projects are expected to contribute to the advancement of at least one goal. RPC staff will be responsible for performing the spatial analyses to determine whether or not a project meets certain criteria within the checklists. However, an applicant is encouraged to submit additional materials to demonstrate a project's ability to meet specific criteria or affect specific performance indicators. The evaluation checklists are provided in the Appendix of this document. The RPC will assess the cumulative ability of all of the projects to impact achievement of regional objectives and confer with project sponsors on adjustments needed to better align projects with long-term goals.

The Process to Fiscal Constraint

Fiscal constraint is a federal requirement and a guiding principle in the development of the MTP and the TIP. The evaluation of projects for consistency with regional goals is only the first step in planning and programming projects. The RPC must forecast revenues for the 30-year planning horizon and compare revenue options to identified needs and program projects accordingly. At the same time, the RPC will need to balance regional and local priorities and ensure that resources are distributed across the Metropolitan Planning Area in an equitable manner. This analysis as well as stakeholder review and input will determine the constrained and illustrative projects which will ultimately be adopted by the Transportation Policy Committee in the 2056 long-range plan.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Questions may be submitted by email or phone to:

Tom Haysley
Principal Planner
Phone: 504-483-8510
Email: thaysley@norpc.org

Webinar

RPC staff will also be hosting a webinar on **February 25, 2026, at 1 p.m. CST** which will provide information for prospective applicants on the application process and requirements. Applicants can register for the webinar here.

APPENDIX: MTP PROJECT EVALUATION CHECKLISTS

MTP PROJECT EVALUATION CHECKLIST – ROADWAY PROJECTS

Safety and Security

- ☐ Project includes proven safety counter measures
- ☐ Project addresses safety issues on a roadway that has been identified as part of the High Injury Network
- ☐ Project introduces safety countermeasures on a facility that has had one or more fatal crashes in the period from 2020-2024
- ☐ Project introduces safety countermeasures on a facility that has had one or more serious injury crashes in the period from 2020-2024
- ☐ Fatal or serious injury crashes involving a bicyclist or pedestrian occurred within 100 feet of the project area during the crash data analysis period from 2020-2024
- ☐ The project vicinity lacks existing bicycle facilities
- ☐ The project vicinity lacks existing pedestrian facilities
- ☐ Project addresses known or potential safety issues identified by a safety plan or local stakeholders
- ☐ Project includes non-motorized proven safety countermeasures
- ☐ Project improves safety for people with disabilities
- ☐ Project includes measures to mitigate security risks or threats
- ☐ Project is expected to contribute to the achievement of RPC's targets for one or more of the following performance measures:
    - ☐ Number of motorized fatalities and/or rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT
    - ☐ Number of motorized serious injuries and/or rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT
    - ☐ Number of non-motorized fatalities and/or serious injuries

---

Resilience

- ☐ Project may reduce the risk of flooding
- ☐ Project reduces impervious surface coverage
- ☐ Project includes nature-based solutions, low impact design, and/or green stormwater infrastructure techniques/components (i.e., bioswales, pervious pavers, native plantings, tree box filters or trenches, vegetated medians, etc.)
- ☐ Project includes "gray infrastructure" that may reduce the impact of natural hazards (e.g., drainage improvements, infrastructure hardening, roadway raising, etc.)
- ☐ Project may result in reduced vehicular emissions
- ☐ Project reduces risk of extreme temperature effects
- ☐ Project may reduce risk from other natural hazards
- ☐ Project improves water quality and reduces pollutant runoff
- ☐ Project may reduce risk from natural hazards along an evacuation route and/or roadways that provide emergency access to critical facilities
- ☐ Project enhances evacuation network by creating additional routes or network efficiencies
- ☐ Project is referenced in locally adopted hazard mitigation plan, the RPC TRIP, or other resilience plan

Community Improvement

- ☐ Project is in a flagged block group when compared to the MPA region for elderly, under 18 years, Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, Minority (non-white), poverty (population, household or family), limited English household, or disabled
- ☐ Project is located within a block group flagged when compared to the MPA region for transportation insecurity (per RPC's Transportation Insecurity GIS Layer which is the intersection of no vehicle households and poverty)
- ☐ Project improves access to open space or sites for active recreation
- ☐ Project improves accessibility of facilities for people with disabilities
- ☐ Project provides new mobility or accessibility options for a community of need, as identified in a local study or plan, or within a flagged block group in RPC's Disparate Impact Layer
- ☐ Projects provide new mobility or accessibility options for people within a block group with a high level of vulnerability as determined by RPC regional SVI analysis
- ☐ Project was vetted through a public planning process

Economic Opportunity

- ☐ Project is identified in RPC's 2022 Freight Mobility Plan
- ☐ Project addresses improvement of vehicular movement on a freight bottleneck identified by stakeholder(s)
- ☐ Project improves freight vehicle movement on an interstate
- ☐ Project improves freight vehicle movement on a non-interstate NHS route
- ☐ Project includes features to enhance the system's usability by tourists (i.e., wayfinding, intermodal passenger facilities, traveler information, etc.)
- ☐ Project supports local, regional, or state economic development plans or strategies
- ☐ Project provides increased non-motorized access to an employment and/or commercial destinations
- ☐ Project enhances wayfinding for freight travel
- ☐ Project is expected to contribute to the achievement of RPC's targets for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index performance measure

Reliability and Connectivity

- ☐ Project fills in a gap by improving or completing the non-motorized network infrastructure via route or intersection
- ☐ Project fills in a gap by improving or completing the motorized infrastructure network via route or intersection
- ☐ Project intends to improve access and connectivity to areas planned for development or redevelopment and adopted via a local comprehensive planning process
- ☐ Project provides a connection across physical barriers (i.e., waterways, limited access roads, railroads) and enhances network connectivity

- ☐ Project addresses an identified bottleneck or other congestion issue on a corridor identified by Congestion Management Process, state, or local plan
- ☐ Project includes a congestion management strategy identified through the Congestion Management Process
- ☐ Project may result in reduction in VMT or single-occupancy-vehicle trips
- ☐ Project aims to reduce travel time and/or increases travel time reliability
- ☐ Project is a collaboration between multiple jurisdictions
- ☐ Project is expected to contribute to the achievement of RPC's targets for one or more of the following performance measures:
    - Interstate Level of Travel Time Reliability
    - Non-Interstate NHS Level of Travel Time Reliability

System Preservation and Stewardship

- ☐ Project includes complete reconstruction of a roadway
- ☐ Project includes complete reconstruction of a bridge
- ☐ Project involves rehabilitation of a roadway
- ☐ Project involves rehabilitation of a bridge
- ☐ Project has been assessed via a pavement conditions analysis
- ☐ Project involves improvement of facility identified as being in poor condition via state or local assessment
- ☐ Project includes efforts to preserve or enhance a community's cultural resources, historic fabric, architectural history, or other defining cultural characteristics
- ☐ Project includes efforts to reduce, minimize, or avoid negative impacts to the local environment
- ☐ Project is expected to contribute to the achievement of RPC's targets for one or more of the following performance measures:
    - ☐ Percentage of Interstate lane miles in Good condition
    - ☐ Percentage of non-Interstate NHS lane miles in Good condition
    - ☐ Percentage of NHS bridge deck area in Good condition

MTP PROJECT EVALUATION CHECKLIST – TRANSIT PROJECTS

Safety and Security

- ☐ Project addresses a documented operational safety issue
- ☐ Project improves the safety of users within the transit facility
- ☐ Project improves the safety of users traveling to and from the facility
- ☐ Project supports dedicated rights-of-way for transit or mitigates interference from other facility users
- ☐ Project includes measures to mitigate security risks at a facility or facilities

---

Resilience

- ☐ Project may reduce the risk of flooding
- ☐ Project reduces impervious surface coverage
- ☐ Project includes nature-based solutions, low impact design, and/or green stormwater infrastructure techniques/components (i.e., bioswales, pervious pavers, native plantings, tree box filters or trenches, vegetated medians, etc.)
- ☐ Project includes "gray infrastructure" that may reduce the impact of natural hazards (e.g., drainage improvements, infrastructure hardening, roadway raising, etc.)
- ☐ Project may result in reduced vehicular emissions
- ☐ Project reduces risk of extreme temperature effects
- ☐ Project improves water quality and reduces pollutant runoff
- ☐ Project enhances evacuation operations prior to a disaster event
- ☐ Project reduces disruptions to transit operations caused by natural disasters
- ☐ Project is referenced in locally adopted hazard mitigation plan, the RPC TRIP, or other resilience plan

---

Community Improvement

- ☐ Project is in a flagged block group when compared to the MPA region for elderly, under 18years, Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, Minority (non-white), poverty (population, household or family), limited English household, or disabled
- ☐ Project is located within a block group flagged when compared to the MPA region for transportation insecurity (per RPC's Transportation Insecurity GIS Layer which is the intersection of no vehicle households and poverty)
- ☐ Project improves access to open space or sites for active recreation
- ☐ Project improves accessibility of facilities for people with disabilities
- ☐ Project provides new mobility options for a community of need, as identified in a local study or plan, or within a flagged block group in RPC's Disparate Impact Layer
- ☐ Projects provide new mobility options for within a block group with a high level of vulnerability as determined by RPC regional SVI analysis
- ☐ Project was vetted through a public planning process

Economic Opportunity

- ☐ Project aligns with local or regional transit-oriented development plan
- ☐ Project includes features to enhance the system's usability by tourists (i.e., wayfinding, intermodal passenger facilities, traveler information, etc.)
- ☐ Project supports local, regional, or state economic development plans or strategies
- ☐ Project provides enhanced transit access to an existing employment and/or commercial destinations
- ☐ Project provides new transit service along a route within a mixed-use or commercial zoning district

---

Reliability and Connectivity

- ☐ Project fills service gaps and expands service coverage
- ☐ Project increases frequency of a route
- ☐ Project provides additional connections to other transit services or modes of transportation
- ☐ Project improves on-time performance
- ☐ Project improves the ability for users to navigate the transit network
- ☐ Project may result in reduction in VMT or single-occupancy-vehicle trips

---

System Preservation and Stewardship

- ☐ Project addresses maintenance issue to maintain state of good repair
- ☐ Project incorporates measures that mitigate negative impacts to the environment or cultural resources
- ☐ Project is expected to contribute to the achievement of RPC's targets for one or more of the following performance measures:
    - ☐ Percentage of revenue vehicles meeting or exceeding their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)
    - ☐ Percentage of non-revenue vehicles meeting or exceeding their ULB
    - ☐ Percentage of track segments with performance restrictions
    - ☐ Percentage of assets with a condition rating exceeding 2.5 on FTA's TERM scale

E Appendix

American Community Survey Data Tables

American Community Survey Data Tables

Citation: Data compiled from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Summary File (2019 – 2023) published December 2024 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 RPC, Lynn Dupont, GIS Manager.

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) Population by Age:

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region

ACS 5-Year Estimates (2019-2023) Age Categories[*3]

Parish	Total Population	Under 5 Years	Percent Under 5 Years	Ages 5 thru 17	Percent of Ages 5 thru 17	Under 18 Years	Percent Under 18	Ages 18 thru 39	Percent Ages 18 thru 39	Ages 40 thru 64	Percent Ages 40 thru 64	Ages 65 and Over	Percent Elderly Ages 65 and Over	Median Age
Jefferson	432,484	27,292	6.31%	69,698	16.12%	96,990	22.43%	119,912	27.73%	137,215	31.73%	78,367	18.12%	40
Orleans	376,035	20,845	5.54%	53,576	14.25%	74,421	19.79%	124,190	33.03%	115,545	30.73%	61,879	16.46%	38
Plaquemines	23,070	1,456	6.31%	4,308	18.67%	5,764	24.98%	6,730	29.17%	7,362	31.91%	3,214	13.93%	37
St. Bernard	44,172	2,973	6.73%	8,623	19.52%	11,596	26.25%	13,283	30.07%	13,671	30.95%	5,622	12.73%	36
St. Charles	51,863	2,737	5.28%	9,887	19.06%	12,626	24.34%	14,110	27.21%	17,414	33.58%	7,715	14.88%	39
St. James	19,797	1,130	5.71%	3,301	16.67%	4,431	22.38%	5,191	26.22%	6,416	32.41%	3,759	18.99%	41
St. John the Baptist	41,342	2,375	5.74%	7,658	18.52%	10,033	24.27%	10,981	26.56%	14,159	34.25%	6,169	14.92%	39
St. Tammany	269,331	15,618	5.80%	48,439	17.98%	64,057	23.78%	69,375	25.76%	87,382	32.44%	48,517	18.01%	40
Tangipahoa	135,218	9,323	6.89%	23,893	17.67%	33,216	24.56%	42,139	31.16%	39,602	29.29%	20,261	14.98%	36
Livingston [*1] (MPA Region Only)	12,265	1,012	8.25%	2,075	0.00%	3,087	25.17%	3,446	28.10%	3,791	30.91%	1,941	15.83%	41
RPC MPA Region [*2]	1,405,577	84,761	6.03%	231,458	16.32%	316,221	22.50%	409,357	29.12%	442,557	31.49%	237,444	16.89%	38
Louisiana	4,621,025	289,071	6.26%	799,592	17.30%	1,088,663	23.56%	1,361,191	29.46%	1,417,317	30.67%	753,854	16.31%	38

[*1] RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.

[*2] RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8 BG in Livingston Parish.

[*3] Population by age and sex from ACS 5-year estimates (2019-2023) block group estimates coinciding with RPC GIS geographic mapping scale for Title VI and summed by parish.

MPA Population by Race:

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region
American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimate (2019-2023): Demographics by Parish

Parish	Total Pop	White		Black		Native American		Asian		Minority[***3]		Hispanic/Latino		Non-Hisp/Lat	
Jefferson	432,484	227,711	52.65%	112,620	26.04%	3,134	0.72%	18,113	4.19%	204,773	47.35%	78,562	18.17%	353,922	81.83%
Orleans	376,035	118,979	31.64%	207,633	55.22%	1,002	0.27%	10,463	2.78%	257,056	68.36%	29,855	7.94%	346,180	92.06%
Plaquemines	23,070	14,254	61.79%	5,157	22.35%	299	1.30%	927	4.02%	8,816	38.21%	2,193	9.51%	20,877	90.49%
St. Bernard	44,172	27,206	61.59%	10,533	23.85%	318	0.72%	939	2.13%	16,966	38.41%	5,988	13.56%	38,184	86.44%
St. Charles	51,863	33,706	64.99%	11,881	22.91%	549	1.06%	432	0.83%	18,157	35.01%	4,134	7.97%	47,729	92.03%
St. James	19,797	9,834	49.67%	9,572	48.35%	21	0.11%	6	0.03%	9,963	50.33%	372	1.88%	19,425	98.12%
St. John the Baptist	41,342	13,358	32.31%	23,233	56.20%	150	0.36%	473	1.14%	27,984	67.69%	3,449	8.34%	37,893	91.66%
St. Tammany	269,331	201,888	74.96%	32,914	12.22%	2,016	0.75%	3,514	1.30%	67,443	25.04%	21,369	7.93%	247,962	92.07%
Tangipahoa	135,218	83,835	62.00%	40,430	29.90%	98	0.07%	1,029	0.76%	51,383	38.00%	7,511	5.55%	127,707	94.45%
Livingston[*1] (MPA Region Only)	12,265	10,425	85.00%	716	5.84%	8	0.07%	16	0.13%	1,840	15.00%	897	7.31%	11,368	92.69%
RPC MPA Region[**2]	1,405,577	741,196	52.73%	454,689	32.35%	7,595	0.54%	35,912	2.55%	664,381	47.27%	154,330	10.98%	1,251,247	89.02%
Louisiana	4,621,025	2,678,942	57.97%	1,434,953	31.05%	27,605	0.60%	79,925	1.73%	1,942,083	42.03%	321,022	6.95%	4,300,003	93.05%

[*]RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.
[**]RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa and 8 BG in Livingston Parishes.
[***]Minority = All single races other than White. Hispanic is not a race, but an ethnicity and therefore calculated separately with Non-Hispanic for Title VI purposes. Hispanic/Latino population may also be represented in the other racial categories. Single race Non-Hispanic/Latino tables are also available.

MPA Households in Poverty:

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region
New Orleans Area Parishes ACS 5-Year Estimates (2019-2023)

	Population in Poverty			Households in Poverty			Families in Poverty			Household Income
Parish	Total Poverty Population[*3]	Population in Poverty	Percent Population in Poverty	Total Households (HH)	Households in Poverty	Percent of Households in Poverty	Total Families	Families in Poverty	Percent of Families in Poverty	Median HH Income 2023 Dollars (Avg for Region)
Jefferson	428,843	69,819	16.28%	176,986	27,979	15.81%	107,961	13,823	12.80%	$65,246
Orleans	363,814	82,338	22.63%	155,060	36,201	23.35%	73,585	12,013	16.33%	$55,339
Plaquemines	22,629	3,024	13.36%	8,200	1,187	14.48%	6,127	623	10.17%	$82,874
St. Bernard	43,805	9,906	22.61%	15,803	3,437	21.75%	10,394	1,920	18.47%	$57,638
St. Charles	51,317	5,047	9.83%	18,622	2,038	10.94%	13,865	1,040	7.50%	$82,172
St. James	19,615	2,057	10.49%	7,436	889	11.96%	5,409	376	6.95%	$64,536
St. John the Baptist	40,904	5,146	12.58%	14,922	1,941	13.01%	10,322	844	8.18%	$67,418
St. Tammany	266,028	32,413	12.18%	103,286	11,878	11.50%	72,626	6,881	9.47%	$79,277
Tangipahoa	131,063	25,465	19.43%	50,191	9,489	18.91%	32,782	4,484	13.68%	$57,256
Livingston[*1] (MPA Region Only)	12,229	1,574	12.87%	4,340	678	15.62%	3,453	312	9.04%	$75,028
RPC MPA Region[*2]	1,380,247	236,789	17.16%	554,846	95,717	17.25%	336,524	42,316	12.57%	$68,678
Louisiana	4,494,539	848,769	18.88%	1,783,168	336,693	18.88%	1,127,294	159,527	14.15%	$60,023

[*2]RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8BG in Livingston Parish
[*1]RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area. RPC Regional median household income (grey) values are averaged.
[*3]Poverty population includes individuals in housing units and noninstitutional group quarters. The poverty universe excludes children under the age of 15 who are not related to the householder, people living in institutional group quarters (e.g., nursing homes or correctional facilities), and people living in college dormitories or military barracks. All data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates (2019-2023).

MPA Family Households:

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region
ACS 5-Year Estimates (2019-2023) Family Households[*4]

Parish	Total Households[*3]	Households with Children Under 18	Family HH with Children Under 18	Family HH of Married Couples with Children Under 18	Percent Family HH of Married Couples with Children Under 18	Other Family HH with Children Under 18	Households with NO Children Under 18	Single Parent HH with Children Under 18	Percent Single Parent Households with Children Under 18
Jefferson	176,986	49,941	49,614	27,162	15.35%	22,452	127,045	22,779	12.87%
Orleans	155,060	34,628	34,353	15,506	10.00%	18,847	120,432	19,122	12.33%
Plaquemines	8,200	3,066	3,060	2,285	27.87%	775	5,134	781	9.52%
St. Bernard	15,803	5,598	5,590	2,404	15.21%	3,186	10,205	3,194	20.21%
St. Charles	18,622	6,757	6,741	4,459	23.94%	2,282	11,865	2,298	12.34%
St. James	7,436	2,477	2,466	1,417	19.06%	1,049	4,959	1,060	14.25%
St. John the Baptist	14,922	4,632	4,632	2,243	15.03%	2,389	10,290	2,389	16.01%
St. Tammany	103,286	35,572	35,141	22,227	21.52%	12,914	67,714	13,345	12.92%
Tangipahoa	50,191	16,299	16,089	9,247	18.42%	6,842	33,892	7,052	14.05%
Livingston [*1](MPA Region Only)	4,340	1,491	1,491	1,065	24.54%	426	2,849	426	9.82%
RPC MPA Region[*2]	550,506	158,970	157,686	88,015	15.99%	71,162	394,385	72,446	13.16%
Louisiana	1,783,168	547,288	543,298	307,072	17.22%	236,226	1,235,880	240,216	13.47%

[*1]RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.

[*2]RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8 BG in Livingston Parish. ACS 5-year estimates (2019-2023) block group estimates.

[*3]Household (HH) consist of all the people who occupt a housing unit. [*4]Family Household is a household maintained by a householder who is in a family, and includes any related or unrelated people who may be residing there.

MPA Housing Unit Tenure, Value, & Rent:

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region
ACS 5 Year Estimates (2019-2023) Housing Unit Tenure, Value, Rent

Parish	Total Housing Units (HU)	Occupied Housing Units	Percent Occupied Housing Units	Owner Occupied Housing Units	Percent Owner Occupied HU of Occupied HU	Renter Occupied Housing Units	Average HH Size of Occupied HU	Average HH Size of Owner Occupied HU	Average HH Size of Renter Occupied HU	Median Value Owner Occupied HU (Avg for Regions)	Median Gross Rent (Avg for Regions)
Jefferson	194,109	176,986	91.18%	110,285	62.31%	66,701	2.43	2.49	2.32	$243,500	$1,162
Orleans	194,758	155,060	79.62%	78,376	50.55%	76,684	2.34	2.54	2.14	$296,400	$1,211
Plaquemines	9,625	8,200	85.19%	6,057	73.87%	2,143	2.75	2.75	2.75	$275,800	$1,611
St. Bernard	18,004	15,803	87.77%	11,084	70.14%	4,719	2.78	2.77	2.80	$192,100	$1,083
St. Charles	20,595	18,622	90.42%	15,397	82.68%	3,225	2.76	2.83	2.43	$256,800	$1,144
St. James	8,651	7,436	85.96%	6,355	85.46%	1,081	2.64	2.70	2.30	$197,800	$821
St. John the Baptist	17,790	14,922	83.88%	11,890	79.68%	3,032	2.74	2.76	2.67	$184,000	$1,118
St. Tammany	112,414	103,286	91.88%	81,413	78.82%	21,873	2.58	2.64	2.39	$272,200	$1,305
Tangipahoa	58,663	50,191	85.56%	35,896	71.52%	14,295	2.61	2.66	2.50	$204,600	$974
Livingston *1 (MPA Region Only)	5,497	4,340	78.95%	3,611	83.20%	729	2.88	2.77	2.77	$195,950	$1,035
RPC MPA Region *2	640,106	554,846	86.68%	360,364	64.95%	194,482	2.65	2.69	2.51	$231,915	$1,146
Louisiana	2,094,002	1,783,168	85.16%	1,200,407	67.32%	582,761	2.52	2.60	2.36	$208,700	$1,038

*1 RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.
*2 RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8 BG in Livingston Parish
Housing Unit data from ACS 5 year estimates (2019-2023) block group totals and county estimates.

MPA Population by Commute Mode (Number and Percent):

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region
ACS 5-Year Estimates (2019-2023) Commute by Mode

Parish	Total Workers 16UP	Workers CarTruckVan Total	Workers CTV alone	Workers CTV carpool Total	Workers Public Transit Total	Workers Taxi	Workers Motorcycle	Workers Bicycle	Workers Walked	Workers Other Means	Workers WFH
Jefferson Parish	201,372	178,337	155,689	22,648	1,717	837	74	379	3,438	1,694	14,896
Orleans Parish	171,094	123,063	108,121	14,942	7,713	945	372	3,313	9,659	2,634	23,395
Plaquemines Parish	10,678	9,950	8,841	1,109	0	0	0	0	315	83	330
St. Bernard Parish	18,277	16,443	14,712	1,731	117	131	20	129	176	116	1,145
St. Charles Parish	24,277	21,725	20,318	1,407	57	13	63	134	105	314	1,866
St. James Parish	8,574	7,801	7,209	592	26	0	0	0	112	91	544
St. John the Baptist Parish	17,590	16,261	14,903	1,358	33	0	2	12	65	231	986
St. Tammany Parish	123,646	105,184	95,744	9,440	150	131	15	127	1,023	1,684	15,332
Tangipahoa Parish	57,218	51,670	46,762	4,908	115	0	69	105	845	820	3,594
Livingston *1 (MPA Region Only)	5,044	4,866	4,276	590	32	0	0	0	25	0	121
RPC MPA Region *2	637,770	535,300	476,575	58,725	9,960	2,057	615	4,199	15,763	7,667	62,209
Louisiana	1,989,634	1,751,459	1,579,417	172,042	18,079	3,231	1,449	6,493	38,373	26,631	143,919

*1 RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.
*2 RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8 BG in Livingston Parish
Workers 16 and Up Commute by Mode ACS 5-year estimates (2019-2023) block group estimates coinciding with RPC GIS geographic mapping summed by parish

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region
ACS 5-Year Estimates (2019-2023) Commute by Mode

Parish	Total Workers 16UP	Workers CarTrVan Alone	Workers CTV carpool Total	Workers PublicTr Total	Workers Taxi	Workers Motorcycle	Workers Bicycle	Workers Walked	Workers Other Means	Workers WFH
Jefferson Parish	201,372	77.31%	11.25%	0.85%	0.42%	0.04%	0.19%	1.71%	0.84%	7.40%
Orleans Parish	171,094	63.19%	8.73%	4.51%	0.55%	0.22%	1.94%	5.65%	1.54%	13.67%
Plaquemines Parish	10,678	82.80%	10.39%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.95%	0.78%	3.09%
St. Bernard Parish	18,277	80.49%	9.47%	0.64%	0.72%	0.11%	0.71%	0.96%	0.63%	6.26%
St. Charles Parish	24,277	83.69%	5.80%	0.23%	0.05%	0.26%	0.55%	0.43%	1.29%	7.69%
St. James Parish	8,574	84.08%	6.90%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.31%	1.06%	6.34%
St. John the Baptist Parish	17,590	84.72%	7.72%	0.19%	0.00%	0.01%	0.07%	0.37%	1.31%	5.61%
St. Tammany Parish	123,646	77.43%	7.63%	0.12%	0.11%	0.01%	0.10%	0.83%	1.36%	12.40%
Tangipahoa Parish	57,218	81.73%	8.58%	0.20%	0.00%	0.12%	0.18%	1.48%	1.43%	6.28%
Livingston *1 (MPA Region Only)	5,044	84.77%	11.70%	0.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.50%	0.00%	2.40%
RPC MPA Region *2	637,770	74.73%	9.21%	1.56%	0.32%	0.10%	0.66%	2.47%	1.20%	9.75%
Louisiana	1,989,634	79.38%	8.65%	0.91%	0.16%	0.07%	0.33%	1.93%	1.34%	7.23%

*1 RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 8 Block Groups (BG) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.

*2 RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 8BG in Livingston Parish

Workers 16 and Up Commute by Mode ACS 5-year estimates (2019-2023) block group estimates coinciding with RPC GIS geographic mapping summed by parish

MPA Household Vehicle Availability:

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA)-New Orleans Region
ACS 5-Year Estimates (2019 -2023) Vehicles Available

Parish	Total Households (HH)	Households No Vehicle	Percent of HH with No Vehicle	HH1Vehicle	HH2Vehciles	HH3Vehicles	HH4PlusVeh
Jefferson	176,986	13,051	7.37%	74,171	63,277	18,801	7,686
Orleans	155,060	26,538	17.11%	71,640	43,495	10,148	3,239
Plaquemines	8,200	270	3.29%	2,578	3,349	1,581	422
St. Bernard	15,803	1,178	7.45%	6,539	5,595	1,780	711
St. Charles	18,622	506	2.72%	5,040	8,268	3,348	1,460
St. James	7,436	562	7.56%	2,415	2,805	1,051	603
St. John the Baptist	14,922	671	4.50%	5,258	4,956	2,595	1,442
St. Tammany	103,286	4,168	4.04%	31,550	44,945	16,250	6,373
Tangipahoa	50,191	2,768	5.51%	17,690	19,330	7,309	3,094
Livingston *1 (MPA Region Only)	6,069	182	3.00%	2,103	2,320	1,001	463
RPC MPA Region **2	556,575	49,894	8.96%	218,984	198,340	63,864	25,493
Louisiana	1,783,168	147,781	8.29%	658,435	663,534	222,440	90,978

*1RPC Livingston-Parish MPA Region = 5 Tracts (TR) within the parish that adjoins South Tangipahoa Urban Area.

**2RPC MPA Region = Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St John the Baptist, St Tammany, Tangipahoa, and 5TR in Livingston Parish

ACS 5-year estimates (2019-2023) block group estimates coinciding with RPC GIS geographic mapping scale for Title VI and summed by parish.

F Appendix

Stakeholder Input Results and Analysis

2056 MTP Stakeholder Input Results Report

Overview

The MTP 2056 outreach process was redesigned from previous years' iterations to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of how priorities, needs, and perspectives have evolved across the region. The process was structured to offer extensive opportunities for participation, enhance the representativeness of planning inputs, and identify both shared regional priorities and localized needs.

Who We Heard From

The following analysis is based on input from multiple stakeholder groups who participated in the MTP planning process. The overall outreach and engagement process for the MTP was designed to capture perspectives from across Southeast Louisiana, involving local governments, transportation agencies, community organizations, and regional stakeholders. Rather than relying on a single engagement method, the process used multiple means of engagement methos including surveys, community events, parish and municipal meetings, advisory groups, stakeholder discussions, and targeted questionnaires to understand how transportation needs vary across people, places, and types of travel.

Bringing the Voices Together

Each engagement method contributed a different type of information. The public survey provided broad insight into how residents and transportation users experience the system. Community conversations captured lived experience and concerns that may not emerge through structured survey questions. Parish and municipal meetings identified local infrastructure needs and implementation challenges. Regional stakeholders and agencies helped identify system-level issues and connections between transportation and other regional priorities.

The findings were therefore not treated as a simple vote or ranking exercise. Survey responses, stakeholder input, local-government discussions, and technical analysis were considered together to determine where multiple sources of information pointed toward the same transportation need.

This combined approach provides a more complete understanding of the region than any single engagement method could provide on its own. It allows the Metropolitan Transportation Plan to identify both shared regional priorities and the distinct needs of individual communities and population groups.

Who Still Needs to Be Heard

Although the outreach process reached communities throughout the nine-parish region, participation was not evenly distributed across all places or population groups. The analysis identified a need for continued outreach to populations that were comparatively underrepresented, including residents of some smaller parishes, lower-income households, Black and Hispanic communities, people with disabilities, youth, transit-dependent households, and people with limited access to traditional planning processes.

Recognizing these gaps is an important part of interpreting the findings. **The outreach results provide substantial insight into regional transportation needs, but they should be viewed as part of an ongoing engagement process rather than the final opportunity for the public to shape the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.**

Establishing Regional Priorities

The RPC coded stakeholder and local government input in order to ascertain regional priorities. The analysis examined the frequency, distribution, and context of transportation issues identified across parish meetings, municipal discussions, agency consultations, and regional stakeholder sessions. Rather than treating every coded reference as an independent vote, the analysis considered how frequently issues appeared, how consistently they were raised across parishes, and whether they were expressed as general observations, concerns, or specific needs.

The results show that regional transportation priorities are shaped by three closely connected forces: **continued development and changing travel demand, the movement of freight and goods, and the ability of local and regional agencies to advance transportation improvements**. The highest-frequency subjects included:

- development pressure and growth trends
- project-delivery barriers
- electric-vehicle readiness
- port and industrial access
- transit coverage
- truck routes and freight bottlenecks
- data capacity
- gaps in network connectivity

Development pressure and growth trends emerged as the most frequently coded regional issue. Stakeholders described growth as both an opportunity and a source of transportation pressure. New residential, commercial, industrial, and logistics development is changing where trips originate, where people need to travel, and which roads experience the greatest demand. In rapidly developing areas, transportation infrastructure is often being asked to support land-use patterns and travel volumes that did not exist when the network was originally designed. In mature urban areas, redevelopment and changing travel patterns are creating different demands on constrained infrastructure.

Freight movement is similarly central to the regional transportation system. Truck routes, freight bottlenecks, port access, and industrial access were consistently discussed across the region. These findings reflect Southeast Louisiana's role as a major freight, maritime, logistics, and industrial center. Freight transportation supports employment and regional economic activity, but it also creates localized congestion, roadway maintenance needs, safety conflicts, and quality-of-life concerns. The findings indicate that freight should not be addressed as an isolated transportation mode. Freight planning must be coordinated with land use, roadway preservation, community access, evacuation, port operations, and neighborhood safety.

Addressing project-delivery barriers was also among the most prominent regional priorities. Local governments and stakeholders frequently identified challenges related to funding, staffing, permitting, interagency coordination, project development requirements, and the time required to move projects from concept to implementation. These barriers affect communities differently, but

they produce a common regional outcome: transportation needs can remain unresolved even after they have been clearly identified. Improving project delivery will therefore require more than developing a list of projects. It will require technical assistance, stronger regional coordination, clearer funding pathways, improved data, and greater local capacity to prepare competitive and implementable projects.

When the analysis was limited to comments coded specifically as concerns or needs, network connectivity became even more prominent. Missing links, disconnected corridors, congestion points, incomplete bicycle and pedestrian networks, limited transit connections, and gaps between communities and destinations were repeatedly identified as actionable problems. This distinction is important. **Growth and freight dominated the overall discussion, but connectivity and implementation barriers were more likely to be expressed as immediate needs requiring intervention**.

The findings support a set of integrated regional priorities which align with the 2056 MTP goals and objectives:

1. Manage transportation demand associated with growth and changing development patterns. (Relates to MTP Economic Opportunity, Community Impact, and Connectivity goals)
2. Improve freight mobility while reducing conflicts with communities and local travel. (Relates to MTP Reliability and Connectivity and Safety goals)
3. Address bottlenecks, missing links, and gaps in roadway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks. (Relates to MTP Connectivity goal)
4. Strengthen project-delivery capacity and intergovernmental coordination. (Relates to MTP Reliability and Connectivity and Stewardship goal)
5. Expand access to reliable transportation options, particularly where transit and first- and last-mile connections are limited. (Relates to MTP Community Impact and Connectivity goals)
6. Improve roadway, drainage, and transportation-system resilience. (Relates to MTP Sustainability and Resilience goal)
7. Strengthen data and analytic capacity for planning, prioritization, and performance monitoring. (Relates to MTP Stewardship goal)
8. Prepare the region for emerging transportation technologies and electric-vehicle infrastructure. (Relates to MTP Sustainability and Resilience goal)

These priorities are mutually reinforcing. Growth affects freight demand and congestion. Freight routes affect roadway conditions and neighborhood safety. Project-delivery capacity determines whether identified needs become completed improvements. Transit access, bicycle and pedestrian connections, and network continuity determine whether residents can reach jobs, schools, health care, and essential services. Fulfilling regional objectives therefore requires a systems-based approach rather than a collection of isolated modal strategies.

Where the Region Aligns

The strongest regional alignment is found in the shared recognition that development, freight movement, and project implementation are shaping transportation conditions across Southeast Louisiana. Although the intensity and form of these issues differ by parish, stakeholders throughout the region consistently identified them as matters requiring coordinated attention.

Development and growth appeared among the leading priorities in every parish. This broad alignment reflects the fact that no part of the region is unaffected by changing land-use and development patterns. In some communities, the primary concern is rapid outward growth and increased demand on suburban or rural roadways. In others, the concern is redevelopment, housing pressure, industrial expansion, or the need to maintain transportation access in areas experiencing population or economic change. Despite these differences, the regional message is consistent: **transportation planning must be more closely coordinated with future land use, housing, employment, and economic-development decisions.**

Freight bottlenecks were also a leading priority in every parish. This alignment reflects the region's interconnected freight system, which includes ports, industrial facilities, warehouses, railroads, interstate corridors, state highways, and local truck routes. Freight trips routinely cross parish boundaries, meaning that congestion or access problems in one jurisdiction can affect businesses, communities, and transportation operations elsewhere. The findings support **a regional freight strategy focused on corridor reliability, truck-route continuity, bridge and roadway condition, industrial access, safety, and the reduction of freight-related conflicts in residential areas**.

Project-delivery barriers represent another major area of agreement. Nearly every parish identified difficulty advancing needed transportation improvements. While some communities emphasized limited funding, others pointed to staffing shortages, complex federal and state requirements, coordination challenges, or a lack of project-development resources. This common concern creates **a clear regional role for the Metropolitan Planning Organization**. Regional support could include project scoping, data analysis, grant development, benefit-cost analysis, funding identification, interagency coordination, and assistance moving priority projects through planning and environmental review.

Improvement of transportation connectivity. Stakeholders repeatedly described missing roadway links, disconnected bicycle and pedestrian facilities, gaps in transit service, limited access between residential areas and employment centers, and inadequate connections to major destinations. These gaps are particularly consequential for people who do not drive, households with limited access to vehicles, older adults, people with disabilities, and workers traveling outside traditional commute periods. **Regional alignment around connectivity supports a multimodal approach that evaluates complete trips rather than individual facilities**.

Resilience is another unifying concern. Roadway flooding, drainage limitations, storm recovery, evacuation, and infrastructure vulnerability appeared throughout the outreach findings. Even where resilience was not among the highest-frequency codes, it was often embedded in discussions about maintenance, project design, access, and emergency operations. Transportation infrastructure in Southeast Louisiana must function under routine conditions while also supporting evacuation, emergency response, economic continuity, and post-disaster recovery. This creates a shared need to i**ntegrate resilience into project selection, design standards, asset management, and long-range investment decisions**.

Data and analytical capacity also emerged as a cross-regional need**. Stakeholders expressed interest in better information about traffic, crashes, freight movements, transit demand, development trends, flooding, project performance, and community needs.** Reliable and accessible data can help jurisdictions define problems, justify investments, compete for funding, and communicate decisions to the public. A shared regional data framework could reduce duplication, improve consistency, and provide smaller jurisdictions with analytical resources they may not be able to maintain independently.

The areas of alignment indicate that the region has a common transportation agenda even when local conditions differ. **The shared agenda centers on managing growth, supporting goods movement, improving network connectivity, strengthening resilience, expanding access, and increasing the ability of communities to deliver projects.** These common priorities can serve as the foundation for regional goals, investment criteria, performance measures, and coordinated implementation strategies.

Areas of Divergence

Regional alignment does not mean that transportation needs are identical across Southeast Louisiana. The outreach findings reveal meaningful differences in how regional issues are experienced at the parish and community level. These areas of divergence are important because they identify where a regional strategy must be flexible enough to respond to local conditions.

Jefferson Parish demonstrated a stronger emphasis on intergovernmental coordination, regional planning, green infrastructure, and the management of diverse urban, suburban, industrial, and coastal conditions. Transportation needs vary substantially within Jefferson, from dense east-bank communities to industrial corridors, west-bank municipalities, and coastal areas. This diversity increases the importance of coordination across municipalities, agencies, drainage systems, freight corridors, and transportation modes.

Orleans Parish showed comparatively stronger emphasis on the relationship between transportation and housing, redevelopment, transit access, infrastructure condition, and data capacity. As the region's densest urban area, Orleans faces transportation needs shaped by constrained rights-of-way, aging infrastructure, high transit dependence, pedestrian activity, tourism, major employment centers, and redevelopment pressure. The parish's priorities point toward strategies that coordinate transportation investments with housing, neighborhood development, transit service, accessibility, and infrastructure preservation.

Plaquemines and St. Bernard parishes both showed strong emphasis on freight, port and industrial access, development, and constrained network connectivity. Their transportation systems are influenced by limited north-south or east-west route options, coastal and river conditions, industrial activity, and evacuation needs. In these areas, a single disrupted corridor can create significant consequences for residents, freight operations, and emergency response. Redundancy, bridge and roadway condition, evacuation reliability, and industrial access are therefore especially important.

St. James Parish demonstrated a pronounced focus on industrial growth, port access, freight routes, and electric-vehicle readiness. These priorities reflect the parish's economic and industrial context. Transportation strategies must support industrial and freight access while also addressing community safety, roadway impacts, and the movement of residents through corridors shared with heavy vehicles.

St. John the Baptist Parish placed greater emphasis on roadway flooding, drainage, limited funding, and project-delivery barriers. These concerns suggest that transportation reliability is closely tied to water management and local implementation capacity. In such areas, even routine rainfall can affect access to homes, employment, schools, and emergency services. Transportation improvements may therefore need to be coordinated with drainage, flood-risk reduction, and resilience investments.

St. Tammany Parish showed comparatively greater emphasis on pedestrian safety, bicycle safety, accessibility, and equity. Rapid growth and dispersed development patterns have increased travel demand while making non-automobile travel difficult in many locations. These findings indicate a need for safer crossings, connected sidewalks and bicycle facilities, improved access to transit, and stronger connections between residential areas, commercial centers, schools, and community destinations.

St. Charles Parish similarly elevated evacuation operations, drainage capacity, storm recovery, and funding constraints. The parish's industrial facilities, river crossings, constrained corridors, and exposure to hurricane impacts create transportation needs that are closely connected to emergency management and economic continuity. Regional planning should recognize the dual role of transportation infrastructure in supporting everyday mobility and emergency operations.

Tangipahoa Parish placed particularly strong emphasis on growth pressure, freight movement, connectivity, and roadway flooding. Continued development around Hammond, Ponchatoula, interstate corridors, and other growth areas is increasing demand on roadways that may also serve freight, local access, and regional travel. The parish's priorities support proactive corridor planning, preservation of future connections, access management, drainage coordination, and transportation investments aligned with anticipated development.

Divergence also exists between urban, suburban, rural, river, and coastal transportation contexts. Urban communities are more likely to emphasize transit, pedestrian access, infrastructure condition, and competition for limited right-of-way. Suburban and rapidly growing communities are more likely to emphasize congestion, corridor capacity, first- and last-mile gaps, and development coordination. River and industrial communities are more likely to emphasize freight movement, port access, truck routes, and project funding. Coastal communities are more likely to emphasize evacuation, network redundancy, storm recovery, and the vulnerability of limited access routes.

These differences should not be interpreted as conflicts in regional priorities. **Instead, they show how shared regional issues take different forms across the planning area.** Economic development is a regional priority, but its implications differ in a dense urban neighborhood, a suburban growth corridor, an industrial river parish, and a coastal community. Connectivity is a regional priority, but the needed intervention may be a transit connection, a sidewalk, a new roadway link, a bridge improvement, or a more reliable evacuation route.

The central finding is that Southeast Louisiana is aligned on the major forces affecting its transportation future, but communities differ in the way those forces are experienced. Effective regional planning will depend on translating shared priorities into locally responsive actions.

Methods of Input Analysis

Participatory Decision Making in Planning and Structured Outreach Methods

A participatory decision-making approach was employed to gather perspectives from local governments, planning partners, stakeholders, and other regional participants. The methodology integrated qualitative and quantitative research methods to identify shared transportation needs, priorities, and disparities across geographies and stakeholder groups.

Integrated Qualitative and Quantitative Research Approach

The methodology employed qualitative research techniques to gather comprehensive information on transportation requirements, challenges, opportunities, experiences, and priorities. Qualitative findings provided context and insights into the significance of specific issues to participants and the variation in transportation needs across communities and stakeholder groups.

A structured coding and analytical framework were subsequently utilized to identify recurring themes, subthemes, and patterns within the qualitative findings. These findings were evaluated in conjunction with quantitative outreach results and regional transportation planning data to assess the frequency, distribution, and significance of identified needs and priorities.

The integrated approach facilitated the complementarity of qualitative and quantitative findings, thereby supporting a more holistic understanding of regional transportation needs while preserving geographically, organizational, and community-specific context.

Analytic Framework

Statistical analysis was employed to assess the distribution, frequency, and variability of outreach findings, thereby supporting the interpretation of regional transportation requirements and priorities.

The analytical methodology was tailored to complement qualitative findings rather than consider survey responses as a standalone indicator of regional need. Survey data, coded qualitative input, demographic characteristics, and geographic information were analyzed concurrently to discern recurring patterns, areas of congruence, and significant disparities across populations and geographies.

Priorities were identified using the following analytic methods:

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize survey participation and transportation user responses. Analysis encompassed response frequencies, percentages, distributions, and other summary measures pertinent to the survey data structure. These measures facilitated the

identification of frequently reported transportation experiences, barriers, needs, and priorities, as well as the assessment of the relative frequency of themes across the regional dataset.

Geographic Analysis

Geographically, survey and outreach data were analyzed to identify variations and similarities within the metropolitan planning area. Where data availability and response rates permitted analysis, findings were examined at regional, parish, municipal, and subregional levels. Geographic participation patterns were subsequently compared with population distribution to pinpoint areas of overrepresentation, underrepresentation, or restricted participation. Geographic analysis facilitated the identification of transportation needs and priorities that exhibited broad regional consensus, as well as issues that were more concentrated within specific communities or jurisdictions.

Demographic and Socioeconomic Analysis

Survey findings were analyzed across various demographic and socioeconomic characteristics to identify disparities in transportation experiences, barriers, access, and priorities among different population groups. The analysis focused on identifying patterns that may be obscured when results are evaluated solely at the regional aggregate level. Where appropriate and supported by sufficient responses, findings were disaggregated to examine variation among population groups and gain a deeper understanding of differences in transportation system experiences. Demographic and socioeconomic findings were interpreted in conjunction with participation rates and data limitations to prevent overestimating results from small or underrepresented groups.

Cross-Tabulation and Comparative Analysis

Cross-tabulation was utilized to compare responses across geographic, demographic, socioeconomic, and transportation-related variables. Comparative analysis corroborated the evaluation of relationships between transportation experiences and participant characteristics, encompassing variations in reported barriers, access to destinations and opportunities, transportation priorities, and community vision. These analyses facilitated the identification of both consistent regional patterns and areas where experiences or priorities diverged among participant groups.

Frequency and Thematic Analysis

Qualitative input obtained through interviews, workshops, stakeholder engagement, public comments, and open-ended survey questions was systematically coded using a structured thematic framework.

The frequency of themes and subthemes was analyzed to identify recurring issues and assess the extent to which transportation needs and priorities were evident across various engagement methods or participant groups.

Frequency served as one indicator of the prevalence of an issue, but it was not interpreted as the sole measure of planning significance. The geographic distribution, affected populations, severity of identified barriers, and relationship to technical transportation data were also considered when evaluating the findings.

Alignment and Divergence Analysis

Outreach findings were analyzed to identify areas of alignment and divergence across geographies, population groups, and planning partners. Alignment was identified where similar transportation needs, experiences, or priorities consistently emerged across multiple groups, geographic areas, or outreach methods. These findings were utilized to identify issues with potential regional significance and inform regional MTP goals and objectives.

Divergence was identified where transportation needs, experiences, or priorities varied across geography, demographic or socioeconomic characteristics, or stakeholder groups. Divergent findings were evaluated to determine whether they reflected localized transportation conditions, disparities in access or travel behavior, specialized transportation functions, or other community-specific factors. This analysis enabled the planning process to distinguish between needs that may benefit from coordinated regional strategies and those that may require targeted, localized, or context-sensitive approaches.

Coding and Thematic Analysis

Qualitative input collected throughout the outreach process was systematically reviewed and coded using a standardized analytical framework. Responses were organized and evaluated according to:

- Primary themes
- Subthemes
- Frequency of occurrence
- Geographic distribution
- Stakeholder or participant type
- Areas of regional alignment
- Areas of geographic, demographic, or topical divergence

This coding process transformed open-ended comments, meeting notes, interviews, and other qualitative input into structured information that could be compared across participants and geographies. The analysis helped identify recurring transportation needs, community priorities, areas of consensus, and place-specific concerns. These findings were then considered alongside survey results, demographic information, transportation data, and other technical planning inputs to provide a more complete understanding of regional and local transportation priorities.

Integration with Technical Planning Data

Statistical outreach findings were evaluated in conjunction with regional transportation planning data and other technical inputs. The analytical process assessed the alignment of user experiences and community priorities with transportation system data, the additional context provided by outreach findings to observed technical conditions, and the differences identified through outreach that warranted further analysis.

The integration of outreach and technical data facilitated a more comprehensive assessment of transportation needs and enhanced the connection between public input and the development of MTP goals, objectives, and planning priorities.

Interpretation and Data Limitations

Outreach data were interpreted within the context of the survey methodology, response distribution, and level of representation achieved through the engagement process.

Survey findings were not assumed to represent a statistically random sample of the entire regional population. Results were evaluated using participation characteristics, geographic distribution, demographic and socioeconomic representation, and consistency across multiple outreach methods.

Where response levels or representation limited the ability to generalize findings, results were identified as indicative of participant experiences or localized conditions rather than broadly representative regional conclusions.

This analytical framework supported a transparent and defensible use of outreach data while preserving the value of individual, community, and stakeholder perspectives within the regional transportation planning process.

G Appendix

Federal Requirements Crosswalk

Federal Requirements Crosswalk	
MTP Requirement as Written in 23 CFR §450.324	*Where MTP Addresses Requirement*
(a) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. In formulating the transportation plan, the MPO shall consider factors described in § 450.306 as the factors relate to a minimum 20-year forecast period. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be the date of a conformity determination issued by the FHWA and the FTA. In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO.	Chapter 1-Introduction, plan covers a 30 year period. Chapter 6-Goals and Objectives, Section 6.2 consistency with planning factors.
(b) The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.	Chapter 7-Plan Implementation for explanation of tiered approach to project implementation and short and long-term objectives and planning actions.
(c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every 4 years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas and at least every 5 years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon. In addition, the MPO may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year. The MPO shall approve the transportation plan (and any revisions) and submit it for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.	Chapter 1-Introduction, plan updated every 4 years. Chapter 3-Our Region & 4-Transportation System for trends analysis and population and travel demand forecasts. Copies of the draft were sent to the required agencies.
(d) In metropolitan areas that are in nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the MPO shall coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP).	N/A - the region is in air quality attainment.
(e) The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data used in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.	See footnotes for data sources. RPC uses best available for baseline assessments and modeling. Programmatically RPC uses the US Census decennial and every other year, American Community Survey 5-year estimates.
(f) The metropolitan transportation plan shall, at a minimum, include:	

Federal Requirements Crosswalk	
MTP Requirement as Written in 23 CFR §450.324	*Where MTP Addresses Requirement*
(1) The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan;	Chapter 4-Transportation System includes current and projected demand.
(2) Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities), and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan.	Chapter 4-Transportation System includes description of existing and proposed facilities. Appendices B & C includes list of proposed highway and transit facilities.
(3) A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with § 450.306(d).	Chapter 5-System Performance
(4) A system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in § 450.306(d), including—	Chapter 5-System Performance
(i) Progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data; and	Chapter 5-System Performance
(ii) For metropolitan planning organizations that voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios, an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of the transportation system and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified performance targets.	N/A - RPC is not electing to develop multiple scenarios.
(5) Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods;	Chapter 7-Plan Implementation includes planning actions related to maximizing mobility, reducing vehicular congestion, and improving safety.
(6) Consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs that meet the requirements of this subpart, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide.	Chapter 4-Transportation System describes congestion management process.

Federal Requirements Crosswalk	
MTP Requirement as Written in 23 CFR §450.324	*Where MTP Addresses Requirement*
(7) Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system.	Chapter 7-Plan Implementation includes planning actions and objectives related to transportation resilience and multimodal connectivity improvements, and improving reliability performance to prevent congestion. Appendices B & C includes descriptions of related capital investments.
(8) Transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a), as appropriate;	Chapter 7-Plan Implementation includes planning actions and objectives related to improving regional transit connectivity and intercity bus service. Appendices B & C includes descriptions of related capital investments.
(9) Design concept and design scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities in sufficient detail, regardless of funding source, in nonattainment and maintenance areas for conformity determinations under the EPA's transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). In all areas (regardless of air quality designation), all proposed improvements shall be described in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates;	Appendices B & C includes highway and transit project scopes and budgets.
(10) A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The MPO shall develop the discussion in consultation with applicable Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation;	Chapter 7- Plan Implementation includes planning actions related to environmental mitigation. Chapter 2, Section 2.5 details many of the agency's environmental programs which aim to restore and maintain the regional environment and mitigate impacts of transportation system.
(11) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.	Appendix A includes Financial Plan.
(i) For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain the	See Appendix A.

Federal Requirements Crosswalk	
MTP Requirement as Written in 23 CFR §450.324	*Where MTP Addresses Requirement*
Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).	
(ii) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO(s), public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under § 450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.	See Appendix A.
(iii) The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. The financial plan may include an assessment of the appropriateness of innovative finance techniques (for example, tolling, pricing, bonding, public private partnerships, or other strategies) as revenue sources for projects in the plan.	See Appendix A.
(iv) In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect "year of expenditure dollars," based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).	The financial plan in Appendix A provides for all projects proposed for funding from chapter 53, other federal funds, state assistance, and local sources; the financial plan also uses inflation rates to reflect year of expenditure dollars.
(v) For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan (i.e., beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.	See Appendix A.
(vi) For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP.	N/A
(vii) For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.	Appendix B includes illustrative projects in Tier 3.

Federal Requirements Crosswalk	
MTP Requirement as Written in 23 CFR §450.324	*Where MTP Addresses Requirement*
(viii) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (i.e., by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.	Subsequent amendments to the MTP will take into account changed revenue situations.
(12) Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g).	Chapter 2- Transportation System includes description of existing and proposed facilities. Chapter 7-Plan Implementation includes planning actions to improve connectivity and safety of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
(g) The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate:	The MPO consulted with applicable agencies during plan development and shared draft plan for comment to these agencies.
(1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or	Chapter 3-Our Region, Section 3.4 includes reference to State coastal master plan; MTP planning process includes state agencies.
(2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.	Chapter 3-Our Region details natural environment, related coastal protection plans, and regional nature preserves.
(h) The metropolitan transportation plan should integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP required under 23 U.S.C. 148, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan required under 49 U.S.C. 5329(d), or an Interim Agency Safety Plan in accordance with 49 CFR part 659, as in effect until completion of the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, and may incorporate or reference applicable emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security, as appropriate, to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.	See Chapter 4-Transportation System, Section 4.4 Safety.
(i) An MPO may, while fitting the needs and complexity of its community, voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios for consideration as part of the development of the metropolitan transportation plan.	N/A - The MPO is not electing to develop multiple scenarios.

Federal Requirements Crosswalk	
MTP Requirement as Written in 23 CFR §450.324	*Where MTP Addresses Requirement*
(j) The MPO shall provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under § 450.316(a).	See Chapter 1-Introduction, Section 1.4 Outreach and Engagement Process for details.
(k) The MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.	Draft and final adopted plan will be published on norpc.org.
(l) A State or MPO is not required to select any project from the illustrative list of additional projects included in the financial plan under paragraph (f)(11) of this section.	
(m) In nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, the MPO, as well as the FHWA and the FTA, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended transportation plan in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). A 12-month conformity lapse grace period will be implemented when an area misses an applicable deadline, in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). At the end of this 12-month grace period, the existing conformity determination will lapse. During a conformity lapse, MPOs can prepare an interim metropolitan transportation plan as a basis for advancing projects that are eligible to proceed under a conformity lapse. An interim metropolitan transportation plan consisting of eligible projects from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP may proceed immediately without revisiting the requirements of this section, subject to interagency consultation defined in 40 CFR part 93, subpart A. An interim metropolitan transportation plan containing eligible projects that are not from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP must meet all the requirements of this section.	N/A - The region is in air-quality attainment .

H Appendix

Amendments