

TECHNICAL REPORT #5 Plan Development

October 2020

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Monroe Metropolitan Planning Organization

1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Public and Stakeholder Involvement Phase 1	2
2.1 How We Engaged	2
2.2 Stakeholder Input	3
2.3 Public Input	9
3.0 Public and Stakeholder Involvement Phase 2	
3.1 How We Engaged	27
3.2 Stakeholder Input	27
3.3 Public Input	27
4.0 Review of Existing Plans	
5.0 Visioning and Strategies	
5.1 Vision and Strategic Framework	
5.2 Goals and Objectives	
5.3 National Goals and Performance Measures	
5.4 Strategies	40
5.4 Strategies 6.0 Project Development	40
5.4 Strategies 6.0 Project Development 6.1 Project Identification	40 42 42
 5.4 Strategies 6.0 Project Development 6.1 Project Identification 6.2 Estimating Project Costs 	
 5.4 Strategies 6.0 Project Development 6.1 Project Identification 6.2 Estimating Project Costs 7.0 Environmental Analysis and Mitigation	40 42 42 42 43 46
 5.4 Strategies 6.0 Project Development 6.1 Project Identification 6.2 Estimating Project Costs 7.0 Environmental Analysis and Mitigation	
 5.4 Strategies 6.0 Project Development	40 42 42 43 43 46 46 48
 5.4 Strategies	40 42 42 43 43 46 46 48 53
 5.4 Strategies 6.0 Project Development	40 42 42 43 43 46 46 46 48 53 53 54
 5.4 Strategies	40 42 42 43 43 46 46 46 48 53 53 54 66
5.4 Strategies	40 42 42 43 43 46 46 46 48 53 53 54 66 84
5.4 Strategies	40 42 42 43 46 46 46 46 48 53 54 54 66 84 86
5.4 Strategies	40 42 42 43 46 46 46 46 48 53 54 66 84 86 86

9.0 Financial Plan	95
9.1 Roadway Funding	95
9.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding	99
9.3 Public Transit Funding	100
10.0 Implementation Plan	103
10.1 Fiscally Constrained Plan	103
10.2 Visionary (Unfunded) Projects	113
Appendix: Public/Stakeholder Outreach Record	123

Table of Tables

Table 2.1: Phase I Public and Stakeholder Activity	3
Table 2.2: What is the region's single biggest transportation need?	5
Table 2.3: Most Congested Corridors	5
Table 2.4: Corridor or Intersection Most in Need of Safety Improvements	5
Table 2.5: Public Survey Responses by MPA ZIP Code	9
Table 2.6: Budget Allocation Responses	12
Table 2.7: Most Congested Corridor During Rush Hour	13
Table 2.8: Roadway Most in Need of Safety Improvements	14
Table 2.9: Improving Traffic Flow	18
Table 2.10: Bridge Improvement Ideas	20
Table 2.11: Bicycle and Pedestrian Ideas	21
Table 2.12: Transit Ideas	22
Table 2.13: Road Maintenance	23
Table 2.14: Other Transportation Improvements	24
Table 4.1: Plans Reviewed	28
Table 5.1: Relationship between Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, and Federal Plai Factors	nning 38
Table 6.1: Typical Roadway Costs by Improvement Type	44
Table 7.1: Typical Environmental Resources Evaluated	47
Table 7.2: National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as of 2020	49
Table 7.3: Test Projects Impacting Wetlands, Impaired Water, and/or Flood Zones	58
Table 7.4: Species Identified Under Endangered Species Act and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act in Ouachita Parish	64
Table 7.5: Test Projects Impacting Historic Districts and/or Historic Sites	67
Table 7.6: Test Projects Impacting Prime Farmland	70
Table 7.7: Test Projects Impacting Low-Income Households and/or People of Color or Mino Populations	ority 77
Table 7.8: Test Projects Impacting Schools, Colleges, Universities, and/or Cemeteries	79

Table 8.1: Project Prioritization Methodology for Roadway Capacity Projects	37
Table 8.2: Project Prioritization Results for Roadway Capacity Projects	38
Table 8.3: Project Prioritization Methodology for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects) 1
Table 8.4: High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridors 9) 2
Table 8.5: Pedestrian Intersection Projects) 3
Table 10.1: Travel Impacts of Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects)4
Table 10.2: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects10)6
Table 10.3: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects)8
Table 10.4: Fiscally Constrained List of Transit Projects11	11
Table 10.5: Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects11	15
Table 10.6: Visionary Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors11	18
Table 10.7: Pedestrian Intersection Projects 12	20

Table of Figures

Figure 1.1: Planning Process	1
Figure 2.1: Transportation Priorities Ranked in Order of Importance	4
Figure 2.2: Compared to the last 25 years, how do you think the Monroe MPO will grow throu 2045?	ugh 4
Figure 2.3: Stakeholder Anticipated Growth Areas	6
Figure 2.4: Stakeholder Ideas for Roadway Improvements	7
Figure 2.5: Stakeholder Ideas for Other Improvements	8
Figure 2.6: Representation of Survey Respondents Compared to Population, by ZIP Code	10
Figure 2.7: Main Mode of Transportation in Monroe MPA	11
Figure 2.8: Top Transportation Priorities	11
Figure 2.9: Budget Allocation Results	12
Figure 2.10: Biggest Challenges to Walking and Bicycling	16
Figure 2.11: Biggest Challenges to Riding Transit	17
Figure 2.12: Most Congested Areas, According to Public Survey	25
Figure 2.13: Areas Most In Need of Safety Improvements, According to Public Survey	26
Figure 5.1: Vision and Strategic Framework	33
Figure 5.2: Current Transportation Performance Overview	37
Figure 7.1: Wetlands and Waterways	55
Figure 7.2: Flood Zones	56
Figure 7.3: Critical Habitats	65
Figure 7.4: Historic and Recreational Resources	68
Figure 7.5: Prime Farmland	73
Figure 7.6: Potentially Hazardous Sites	75
Figure 7.7: Block Group Demographics: People in Poverty	81
Figure 7.8: Block Group Demographics: Minority Populations	82
Figure 7.9: Other Community Resources	83
Figure 8.1: Project Prioritization Results for Roadway Capacity Projects	90

Figure 8.2: High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridors and Pedestrian Intersection Project	s. 94
Figure 10.1: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Projects (Federal Funding Only)	.103
Figure 10.2: Fiscally Constrained Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects (Federal Funding Only)	.104
Figure 10.3: Fiscally Constrained Transit Projects (Federal Funding Only)	.105
Figure 10.4: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects	.107
Figure 10.5: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects	.110
Figure 10.6: Fiscally Constrained Transit Plan	.112
Figure 10.7: Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects	.117
Figure 10.8: High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors	.121
Figure 10.9: Visionary Transit Projects	.122

Introduction

1.0 Introduction

This report describes how the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) was developed and details the associated information and planning process that was used. It builds on other technical reports and addresses the following topics:

- Public and Stakeholder Involvement
- Existing Plans
- Visioning and Strategies
- Project Development
- Environmental Analysis and Mitigation
- Project Prioritization
- Financial Plan
- Implementation Plan

Figure 1.1: Planning Process



The first phase of the planning process – Listening and Learning – was set up to hear about transportation priorities and ideas for improvement in the region. It was also an opportunity to meet with key stakeholders and learn about needs and upcoming plans.

Input in this phase was used to develop the vision, goals, and objectives and to identify potential projects to be included in the plan. Input on growth areas was also used in forecasting future socioeconomic data for the regional travel demand model.

2.1 How We Engaged

Stakeholder Input Meeting

On March 9, 2020 a meeting was held for the area's stakeholders at the Monroe Civic Center at 401 Lea Joyner Memorial Expressway from 2:00 P.M. to 3:30 P.M. Fifteen (15) people attended in addition to staff. Of this group;

- Four (4) people identified as working for government agencies,
- Four (4) identified as elected officials,
- One (1) identified as representing a major employer, and
- One (1) identified as from an advocacy group.

The purpose of this meeting was to learn about priorities, brainstorm ideas for improving transportation, and identify major growth areas.

Public Meeting and Online Survey

Two (2) public meetings were held. The first was on March 9, 2020 from 4:30 P.M. to 6:30 P.M. at the Monroe Civic Center and had seven (7) attendees plus staff. The second was held on March 10, 2020 from 4:30 P.M. to 6:30 P.M. in West Monroe at the West Ouachita Senior Center at 1800 N 7th Street with 11 attendees plus staff. After signing in, participants walked through multiple station areas that introduced the plan, asked about priorities, and asked about big ideas.

On March 10, surveys were also distributed to transit riders on the University and Jackson Routes. The same survey was available online from March 9 through June 8th to the public who could not attend the meetings. Over 450 people participated in this online survey.

Activity	People Engaged	Surveys Completed
Stakeholder Meeting	15	14
Public Meetings	18	13
Transit Rider Surveys	32+	32
Online Survey	462	462
Total	527+	521

Table 2.1: Phase I Public and Stakeholder Activity

2.2 Stakeholder Input

The attendees of the MTP stakeholder meeting participated in three exercises.

The first exercise was an interactive polling exercise that asked about transportation priorities, challenges, and concerns. Results from the poll are shown on the following pages and key takeaways include:

- Stakeholders identify maintaining and repairing roads in good condition and funding these repairs as the top priority
- Increasing connectivity in the region is another priority
- Almost two-thirds of the stakeholders believe the region will grow at the same or slightly faster pace in the next 25 years as it has been
- US-165 was frequently named as problematic for safety and for congestion
- Well Rd. was named the most congested corridor.

In a second exercise stakeholders were asked to mark areas where they expected future development and indicate what kind of development was expected (residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, or educational/medical). Figure 2.4 shows these areas of anticipated development.

The third exercise asked stakeholders to mark areas in the MPO that they thought needed transportation improvements or where they knew of planned projects. These could include projects for roadways, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, transit, freight, or any other transportation need. Figure 2.5 maps this input.

Figure 2.1: Transportation Priorities Ranked in Order of Importance



Figure 2.2: Compared to the last 25 years, how do you think the Monroe MPO will grow through 2045?



Transportation Need	Times Mentioned	
Repair Roads	8	
Increase Maintenance Funding	4	
Reduce Congestion (especially along US-165 and I-20)	4	
Improved Connectivity in the Region	1	
Improve Drainage	1	
Increase Bicycle and Walking Trails	1	

Table 2.2: What is the region's single biggest transportation need?

Table 2.3: Most Congested Corridors

Corridor	Times Mentioned	
Well Rd	6	
US-165 N	4	
Louisville Rd/ Desiard St	3	
Thomas Rd	2	
Hwy-80	2	

Table 2.4: Corridor or Intersection Most in Need of Safety Improvements

Corridor or Intersection	Intersection With	Times Mentioned
US-165		4
Garrett Road	I-20	3
Garrett Road		1
Hudson St	6 th Ave	1
Well Rd	Cypress Ave	1
Thomas Road		1
Thomas Road	I-20 Exit N	1
Jackson St	Richwood Rd 1; S Grand St	1

Figure 2.3: Stakeholder Anticipated Growth Areas



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Note: The lightly shaded yellow area in the western part of the parish was a comment that suggested high residential growth in a broadly defined area.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.





Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.



Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Figure 2.5: Stakeholder Ideas for Other Improvements



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.



Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

2.3 Public Input

The public meeting and online survey asked people to weigh-in on five (5) topics that would help planners better understand priorities and needs in the region:

- Type of transportation mode
- Transportation priorities
- Biggest challenges for riding transit, walking, or bicycling
- Roadways with the most congestion or safety issues
- Big ideas for transportation improvements

The exercises at the public meeting and the surveys, paper and online, were identical. Over 500 surveys were completed from the public meeting, transit riders, and online survey. Survey participants were not required to answer all questions.

Table 2.5 displays participation by MPA ZIP codes. Efforts were made to reach residents throughout the region and most ZIP codes were evenly represented by their percentage of the MPA's population.

ZIP Code	Area	Count	% of MPA's Population	% of Public Survey Responses
71291	Northern West Monroe + Claiborne	105	20.2	30.0
71203	Northwestern Monroe	57	13.1	16.0
71201	Downtown Monroe	55	24.2	16.0
71202	Southern Monroe + Richwood	39	17.6	11.0
71292	Southern West Monroe	39	13.0	11.0
71225	Western West Monroe + Calhoun	12	5.1	3.0
Percent of Surveys:			93.2	88.0

Table 2.5: Public Survey Responses by MPA ZIP Code

Figure 2.6: Representation of Survey Respondents Compared to Population, by ZIP Code



% of MPA Population % of Survey Respondents

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Participants were asked their main mode of transportation for commuting or running errands. They were allowed to select more than one mode. The results of this question differ from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey results that show 84 percent of residents in the Monroe Urbanized Area (UZA) driving along as their primary source of transportation. The audiences and question formats are not comparable, especially considering that transit riders were targeted for their input, but it does suggest that modes besides driving alone may be more popular than typically thought.



Figure 2.7: Main Mode of Transportation in Monroe MPA

Public Priorities Exercise

Participants were asked to independently rank six (6) transportation priorities from 0 to 4, with 0 being least important and 4 being most important. Not all participants answered this question and participants could rank fewer than six (6) priorities. The top priorities were the ones which received the most #4 rankings. It should be noted that many participants chose not to rank some priorities such as supporting bicycling, walking, transit or freight.

Figure 2.8: Top Transportation Priorities



Budget Allocation Exercise

Participants were asked to imagine they had \$100 to spend on transportation projects and to allocate their money in increments of \$10 among nine (9) different categories. This exercise includes the composite results from the stakeholder and public meetings. Roadways were a clear focus of participants in maintaining roadways or widening and extending.

Figure 2.9: Budget Allocation Results



Table 2.6: Budget Allocation Responses

Priority	\$ Allocated	% Allocated
Maintain existing roadways	490	25.8%
Move freight more efficiently	60	3.2%
Improve safety for all users	270	14.2%
Improve public transit	170	8.9%
Use technology & new road designs to reduce traffic	210	11.1%
Add new roads or widen/extend roads	420	22.1%
Improve bicycle infrastructure	50	2.6%
Improve pedestrian infrastructure	150	7.9%
Improve streetscape appearance	80	4.2%

Roadway Congestion Exercise

Almost 350 responses were provided naming the most congested area during rush hour. Almost 80 percent of responses named the same five (5) roadways listed below. Specific corridors or intersections that were frequently named are listed below these roadways. Hwy-165 stands out as the most congested roadway, especially Hwy-165 N.

Table 2.7	': Most	Congested	Corridor	Durina	Rush	Hour
		congestea	connaon	Paring	i (abii	

Corridor	Sample Comments	Times Mentioned
Hwy-165 • Hwy-165 N to Morehouse • I-20 Intersection • Desiard St • Forsythe Bypass	Lots of traffic in both directions, especially 7 A.M. to 9 A.M. and 3:30 P.M. to 6 P.M.	72
 I-20 Stella/Mill St interchange Thomas Rd interchange Ouachita River Bridge section Vancil Rd exit 	Ramps become backup up and people don't merge safely or efficiently	61
 Louisville Ave From the bridge to 10th St At Sterlington Rd/Hwy- 165/Desiard Rd 	"Replace lights with blinking yellow or roundabouts"	54
Cypress Rd Vancil Rd Drake Dr Avant Rd Harrell Rd Well Rd	West Ridge Middle School and the lack of traffic lights creates congestion and difficult turns	25
Thomas Rd • From I-20 to Cypress Rd	"Lights need to be adjusted for 5pm traffic" "Add a bus route" "Make Bell Lane a through street to Thomas Rd"	22

Roadway Safety Exercises

Over 150 responses were provided on areas most in need of safety improvements. About 70 percent of these locations can be grouped along the roads mentioned in Table 2.8 along with specifically named corridors or intersections. The I-20 interchanges were most frequently named as dangerous areas as well as Hwy-165 S for pedestrians and Thomas Road.

Corridor	Sample Comments	Times Mentioned
 I-20 Well Road interchange/ on-ramp Stella St/Mill St interchange Bridge over Ouachita River Downtown Monroe corridor 	Need lighting at interchanges "On-ramp onto the highway barely has room to mergeand cannot see oncoming traffic around the curve"	28
 Hwy-165 (N and S) Hwy-165 S is very dangerous for pedestrians Improve or extend the I-20 ramp 	"Dangerous" "Too many cars vs. pedestrians"	23
 Thomas Rd I-20 Ramp Downing Pines Rd Glenwood Regional Medical Center and Glenwood Dr 	"Dangerous blind curve over the interstate"	11
Cypress St Vancill Rd Harrell Rd Drake Dr Avant Dr	"West Ridge Middle School intersection backs up the whole area" "Light at the intersection of Vancil Rd and Cypress St is definitely needed"	12
Desiard St By Sterlington Rd By Hwy-165 By Filhiol Ave At Bayou Dr By Warhawk Way	"Personal and commercial vehicles frequently run red lights"	6

Table 2.8: Roadway Most in Need of Safety Improvements

Corridor	Sample Comments	Times Mentioned
Louisville Ave • 18 th St • Oliver Rd • Lamy Rd • Bridget St	Pedestrians walking to transit cannot safely cross the street People turn on red lights	10
Garrett Rd • I-20 Ramp • By Lowe's	"Dangerous to walk" "Road between Lowe's and the mall needs to be improved"	7
Arkansas Rd • Harrell Rd • Traffic circles • Audubon Ave • From Wallace Dr to Tasha Dr	"Slope of the road and foliage make this difficult for pulling out" [at Harrell]	5
Forsythe Ave N 18 th St N 19 th St	Intersections need lights and to be safer for bicyclists	4

Biking and Walking Challenges

When asked about the biggest challenges to bicycling and walking, over half of respondents answered with the lack of infrastructure and the limited maintenance on existing infrastructure. The next biggest challenges were Safety and Comfort followed by Awareness and Public Information.



Figure 2.10: Biggest Challenges to Walking and Bicycling

Transit Challenges

When asked the biggest challenges to riding transit, answers noticeably varied between the transit riders surveyed on the bus and the participants in the online survey who mostly drove. Transit riders found the biggest challenges to be limits in hours and service area, followed by slow travel times. The participants who mostly drove said the biggest challenge was safety and comfort, awareness and public information, and limited hours of service.





Big Ideas Exercise

Respondents were also asked an open-ended question, "What BIG IDEAS do you have for improving transportation in the region? Think about getting around by all modes- driving, riding transit, walking, biking, etc." Nearly 300 participants answered this question. Their answers are organized below into road, transit, bike/ped, and other improvements. Some responses suggested big changes while others were comments for general improvements.

Improving Flow of Traffic

21 people mentioned road maintenance. 17 of these comments asked for general maintenance of existing roads.



Table 2.9: Improving Traffic Flow

ldea Category	Idea	Times Mentioned
	Create a loop around Monroe and West Monroe	10
	Widen I-20 (especially from Garrett Rd to Well Rd)	4
	Expand Hwy-165 to three lanes	3
	General request to widen roads in high congestion areas	3
	Create multiple routes to popular destinations	2
	Improve the I-20 interchange at Vancil Rd	2
	Extend Norris Ln to Good Hope roundabout	1
Increase	Improve I-20 interchange at Thomas Rd	1
Capacity	Add turning lanes at N 18 th St	1
	Add turning lane at Cypress Ln	1
	Increase capacity at Louisville Ave	1
	Add more turning lanes at major intersections	1
	Connect Arkansas Rd to I-20 at Well Rd	1
	Add short passing lanes in rural areas	1
	Add more left turn lanes and signals at intersections	1
	Make US-80 a couplet	1

ldea Category	ldea	Times Mentioned
Reduce Congestion	 General request to reduce congestion, but specifically at: Hwy-165 N Finks Hideaway Rd Hwy-139 Louisville Rd (especially P.M. hours) Westridge Dr Harrell Rd Vancil Rd Well Rd Calhoun, especially when school lets out and the bridge is backed up Endom Bridge roundabout Richwood Rd #1 	15
Traffic Lights	Use roundabouts instead of lights	5
	Use a smart traffic management system	2
	Use road humps, not bumps, to slow traffic in neighborhoods like the Garden District	1
	Increase signal length and coordinate signals on Hwy-165	1
	Decrease lights on Hwy-165	1
	Clear foliage and obstructions from intersections	1
	Close Clayton St and Layton St I-20 ramps to promote smoother flow	1
	Improve lights around Ochsner LSU Health Monroe Medical Center	1

Bridge Improvements

22 respondents discussed improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Almost all these comments mentioned adding a new bridge.

Add another bridge across Ouachita River

Table 2.10: Bridge Improvement Ideas

ldea	
 Add a new bridge connecting north West Monroe to Monroe. Some specific locations include: Arkansas Rd to Forsythe Ave Century Link Dr Cypress St to Forsythe Ave Bres Ave to Louisville 	21
Replace old bridges	
Improve congestion Endon Bridge roundabouts	

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

Over 95 respondents discussed improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Almost all these comments asked for a larger and safer active transportation system, including sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and offroad paths. Most comments were general; a few provided more specific ideas for improvements and are listed below.



Table 2.11: Bicycle and Pedestrian Ideas

Idea	Times Mentioned
Increase bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety	41
Create more or improve the quality of existing sidewalks	36
Construct off-road paths for bicycling and walking	19
Improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists (i.e. reduce vehicle speeding and driver inattentiveness; improve street lighting; reduce crime)	17
Build on-road bicycle lanes	14
Create more safe crosswalks	6
Clean and maintain shoulders and sidewalks	4
Connect parks with a bicycle path	3
Find reliable funding for sidewalks (ideas include grants, building into city budget, or requiring developers to construct)	3
Provide education for safe bicycling and information on bicycle routes	2
Build sidewalks and bicycle paths around and connecting to schools (i.e. Lee Junior High and Neville High School)	2
Build a levee bicycle and pedestrian path	2
Create sidewalks in neighborhoods and bicycle routes between neighborhoods	2
 Build sidewalks along the following areas: Louisville Rd Desiard Rd 18th St Forsythe Ave City of West Monroe High traffic areas 	1 vote per location (2 for Louisville)
 Build bicycle lanes or paths along the following areas: Downtown Monroe Bon Aire Drive Areas with high rush hour traffic 	1 vote per location
Provide bicycle parking	1
Repurpose old rail tracks for a lit bicycle/walking pass	1
Improve markings for bicycle lanes	1
Improve ramps and crosswalks for wheelchair users	1
Provide crosswalks at Louisville Ave and 18 th St	1

Monroe Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transit Improvements

Over 75 respondents discussed improving transit. The most popular request was to increase the areas of service for transit, especially to include West Monroe. The next most popular request, especially from transit riders, was to provide nighttime service. The other popular ideas were to provide inter-city rail service like Amtrak to connect and to improve bus routes to connect to key destinations and to provide.

Nighttime and weekend transit hours Increase transit service coverage throughout the region

Not all comments were big ideas for improvement. Three (3) respondents said that there should not be transit in West Monroe and three (3) respondents said that the Monroe Transit System is doing a good job.

Table 2.12: Transit Ideas

Idea	Times Mentioned
 Increase service area of transit Increase access to all areas, both urban and rural (9 comments) Unify Monroe and West Monroe transit or create West Monroe transit system (7 comments) 	17
Extend hours of service to include nighttime	11 (7 of these came from transit riders)
Provide Amtrak service to cities like Jackson, Longview, Ruston, and Meridian	8
 Improve the routes. Ideas for routes include: Express bus down Hwy-165 to the Pecanland Mall Stop at 18th St; Airport; Mall; Sports Complexes; Parks LA Delta Community College Mass transit or express route connecting ULM, downtown Monroe, and West Monroe Garrett Rd Connect Target and the mall to downtown 	8
Create light rail that services the parish, provides jobs, and runs on clean energy and connects to Ruston	5
Decrease wait time between buses and sync bus connections	4
Add more buses to the Louisville Route; the bus gets crowded	3 (all were transit riders)
Add benches and maintain bus stops, even for West Monroe transit	3

Monroe Metropolitan Planning Organization

ldea	Times Mentioned
Create a water trolley or shuttle between downtown Monroe and West Monroe	3
General hope to improve transit	2
Decrease the size of buses in Monroe, especially in North Monroe	2
Advertise West Monroe Transit Service and provide more readily available bus route information	2
Improve public safety for transit riders walking to their stops, especially for seniors and by assisted living like St. Joseph's	2
Add bus stops, especially on Hwy-165 S and people have to walk very far	2
Decrease length of routes; the spoke-and-hub system takes too long	1
Slow down bus speeds in residential neighborhoods	1
Maintain buses better so they do not break down	1
Keep buses cool in the summer	1
Create vanpool or transit around congested areas like Thomas Rd and Well Rd exits off I-20	1
Have large employers in West Monroe like the paper mills fund transit	1

Road Maintenance

21 people mentioned road maintenance. 17 of these comments asked for general maintenance of existing roads.



Table 2.13: Road Maintenance

Idea	Times Mentioned
Maintain existing roads (i.e. Richwood Rd #1)	18
Paint or repaint lines on the roads	3
Fix potholes	2
Implement a gas tax to fund road improvements	1
Do not make new roads but focus on maintenance	1



Other Improvements

Seventeen (17) people mentioned other ideas for transportation improvements. Eleven (11) of these discussed improving driver behavior to be safer for all road users.

Table 2.14: Other Transportation Improvements

Idea	Times Mentioned
 Improve driver behavior. Specific improvements include: Slow down speeding drivers Stop drivers from running lights (i.e. at Hwy-165 or Forsythe Ave) Educate drivers to respect pedestrians' and bicyclists' rights to the road Enforce the use of traffic signals Reduce distracted driving 	11
Reduce crime	4
Expand the Monroe Regional Airport capacity by adding runways and bringing in major lines	2
Adopt a complete streets policy	1
Improve transportation as a way of attracting new employers and residents	1
Provide broadband access, especially in Region 8, and free wifi	1
Encourage denser development to support multimodal transportation	1
Improve municipal leadership to competently allocate tax money and design infrastructure	1
Beautify streetscapes	1
Encourage rideshare options	1
Increase consistency and community support for transportation	1
Reassess speed on Hwy-80	1
Create east and westbound signs on I-20 describing traffic conditions	1
Barricade the on-ramps to improve safety on I-20 near the hospital and Ouachita River Bridge	1
Improve general safety	2

Bastrop West Monroe / Monroe Inset Collinston Sterlington West Monroe Monroe 🔴 6 LINCOLN Choudrant \bigcirc 20 Monroe 0 West Monroe \bigcirc 00 **OUACHITA** 20 Richwood RICHLAND JACKSON Eros 0

Figure 2.12: Most Congested Areas, According to Public Survey

Data Source: Public Input; Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Monroe Metropolitan Planning Organization



Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.



Figure 2.13: Areas Most In Need of Safety Improvements, According to Public Survey

Data Source: Public Input; Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Monroe Metropolitan Planning Organization Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

During this phase, the public and stakeholders reviewed the draft plan and provided input to refine and finalize the plan.

3.1 How We Engaged

Per the MPO's Public Participation Plan, a comment period for review of the draft plan was held for over 15 days beginning on October 9, 2020 and formally ending on October 26, 2020. Notice of this comment period was advertised in the newspaper of record (The News-Star), posted on the OCOG website, and emailed to the project's contact database that included stakeholders and members of the public who provided their email address during Phase 1 outreach.

Copies of the draft document were available for public review at the North Delta offices, on the OCOG website, and at the Ouachita Parish libraries in the cities of Monroe and West Monroe

A public meeting was held on October 26, 2020 at 11:30 a.m. to hear comments on the proposed draft plan. Notice of this public meeting was provided two-weeks in advance, per the MPO's Public Participation Plan.

3.2 Stakeholder Input

No comments were received from stakeholders during the comment period or during the public meeting.

3.3 Public Input

No comments were received from the public during the comment period or during the public meeting.

4.0 Review of Existing Plans

In preparing this document, relevant plans from the state, MPO, parish, and municipal level were reviewed. Key takeaways regarding transportation are summarized on the following pages.

Table 4.1: Plans Reviewed

Plan	Agency
2040 Monroe Urbanized Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2015)	Ouachita Council of Governments
Strategic Highway Safety Plan (2017)	LADOTD
Louisiana Freight Mobility Plan (2018)	LADOTD
Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan (2018)	Ouachita Council of Governments & North Delta Regional Human Services Transportation Council
Monroe Comprehensive Plan (2008)	City of Monroe
Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 1 (2018)	City of West Monroe
ULM Campus Facilities Master Plan (2013)	University of Louisiana at Monroe

2040 Monroe Urbanized Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2015)

The *Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2040* (2015) is developed every five (5) years by the MPO with regional municipal partners like the Cities of Monroe and West Monroe as well as major stakeholders and the general public. Their input and an analysis of existing conditions, current demand, and future demands helps the MPO to identify and prioritize transportation improvements.

Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) (2017)

Louisiana has made tremendous strides in improving traffic safety by adopting a strategic vision for reducing traffic-related deaths and severe injuries: Destination Zero Deaths. The vehicle for reaching this destination is the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), which uses a comprehensive, data-driven, multidisciplinary approach to identify the state's most severe traffic safety problems and the most effective approaches to solve them. The Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD), the Louisiana State Police (LSP), and the Louisiana Highway Safety Commission (LHSC) lead the SHSP.





Louisiana is one of the few states that have adopted a regional approach to safety and has established nine (9) regional safety coalitions to identify and implement SHSP-related programs and activities that address the unique needs and concerns of each of the State's diverse areas. Some of the Northeast Louisiana Highway Safety Partnership's accomplishments include:

- Launching a Sudden Impact youth program.
- Conducting a bicycle/pedestrian seminar.
- Hosting a prescription take back day to address drugged driving issues.
- Supporting 21st Century Educational Grant Program.

The SHSP also identifies strategies and emphasis areas for analysis and investment. The LADOTD SHSP emphasis areas are shown in *Technical Report #2: Existing Conditions*.
Review of Existing Plans

Louisiana Freight Mobility Plan (2018)

The Louisiana Freight Mobility Plan is designed to meet the requirements of The FAST Act of 2015. The Plan considers highway, rail, aviation, and port and waterway needs. The Plan also describes the pipeline system but does not provide investment or policy recommendations for it. The Federal and State goals and objectives that provide the framework for implementing the Plan are described in the Plan.

The Plan also:

• Gives a detail of how freight activity has an impact on economic activity in Louisiana.



- Describes freight policies, strategies, and institutions, as well as identifies the state's freight corridors and freight transportation assets.
- Summarizes the condition and performance of, as well as the amount of freight moved on, the state's freight transportation system.
- Provides an overview of freight trends, needs, and issues.
- Discusses the strengths and challenges of the freight transportation network.
- Recommends the freight improvement strategy for Louisiana.
- Identifies a fiscally constrained freight investment plan.
- Provides an Implementation Plan.

In 2012, Louisiana moved 1.2 billion tons of goods worth \$971 billion from, to, or within the state across all modes. The state's freight movements accounted for 4.4 percent of the national total, placing it 4th among states, behind Texas, California, and Illinois. Louisiana's most valuable shipments revolve around the energy industry. Louisiana moves lumber and wood products (logs) more than any other commodity by weight. By mode, trucks moved more freight by weight and by value than any other mode.

Review of Existing Plans

Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan (2018)

In 2018 the Ouachita Council of Governments (OCOG) updated the Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan for the publicly funded human services transportation programs in the 11 parishes of the North Delta region. This plan determines transit gaps and coordination opportunities among these transportation programs and develops strategies to rectify the identified shortfalls and coordination issues. This plan identified the following key findings for existing conditions in the North Delta Region:



- There is a currently a high demand for these services, and this demand is expected to significantly increase by seniors in coming years. Demand will also increase by residents with disabilities, living below the Federal Poverty Level, or living in rural areas.
- Current coordination among agencies needs significant improvement.

Monroe Comprehensive Plan (2008)

In 2008 the City of Monroe completed its *Monroe Comprehensive Plan*. The plan provides some concepts for pedestrian and bicycle improvements such as:

- Streetscape improvements along DeSiard Street,
- A riverfront boardwalk along the Ouachita River,
- A waterfront greenway and an urban greenway,
- A trail along the right-of-way of Martin Luther King Jr. Drive,
- Pedestrian trails to help with neighborhood infill in south Monroe, and
- Improved pedestrian walkways and connections between neighborhoods and parks.



West Monroe Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2018)

In 2018 the City of West Monroe introduced their *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 1*, which added bicycle and pedestrian improvements to already funded on-going projects. The Phase 1 plan is only the beginning of a larger effort to enhance and preserve the wetlands areas and green space across the city. The city also has a downtown plan in progress that emphasizes improving downtown pedestrian conditions and streetscapes.

ULM Campus Facilities Master Plan (2013)

In 2013 the University of Louisiana at Monroe released a campus facilities master plan that aims to improve the beauty and functionality of campus for learning, working, and living. The plan recommends the following pedestrian improvements:

- Expanded pedestrian paths throughout campus including a bayou-centric pedestrian path,
- Three new crosswalks across University Drive,
- Street trees and signage along major roads, and
- Traffic calming devices with embellished pedestrian crosswalks at major roads.



5.0 Visioning and Strategies

Using the public and stakeholder input, a long-term vision was developed followed by supporting goals and objectives. These goals and objectives are consistent with national goals set forth in federal transportation legislation.

5.1 Vision and Strategic Framework

The graphic below shows the long-term vision, goals, and objectives for the Metropolitan Planning Area. These reflect local priorities as well as national transportation goals.

The graphic also illustrates the overall strategic framework and how the goals and objectives support the vision. Strategies and the implementation plan address the goals and objectives and are discussed later.

Figure 5.1: Vision and Strategic Framework



5.2 Goals and Objectives

For each goal, objectives were identified that clarify and expand upon the goal statement. These activity-based objectives are used later to identify specific strategies that help the MPO achieve its stated goals.



Goal: Provide Reliable Transportation Options

- TO.1 Reduce roadway congestion and delay
- **TO.2** Make more areas in the region walkable and bikeable
- TO.3 Expand and improve transit to meet the needs of the region
- TO.4 Support convenient and affordable access to surrounding airports and regions



Goal: Improve Safety and Security

SS.1 Redesign corridors and areas with existing safety and security needs
SS.2 Coordinate with local and state stakeholders to improve enforcement of traffic regulations, transportation safety education, and emergency response
SS.3 Encourage the use of Intelligent Transportation Systems and other technology during disruptive

incidents, including evacuation events



Goal: Maintain and Maximize Our System

MM.1 Maintain transportation infrastructure and assets in a good state of repairMM.2 Reduce demand for roadway expansion by using technology to efficiently and dynamically manage roadway capacity



Goal: Support Prosperity

SP.1 Pursue transportation improvements that are consistent with local plans for growth and economic development

SP.2 Support local businesses and industry by ensuring efficient movement of freight by truck, rail, and other modes

SP.3 Address the unique needs of visitors to the region and the impacts of tourism

SP.4 Promote context-sensitive transportation solutions that integrate land use and transportation planning and reflect community values



Goal: Protect Our Environment and Communities

EC.1 Minimize or avoid adverse impacts from transportation improvements to the natural environment and the human environment (historic sites, recreational areas, environmental justice populations) **EC.2** Encourage proven Green Infrastructure and other design approaches that effectively manage and mitigate stormwater runoff

EC.3 Work with local and state stakeholders to meet the growing needs of electric and alternative fuel vehicles

EC.4 Increase the percentage of workers commuting by carpooling, transit, walking, and biking

Relationship with Planning Factors

Federal legislation requires the Metropolitan Transportation Plan to consider the following ten (10) planning factors:

- 1) Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- 2) Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- 4) Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
- 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;
- 6) Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- 7) Promote efficient system management and operation;
- 8) Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
- 9) Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and
- 10) Enhance travel and tourism.

Table 5.1 shows how these planning factors are addressed by each goal area.

5.3 National Goals and Performance Measures

Following federal legislation and rulemaking, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have moved to performance-based planning and have established national goals and performance measures. These national goals and performance measures are summarized below.

The MTP goals and objectives are consistent with these national goals and federal performance measures, as indicated in Table 5.1.

- Safety To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
 - Number of fatalities
 - o Rate of fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Travelled
 - Number of serious injuries
 - Rate of serious injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Travelled
 - o Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries
- Infrastructure Condition To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
 - o Percentage of Interstate pavements in Good condition
 - Percentage of Interstate pavements in Poor condition
 - Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition
 - Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition
 - Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Good condition
 - Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Poor condition
- Congestion Reduction To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System
 - Annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay per capita*
 - Percent of non-single-occupant vehicle travel
- System Reliability To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
 - o Percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable
 - o Percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable

Visioning and Strategies

- Freight Movement and Economic Vitality To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
 - o Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index
- Environmental Sustainability To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
 - Total emissions reduction*
- Transit Asset Management To maintain transit assets in a state of good repair.
 - o Percentage of track segments that have performance restrictions
 - Percentage of revenue vehicles that exceed useful life benchmark
 - Percentage of non-revenue vehicles that exceed useful life benchmark
 - Percentage of facilities rated less than 3.0 on TERM Scale

*only required for areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for certain pollutants

Current Performance

The MPO is supporting the State of Louisiana's adopted performance targets for the required federal performance measures and is monitoring performance for these measures over time. The graphic below summarizes existing conditions within the MPA for these performance measures.

For more detailed information, see Technical Report 3: Transportation Performance Management.

Saf	ety	Pavement	t Bridge Conditio	Tra ns Re	vel Time liability	Truck Tim Reliabilit	e Transit y of Re	State pair
Nee Improv	eds vement	Needs Improveme	nt Good		Good	Good	Po	or
Good	Meets	s Target	Needs mprovement	Does N Some T	lot Meet Fargets	Poor	Does Not Most Targ	Meet gets

Figure 5.2: Current Transportation Performance Overview

Visioning and Strategies

Table 5.1: Relationship between Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, and Federal Planning Factors

Goals	Objectives	Performance Measures	
Goal 1: Provide Reliable Transportation Options	 TO.1 Reduce roadway congestion and delay TO.2 Make more areas in the region walkable and bikeable TO.3 Expand and improve transit to meet the needs of the region TO.4 Support convenient and affordable access to surrounding airports and regions 	 NHS Travel Time Reliability Percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable Percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable Freight Reliability Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index 	 (1) Support the econom global competitiveness (4) Increase accessibilit (6) Enhance the integra across and between m (9) Improve the resilien or mitigate stormwater
Goal 2: Improve Safety and Security	 SS.1 Redesign corridors and areas with existing safety and security needs for all modes SS.2 Coordinate with local and state stakeholders to improve enforcement of traffic regulations, transportation safety education for all users, and emergency response times and incident management SS.3 Encourage the use of Intelligent Transportation Systems and other technology during disruptive incidents, including evacuation events 	 Safety Number of fatalities Rate of fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Travelled Number of serious injuries Rate of serious injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Travelled Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries 	 (2) Increase the safety of motorized users (3) Increase the security motorized users
Goal 3: Maintain and Maximize Our System	MM.1 Maintain transportation infrastructure and assets in a good state of repair MM.2 Reduce demand for roadway expansion by using technology to efficiently and dynamically manage roadway capacity	 Bridge Conditions Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Good condition Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Poor condition Percentage of Interstate pavements in Good condition Percentage of Interstate pavements in Poor condition Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition Percentage of revenue vehicles that exceed useful life benchmark Percentage of non-revenue vehicles that exceed useful life benchmark Percentage of facilities rated less than 3.0 on TERM Scale 	(7) Promote efficient sy (8) Emphasize the pres

Federal Planning Factors

nic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling 5, productivity, and efficiency

y and mobility of people and freight

ation and connectivity of the transportation system, odes, for people and freight

ncy and reliability of the transportation system and reduce r impacts of surface transportation

of the transportation system for motorized and non-

y of the transportation system for motorized and non-

vstem management and operation

ervation of the existing transportation system

Visioning and Strategies

Goals	Objectives	Performance Measures	
Goal 4: Support Prosperity	 SP.1 Pursue transportation improvements that are consistent with local plans for growth and economic development SP.2 Support local businesses and industry by ensuring efficient movement of freight by truck, rail, and other modes SP.3 Address the unique needs of visitors to the region and the impacts of tourism SP.4 Promote context-sensitive transportation solutions that integrate land use and transportation planning and reflect community values 	These are process-related objectives and do not have any associated federal performance measures.	 (1) Support the economic global competitiveness (4) Increase accessibility (5) Protect and enhance improve the quality of improvements and Starpatterns (6) Enhance the integrated across and between matrix (10) Enhance travel and starpatterns
Goal 5: Protect Our Environment and Communities	 EC.1 Minimize or avoid adverse impacts from transportation improvements to the natural environment and the human environment (historic sites, recreational areas, environmental justice populations) EC.2 Encourage proven Green Infrastructure and other design approaches that effectively manage and mitigate stormwater runoff EC.3 Increase the percentage of workers commuting by carpooling, transit, walking, and biking 	These are process-related objectives and do not have any associated federal performance measures.	 (5) Protect and enhance improve the quality of improvements and Star patterns (9) Improve the resilier or mitigate stormwater

Federal Planning Factors

nic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling s, productivity, and efficiency

ty and mobility of people and freight

te the environment, promote energy conservation, life, and promote consistency between transportation ite and local planned growth and economic development

ation and connectivity of the transportation system, odes, for people and freight

l tourism

e the environment, promote energy conservation, life, and promote consistency between transportation te and local planned growth and economic development

ncy and reliability of the transportation system and reduce r impacts of surface transportation

5.4 Strategies

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



Responsibly Improve Roadway System

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



Improve and Expand Public Transportation

Improve existing transit services in the City of Monroe. Explore expanding transit services in West Monroe and beyond.

x ofo

Rapidly Expand Biking and Walking Infrastructure

There were frequent comments from public input were for better walking and biking conditions. The MPO should encourage more bicycle and pedestrian projects and encourage bicycle and pedestrian improvements as part of planned roadway projects. There was also great demand expressed for increased safety on bicycle and pedestrian facilities.



Prioritize Maintenance

The MPO should proactively address pavement conditions, bridge conditions, and transit asset management. Additional studies may be worthwhile to collect maintenance data on roadways outside of the National Highway System. Maintenance needs were the most often identified needs in the stakeholder consultation and public input.



Establish a Safety Management System

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

_	
•	•

Monitor Emerging Technology Options

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

6.0 Project Development

This chapter summarizes how committed and potential transportation projects were identified and how cost estimates were developed for these projects.

6.1 Project Identification

Roadway Projects

A preliminary list of roadway projects was developed for both capacity and non-capacity roadway projects. Each list included the following:

- All projects included in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- All projects from the 2040 MTP
- Projects addressing needs frequently cited in public input
- Projects identified in stakeholder consultation and in existing plans
- Projects that addressed any remaining needs identified in the Needs Assessment

The list of projects was refined with stakeholders and some projects were removed or modified in scale/scope based on feasibility assessments.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

The current TIP did not include any current bicycle or pedestrian projects to incorporate into the MTP. Instead, the MPO will continue to work with its local agencies to identify and prioritize bicycle and pedestrian projects along high priority bicycle and pedestrian corridors. These corridors were identified based on existing plans and the results shown in *Technical Report #4: Needs Assessment*.

Furthermore, bicycle and pedestrian improvements must be part of the overall design phase of all projects and included unless restrictions apply, consistent with FHWA guidance.

Transit Projects

At a minimum, the MTP assumes that existing transit services will continue to operate at current levels and that vehicles will be kept in a good state of repair.

The Needs Assessment also revealed demand for a fixed route transit system in West Monroe. Additionally, the Needs Assessment showed demand for evening hours for Monroe Transit routes and higher frequency routes on the Monroe Transit University route.

6.2 Estimating Project Costs

Roadway Project Cost Estimates

Cost estimates were created by analyzing the project costs of historically let projects within the MPA from 1981 through 2018. Inflation factors were used to develop project costs in 2019 dollars and the average cost for each project type was determined. These typical cost estimates for various types of improvements are shown in Table 6.2 and reflect the total cost of the project, including right-of-way acquisition, engineering, and construction.

Table 6.1: Typical Roadway Costs by Improvement Type

Improvement Type	Average Cost (2019 dollars)	Unit
New 4 Lane Freeway	\$17,300,000	Mile
New 2 Lane Roadway	\$5,400,000	Mile
New 4 Lane Arterial	\$9,800,000	Mile
Interstate Widening	\$10,000,000	Mile
Interstate Rehab	\$2,100,000	Mile
Arterial Widening	\$3,650,000	Mile
Center Turn Lane	\$3,300,000	Mile
Reconstruction	\$2,100,000	Mile
Overlay	\$750,000	Mile
ITS	\$850,000	Mile
New Bridge	\$3,500,000	Each
Bridge Replacement	\$2,100,000	Each
RR Crossing	\$210,000	Each
Intersection Improvement	\$900,000	Each
Interchange Improvement	\$6,000,000	Each
New Interchange	\$24,000,000	Each
Underpass	\$11,000,000	Each
RR Overpass	\$6,500,000	Each
Roundabout	\$1,100,000	Each

Source: LADOTD Historic Project Lettings 1981-2018

Note: Costs include Construction, Engineering, Right-of-Way & Utilities

Transit Project Cost Estimates

The annual cost of operating public transit in the MPO was taken from the current levels of expenditures shown in the TIP. These costs were in 2018 dollars and were used as provided, but future costs were inflated by one (1) percent a year.

Capital transit projects for FY 2020-FY 2021 were provided in the TIP and these were used as provided.

Future capital costs were estimated by analyzing the ratio of annual Vehicle Revenue Miles to annual capital costs in historic National Transit Database (NTD) data and assuming this ratio will hold constant in the future and that all vehicles will be replaced on a regular cycle based on FTA useful life benchmarks.

7.0 Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

7.1 The Environment and MTP

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) must consider the impacts of transportation projects on both the natural and human environments. Appropriate consideration of environmental impacts early in the planning process:

- Increases opportunities for interagency coordination,
- Allows for expedited project delivery, and
- Promotes environmentally sustainable outcomes.

Table 7.1 presents the resources typically considered in environmental impact evaluations. This chapter focuses on these resources and their implications in the Monroe MPA and Ouachita Parish. The chapter also provides a high-level environmental analysis of test projects and possible mitigation strategies to address their potential impact.

Table 7.1: Typical Environmental Resources Evaluated

Resource	Importance
Air Quality	Public health, welfare, productivity, and the environment are degraded by air pollution.
Wetlands	Flood control, wildlife habitat, and water purification must be considered (applies to private, state, and federally funded projects).
Floodplains	Encroaching on or changing the natural floodplain of a water course can result in catastrophic flooding of developed areas.
Threatened and Endangered Species	Loss of species can damage or destroy ecosystems.
Historic Structures	Impacts to quality of life and preservation of the national heritage must be considered.
Archaeological Sites	Impacts to quality of life and preservation of national and Native American heritage must be considered.
Farmlands	Conversion compatibility with state and local farmland programs and policies must be ensured.
Hazardous Materials (HAZMAT) Sites	HAZMAT sites on existing or acquired right-of-way can present health hazards, additional costs and delays, and liability for state and federal projects.
Environmental Justice	Steps must be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high impacts on minorities and low-income populations.
Noise	Noise can irritate, interrupt, and disrupt, as well as generally diminish, the quality of life.
Recreation Areas	Impacts to quality of life and neighborhood cohesion must be considered.

7.2 Air Quality and Change in Climate

Transportation and Air Quality

Highway vehicles and non-road equipment, such as farm and construction equipment, gasolinepowered lawn equipment, and power boat and outdoor motors, are mobile sources of air pollutants. Some of these pollutants are known or suspected by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to cause cancer or other serious health and environmental effects. Mobile sources contribute to the combustion of fossil fuels and release nitrogen dioxide and volatile organic compounds (VOC), which chemically react in the presence of heat and sunlight to form ground-level ozone. Ground-level ozone can trigger various health problems, such as asthma, and can have harmful effects on sensitive vegetation and ecosystems. Mobile sources also contribute to climate change when combustion of fossil fuels releases nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide.

The EPA regulates vehicle emissions and fuel efficiency through its vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards. It also regulates and monitors pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment through the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1970. The EPA has set NAAQS for six principal "criteria" pollutants. These pollutants are listed in Table 7.2 along with the current standards.

In 2015, the EPA revised the primary and secondary ozone standards from 0.075 parts per million (ppm) to 0.070 ppm, and retained its indicators (O_3), forms (fourth-highest daily maximum, averaged across three consecutive years), and averaging times (eight hours). Ouachita Parish is not anticipated to be affected by the revised 0.070 ppm standard in the short term. Therefore, it is recommended that Ouachita Parish be designated as Unclassifiable/Attainment for the 2015 NAAQS.

Pollutant	Primary/ Secondary	Averaging Time	Level	Form
Carbon	Drimon	8 hours	9 ppm	Not to be exceeded more than once per
Monoxide	Primary	1 hour	35 ppm	year
Lead	Primary and secondary	Rolling 3- month average	0.15 µg/m³	Not to be exceeded
Nitrogon	Primary	1 hour	100 ppb	00 th perceptile of 1 hour daily provincem
Dioxide	Primary and secondary	Annual	53 ppb	concentrations, averaged over 3 years
Ozone	Primary and secondary	8 hours	0.070 ppm	Annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8- hour concentration, averaged over 3 years
	Primary	Annual	12.0 µg/m ³	Annual mean, averaged over 3 years
	Secondary	Annual	15.0 µg/m³	Annual mean, averaged over 3 years
Particle Pollution	Primary and secondary	24 hours	35 μg/m³	98 th percentile, averaged over 3 years
	Primary and secondary	24 hours	150 µg/m³	Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years
Sulfur	Primary	1 hour	75 ppb	99 th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations, averaged over 3 years
Dioxide	Secondary	3 hours	0.5 ppm	Not to be exceeded more than once per year

Table 7.2: National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as of 2020

Notes: $\mu g/m^3 =$ micrograms per cubic meter

ppb = parts per billion

ppm = parts per million

The Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) requires that transportation plans, programs, and projects in nonattainment or maintenance areas that are funded or approved by the FHWA be in conformance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP), which represents the state's plan to achieve or maintain the NAAQS for a particular pollutant. The MTP will be subject to a conformity analysis if the study area exceeds the NAAQS in the future. If this were to occur, the transportation model, which forms the basis of transportation decision-making, provides numeric outputs that may be utilized in regional air quality modeling.

Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

Change in Climate



The current scientific belief is that the planet is undergoing a period of warming caused by an increase in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. This

increase was brought about by human behavior through the use of fossil fuels. According to the EPA, the transportation sector generated the largest share, more than 28 percent, of GHG emissions in the United States in 2018. The MPO understands the need to achieve air quality standards within the area and is taking several steps to address this challenge.

Effects of Climate Change

Ouachita Parish is inland from the coast; therefore, rising sea levels are not considered a direct concern for the area. However, such events can impact the area over time. The most obvious and immediate effect of climate change has been the increased global temperature, which impacts the transportation system. The increased heat warps the steel of railroad tracks, stresses bridge joints, and affects pavement conditions. Pavement that has been softened by heat to which it was not designed to withstand can buckle and rut under high truck volumes. This in turn creates a need for further maintenance and the use of more material, which itself is carbon-based.

The rising temperatures are not the only major impact observed as a result of climate change. Storms have been increasing in intensity with the shift in the climate, and "Superstorms" such as Katrina, Sandy, and Harvey are becoming a more regular occurrence. Ouachita Parish has experienced direct impacts of weather extreme amplification recently, with three (3) tornados on the same day in April 2020 and a flooding event in March 2016.

Storms of a high intensity over a short period of time are becoming common and can result in flash floods, which can trap motorists and deposit large amounts of water on the impervious surfaces of the roadways. This water eventually becomes surface runoff and can pool and damage a roadway's substructure. The impact is greatest near major rivers, leading to potential disasters that can affect roadways and other infrastructure.

Climate Change Strategies

As noted previously, the transportation system is the largest contributor of GHGs, which come from vehicle emissions and air conditioning and increase when a vehicle is idling. This contribution to GHGs makes the transportation sector a priority when addressing the impacts of climate change. Several strategies may be employed to reduce the impact of transportation on climate change.

Introducing Low-Carbon Fuels

This strategy explores the use of fuels from alternative sources that produce less carbon and are more efficient. Such fuels include:

Ethanol

- Natural gas
- Biodiesel
 Hydrogen

Additional sources of low-carbon fuels are from hybrid and electric vehicles. In an effort to reduce emissions, local transit systems have been switching to hybrid buses.

Reducing High-Carbon Activities

Single-occupancy vehicles and motorcycles are comparatively inefficient modes of transportation that produce GHGs. Strategies can be implemented that encourage transportation users to choose alternate transportation modes that lead to a reduction in emissions from the transportation system. These strategies include the use of carpooling, increased transit ridership, and reduction of unnecessary trips.

The construction and maintenance of transportation systems can also contribute to GHGs, as many of the products used in these processes are carbon-based. The use of lower-carbon materials during construction and maintenance would aid in reducing GHGs.

Improving System Efficiency

The transportation network is the system by which people, goods, and services are moved through the area. Strategies that encourage an efficient transportation system by improving traffic operations, and therefore decreasing travel times and idling vehicles, can be achieved through the use of:

- Intelligent transportation systems (ITS)
- Traffic signal retiming and coordination
- Transportation demand management (TDM)
- Other means to reduce congestion and idling vehicles

Increased Inspections

Another potential strategy the MPO can employ to address the effects of climate change is to increase the frequency of bridge and roadway inspections to verify that infrastructure is structurally sound and has not been degraded from storm erosion. Drainage should also be inspected to ensure that roadways will not contribute to runoff.

Additional Strategies

The strategies identified above are the key methods that can be used to reduce the effect of GHGs from transportation sources. The following strategies may also be deployed:

- Reducing the amount of travel necessary for transportation users
- Increasing vehicle occupancies for all modes
- Establishing transportation pricing
- Encouraging non-vehicular travel
- Promoting trip-chaining
- Improving freight logistics
- Using LED lights in traffic signals

7.3 Environmental Regulations

Planning Requirements

Federal regulations (23 C.F.R. §450) require the MTP to address environmental concerns by consulting with relevant stakeholder agencies and discussing potential environmental mitigation activities. The plan should involve consultation with state and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation. This should include a comparison of the plan with state conservation plans or maps and inventories of natural or historic resources, if this information is available.

The plan must discuss potential environmental mitigation activities relating to implementation of the plan, including potential areas for mitigation and the activities expected to have the greatest potential to mitigate the effects of the plan projects and strategies. Mitigation activities do not have to be project-specific and can instead focus on broader policies, programs, and strategies. The discussion must involve consultation with federal, state, and tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies.

Defining Mitigation

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, or NEPA, established the basic framework for integrating environmental considerations into federal decision-making. Federal regulations relating to NEPA (40 C.F.R. 1508) define mitigation as:

- Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.
- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

7.4 The Natural Environment

Wetlands, Scenic Rivers, Waterways, and Flooding

Transportation projects were evaluated for proximity to wetlands, scenic rivers, impaired waters, flood zones, and navigable waters. While transportation projects should be sensitive to all bodies of water, these water bodies merit special attention for the following reasons:

- Wetlands have many environmental benefits, most notably:
 - Water purification
 - Flood protection
 - Shoreline stabilization
 - o Groundwater recharge
 - o Streamflow maintenance, and
 - Fish and wildlife habitat



- Wetlands and impaired waters are protected by the Clean Water Act.
- The Louisiana Scenic Rivers Act of 1988 established the Louisiana Natural and Scenic Rivers System, which is intended to protect, conserve, and replenish the natural resources of the state including certain free-flowing streams or segments. A Scenic Rivers Permit from the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) is required for activities that could have detrimental ecological impacts on designated Scenic Rivers. LDWF identifies these activities as crossings by roads, railroads, pipelines, and utilities.
- Impaired waters are too polluted or otherwise degraded to meet the state water quality standards. Impaired waters are protected by the Clean Water Act.
- Encroaching on or changing the natural floodplain of a water course can result in catastrophic flooding of developed areas.
- Structures built across navigable waterways must be designed in consultation with the Coast Guard, as required by the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1982.

Figure 7.1 depicts the locations of proposed MTP transportation projects along with the locations of wetlands, impaired waters, scenic rivers, and water bodies. Figure 7.2 shows the locations of proposed MTP transportation projects in relation to flood zones.

Bastrop West Monroe / Monroe Inset Collinston UNION Monroe MOREHOUSE 107 128 West Monroe OakRidge 114 Richwood LINCOLN Chouchant vlonro 20 La pla OUACHITA WestMonro 20 RICHLAND JACKSON Eros Mangham Chatham

Figure 7.1: Wetlands and Waterways

Data Source: NWI; NSI



Figure 7.2: Flood Zones



Data Source: FEMA; NSI

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

As shown on Figure 7.1, some of the proposed MTP transportation projects would cross impaired waters across Ouachita Parish. Furthermore, Figure 7.1 shows that the following water bodies would be impacted by the proposed MTP transportation projects:

- Bayou D'arbonne River
- Ouachita River
- Bayou Desiard River
- Youngs Bayou River

Figure 7.2 shows that the proposed MTP transportation projects are located either in flood zone A, which are areas with a one (1) percent annual chance of flooding where no base flood elevation has been determined, or in in flood zones X and X-500, which are areas that have been determined to be outside of the 500-year or 100-year floodplain.

Table 7.3 identifies the proposed MTP transportation projects that would impact wetlands, impaired waters, and/or flood zones within the study area.

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Impaired Waters	Flood Zone	Wetlands
101	Garret Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to Millhaven Rd	No	X- 500	Yes
102	US 165-B Connector	New 2-Lane Roadway	US 165-B (Jackson St) to Wilson St	No	X- 500	Yes
103	LA 594 (Texas Ave)	Center Turn Lane	US 165-B (Jackson St) to I-20	No	X- 500	No
104	Old Sterlington Rd	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Finks Hideaway Rd	Yes	X- 500	Yes
105	Garret Rd	New 4-Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to I-20	No	A	Yes
106	Loop Rd	Center Turn Lane	La 840-6 to US 165	No	А	Yes
107	Louberta/Elm/ Central Ave	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Kansas Ln	No	X- 500	No
108	Finks Hideaway Rd (Phase 2)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Holland Dr to Raymond Dr	No	А	Yes
109	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Kansas Ln to LA 139 (Old Bastrop Rd)	No	A	Yes
110	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Sandal St to Elkins Rd	No	X- 500	Yes
111	US 80 (Louisville Ave)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Riverside Dr to Sterlington Rd	No	X- 500	Yes
112	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Gilbert St to Kansas Ln	No	X- 500	Yes
113	US 80 (Cypress St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Ole Highway 15 to Well Rd	No	Х	Yes
114	LA 3033	Center Turn Lane	Cheniere Dam to LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd)	Yes	Х	Yes
115	Downing Pines Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Mane St to US 80 (Cypress Rd)	No	Х	No
116	Downing Pines Rd	Center Turn Lane	Thomas Rd to Mane St	No	Х	Yes
117	LA 15	Widen to 4 Lanes	West Study Area Boundary to Cheniere Drew Rd	No	А	Yes

Table 7.3: Test Projects Impacting Wetlands, Impaired Water, and/or Flood Zones

Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Impaired Waters	Flood Zone	Wetlands
118	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Nutland Rd to Prairie Rd	No	X- 500	Yes
119	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to Caldwell Rd	No	Х	Yes
120	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Center Turn Lane	Standifer Ave to Lee Ave	No	X- 500	No
121	Mill St/Stella St Couplet	Widen to 3 Lanes Each	I-20 to N 7th St	No	X- 500	No
122	LA 594	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 139	No	Х	Yes
123	Cheniere Drew Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 616	No	Х	Yes
124	Well Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd) to US 80 (Cypress St)	No	Х	Yes
125	Finks Hideaway Rd (Phase 3)	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	0.17 miles west of Raymond Rd to LA 139	Yes	A	Yes
126	Tichelli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes, and Realignment	US 165 to Garrett Rd	No	X- 500	Yes
127	Parkview Dr/ S 12th St	Center Turn Lane	Winnsboro Rd to Orange St	No	X- 500	No
128	1-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Ouachita River to Garret Rd	No	X- 500	Yes
129	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	LA 546 to Ouachita River	No	Х	Yes
130	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Garret Rd to LA 594	No	X- 500	Yes
131	Finks Hideaway Rd Extension	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	LA 143 (N 7th St) to US 165	Yes	A	Yes
132	Ouachita Loop South	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd) to US 165-B (Jackson St)	Yes	X- 500	Yes
133	Ouachita Loop Southeast	New 2-Lane Roadway	Richwood Rd 2 to Russell Sage Rd	No	А	Yes
134	Ouachita Loop Northwest	New 2-Lane Roadway	Matt Hammonds Rd to Finks Hideaway Rd Ext	Yes	А	Yes
135	Ouachita Loop Southwest	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 34	Yes	Х	Yes

Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Impaired Waters	Flood Zone	Wetlands
201	LA 139	Center Turn Lane	Finks Hideaway Rd Extension Ph 3 to LA 594	No	X- 500	Yes
202	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	I-20 to US 80 (Desiard St)	No	X- 500	No
203	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	US 80 (Desiard St) to Finks Hideaway Rd Extension	Yes	A	Yes
204	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Finks Hideaway Rd Extension to LA 134	No	X- 500	Yes
205	US 165 Bypass	Widen to 6 Lanes	Richwood Rd 2 to I-20	No	X- 500	Yes
206	Bernstein St/ Ticheli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Wilson St to US 165 Bypass	No	X- 500	Yes
207	Richwood Rd 1	Widen to 4 Lanes	Jackson St to Brown St	No	X- 500	Yes
208	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 165 Bypass to Nutland Rd	No	X- 500	Yes
209	I-20 Southern Service Rd	New 2-Lane Roadway	Nutland Rd to Service Rd Terminus	No	X- 500	Yes
210	Harrel Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	No	Х	Yes
211	Wallace Dean Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	No	Х	No
212	US 80 (Cypress St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Well Rd to LA 617 (Warren Dr)	No	х	No
213	Arkansas Rd Extension	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	Trenton St to Park Ave	Yes	A	Yes
214	Trenton St/ S Riverfront Ave	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd) to Mitchell Ln	No	A	No
215	Norris Ln Extension	New 2-Lane Roadway	Lindsey Dr to Good Hope Rd	No	х	Yes
216	Trenton St/ Commerce St	Convert to Couplet	Wood St to Pine St	No	A	No

Mitigation

At this stage of the planning process, there are not enough resources available to assess project-level impacts to specific wetlands. As individual projects proceed through the LADOTD project delivery and NEPA processes, it is anticipated that project sponsors will:

- Ensure that transportation facilities constructed in floodways will not increase flood heights.
- Take steps to avoid wetland and flood zone impacts where practicable.
- Consider strategies that minimize potential impacts to wetlands and flood zones.
- Provide compensation for any remaining unavoidable impacts through activities to restore or create wetlands.
- For projects near impaired waters, consider measures to improve the quality of these waters.

Spotlight: Stormwater Mitigation

In urban areas, unmanaged stormwater often leads to excessive flooding. This flooding can damage property and create environmental and public health hazards by introducing contaminants into new areas. Without proper drainage and stormwater mitigation efforts, new transportation projects have the potential to exacerbate existing stormwater issues.

Transportation Related Strategies

- During project design, minimize impervious surfaces and alterations to natural landscapes.
- Promote the use of "green infrastructure" and other low-impact development practices. Examples include the use of rain barrels, rain gardens, buffer strips, bioswales, and replacement of impervious surfaces on property with pervious materials such as gravel or permeable pavers.
- Adopt ordinances that include stormwater mitigation practices, including landscaping standards, tree preservation, and "green streets".
- Develop a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan at multiple levels; including state, region, and municipality. Efforts should be made to coordinate these plans, even though multiple agencies would have them in place.





Wildlife Management Areas and National Wildlife Refuges

The proposed MTP transportation projects were evaluated for proximity to wildlife and waterfowl refuges. The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, was enacted to provide a program for the preservation of endangered and threatened species, and to provide protection for the ecosystems upon which these species depend for their survival. All federal agencies or projects utilizing federal funding are required to implement protection programs for designated species. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966 affords protection to wildlife or waterfowl refuges when USDOT funds are invested in a project.

- An endangered species is a species in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.
- A threatened species is a species likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.
- Proposed species are those that have been formally submitted to Congress for official listing as threatened or endangered.

Species may be considered endangered or threatened when any of the five following criteria occurs:

- Current/imminent destruction, modification, or curtailment of their habitat or range
- Overuse of the species for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes
- Disease or predation
- Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms
- Other natural or human-induced factors that affect continued existence

The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) provides for the protection of the bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) and the golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*) by prohibiting, except under certain specified conditions, the taking, possession, and commerce of such birds. Under the BGEPA, a "take" of a bald eagle is defined as to "pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, destroy, molest, or disturb."

Table 7.4 lists species protected by federal law in Ouachita Parish. Figure 7.3 displays the proposed MTP transportation projects along with the locations of identified national wildlife refuges. As shown on Figure 7.3, the following proposed MTP transportation projects would impact wildlife management areas and/or national wildlife refuges:

- Finks Hideaway Rd Phase 3 (Project ID 125)
- Ouachita Loop Southeast (Project ID 133)

- Ouachita Loop Northwest (Project ID 134)
- US 165 Sterlington Rd (Project ID 203)

Table 7.4: Species Identified Under Endangered Species Act and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act in Ouachita Parish

Group	Common Name Scientific Name		Status			
Afforded Protection by the Endangered Species Act of 1973						
Bird	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	Dryobates borealis	Endangered			
Mammal	Northern Long-eared Bat	Myotis septentrionalis	Threatened			
	Rabbitsfoot	Theliderma cylindrica	Threatened			
NOIIUSK	Pink Mucket	Lampsilis abrupta	Endangered			
Afforded Protection by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act						
Bird	Bald Eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Not Listed			
	Golden Eagle	Aquila chrysaetos	Not Listed			

Note that the Louisiana Black Bear (*Ursus americanus luteolus*) was removed from the Endangered Species Act in 2016 as a result of a collaborative effort of multiple stakeholders to monitor black bear population numbers, restore black bear habitat, and protect the subspecies for the long term.

Mitigation

Preliminary planning undertaken within the context of development of the MTP does not include resources sufficient to assess project-specific impacts to protected species or protected habitat. As projects are carried forward through the LADOTD project delivery process, the NEPA process, design, and construction, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries will occur, and to the extent practicable, actions that impact critical habitats will be avoided.

Figure 7.3: Critical Habitats



Data Source: USFWS; NSI

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.
7.5 The Human Environment

Historic and Recreational Resources

Transportation projects were evaluated for proximity to historic sites and publicly owned recreational facilities. Section 4(f) of the DOT Act of 1966 affords protection to publicly owned parks and recreation areas and historic sites listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) when USDOT funds are invested in a project.

To be eligible for the NRHP, a district, site, building, structure, or object must possess:

- Integrity of location,
- Design,
- Setting,
- Materials,
- Workmanship,

The following criteria will also be evaluated:

- Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history.
- Association with the lives of significant persons in our past.
- Embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or representative of the work of a master, or possession of high artistic values, or representative of a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Provision or likelihood to provide information important in history or prehistory.

Figure 7.4 depicts historic and recreational areas in the study area. As shown on Figure 7.4, no local parks or golf courses will be impacted from any of the proposed MTP transportation projects. Table 7.5 presents the test projects that would impact historic sites and/or historic districts within the study area.

2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Monroe Metropolitan Planning Organization

- Feeling,
- Association, and
- Generally must be at least 50 years old.

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Historic District	Historic Sites
103	LA 594 (Texas Ave)	Center Turn Lane	US 165-B (Jackson St) to I-20	Yes	Yes
111	US 80 (Louisville Ave)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Riverside Dr to Sterlington Rd	Yes	Yes
120	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Center Turn Lane	Standifer Ave to Lee Ave	No	Yes
128	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Ouachita River to Garret Rd	Yes	Yes
129	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	LA 546 to Ouachita River	No	Yes
132	Ouachita Loop South	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd) to US 165-B (Jackson St)	No	Yes
213	Arkansas Rd Extension	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	Trenton St to Park Ave	Yes	No
214	Trenton St/ S Riverfront Ave	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd) to Mitchell Ln	No	Yes
216	Trenton St/ Commerce St	Convert to Couplet	Wood St to Pine St	No	Yes

Table 7.5: Test Projects Ir	npacting Historic Districts	and/or Historic Sites
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------

<u>Mitigation</u>

Projects will be developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, and to the extent practicable, actions that adversely impact NRHP properties and publicly owned recreation areas will be avoided. When historic properties are adversely affected, mitigation will include data recovery as appropriate to document the essential qualities of the historic resources. When publicly owned recreation areas are adversely affected, appropriate compensation will be provided.

Figure 7.4: Historic and Recreational Resources



Data Source: NRHP; NSI

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Farmland

Farmland is a vital local and national resource, but many communities have witnessed significant loss of this finite resource over the last century. The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA), enacted in 1981, is intended to minimize the impact federal programs have on the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. It assures that, to the extent possible, federal programs are administered to be compatible with state, local government, and private programs and policies to protect farmland.

For the purpose of FPPA, farmland includes:

• Prime farmland

• Land of statewide or local importance.

Unique farmland

Farmland subject to FPPA requirements does not have to be currently used for cropland. It can be forest land, pastureland, cropland, or other land, but not water or urban built-up land.

Figure 7.5 shows prime farmland in Ouachita Parish. An analysis of prime farmland indicates that most of the proposed MTP transportation projects would impact the existing prime farmlands in Ouachita Parish. Table 7.6 presents the test projects that would impact prime farmlands within the study area.

Mitigation

Before farmland can be used for a federally funded project, an assessment must be completed to determine if prime, unique, or statewide or locally important farmlands would be converted to non-agricultural uses. If the assessment determines that the use of farmland is in excess of the parameters defined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, measures must be taken to minimize impacts to these farmlands.

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Prime Farmland
101	Garret Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to Millhaven Rd	Yes
102	US 165-B Connector	New 2-Lane Roadway	US 165-B (Jackson St) to Wilson St	Yes
103	LA 594 (Texas Ave)	Center Turn Lane	US 165-B (Jackson St) to I-20	Yes
104	Old Sterlington Rd	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Finks Hideaway Rd	Yes
105	Garret Rd	New 4-Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to I-20	Yes
106	Loop Rd	Center Turn Lane	LA 840-6 (Forsythe Bypass) to US 165	Yes
107	Louberta/Elm/ Central Ave	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Kansas Ln	Yes
108	Finks Hideaway Rd (Phase 2)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Holland Dr to Raymond Dr	Yes
109	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Kansas Lane to LA 139 (Old Bastrop Rd)	Yes
110	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Sandal St to Elkins Rd	Yes
111	US 80 (Louisville Ave)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Riverside Dr to Sterlington Rd	Yes
112	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Gilbert St to Kansas Ln	Yes
113	US 80 (Cypress St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Ole Highway 15 to Well Rd	Yes
114	LA 3033	Center Turn Lane	Cheniere Dam to LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd)	Yes
115	Downing Pines Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Mane St to US 80 (Cypress Rd)	Yes
116	Downing Pines Rd	Center Turn Lane	Thomas Rd to Mane St	Yes
117	LA 15	Widen to 4 Lanes	West Study Area Boundary to Cheniere Drew Rd	No
118	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Nutland Rd to Prairie Rd	Yes
119	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to Caldwell Rd	No
120	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Center Turn Lane	Standifer Ave to Lee Ave	Yes
121	Mill St/Stella St Couplet	Widen to 3 Lanes Each	I-20 to N 7th St	Yes

Table 7.6: Test Pi	rojects Impacting	Prime Farmland

Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Prime Farmland
122	LA 594	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 139	Yes
123	Cheniere Drew Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 616	No
124	Well Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd) to US 80 (Cypress St)	Yes
125	Finks Hideaway Rd (Phase 3)	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	0.17 miles west of Raymond Rd to LA 139	Yes
126	Tichelli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes, and Realignment	US 165 to Garrett Rd	Yes
127	Parkview Dr/ S 12th St	Center Turn Lane	Winnsboro Rd to Orange St	Yes
128	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Ouachita River to Garret Rd	Yes
129	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	LA 546 to Ouachita River	Yes
130	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Garret Rd to LA 594	Yes
131	Finks Hideaway Rd Extension	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	LA 143 (N 7th St) to US 165	Yes
132	Ouachita Loop South	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd) to US 165-B (Jackson St)	Yes
133	Ouachita Loop Southeast	New 2-Lane Roadway	Richwood Rd 2 to Russell Sage Rd	Yes
134	Ouachita Loop Northwest	New 2-Lane Roadway	Matt Hammonds Rd to Finks Hideaway Rd Ext	Yes
135	Ouachita Loop Southwest	New 2-Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 34	Yes
201	LA 139	Center Turn Lane	Finks Hideaway Rd Ph 3 to LA 594	Yes
202	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	I-20 to US 80 (Desiard St)	Yes
203	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	US 80 (Desiard St) to Finks Hideaway Rd	Yes
204	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Finks Hideaway Rd to LA 134	Yes
205	US 165 Bypass	Widen to 6 Lanes	Richwood Rd 2 to I-20	Yes
206	Bernstein St/ Ticheli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Wilson St to US 165 Bypass	Yes
207	Richwood Rd 1	Widen to 4 Lanes	Jackson St to Brown St	Yes

Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Prime Farmland
208	LA (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 165 Bypass to Nutland Rd	Yes
209	I-20 Southern Service Rd	New 2-Lane Roadway	Nutland Rd to Service Rd Terminus	Yes
210	Harrel Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	No
211	Wallace Dean Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	Yes
212	US 80 (Cypress St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Well Rd to LA 617 (Warren Dr)	Yes
213	Arkansas Rd Extension	New 2-Lane Roadway and Bridge	Trenton St to Park Ave	Yes
214	Trenton St/S Riverfront Ave	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd) to Mitchell Ln	Yes
215	Norris Ln Extension	New 2-Lane Roadway	Lindsey Dr to Good Hope Rd	Yes

Figure 7.5: Prime Farmland



Data Source: NRCS; NSI

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Potentially Hazardous Materials

Accidents, spills, leaks, and past improper disposal and handling of hazardous materials and wastes have resulted in contamination of many sites across the country. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensations, and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as Superfund, was enacted in 1980 and established prohibitions and requirements concerning closed and abandoned hazardous waste sites, provided for liability of persons responsible for releases of hazardous waste at these sites, and established a trust fund to provide for cleanup when no responsible party can be identified. CERCLA also enabled revision of the National Contingency Plan, which established the National Priorities List (NPL).

The NPL is a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States and its territories. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation.

While no sites in Ouachita Parish are listed in the NPL, there are a few cleanup sites identified by the EPA, as illustrated on Figure 7.6. Most types of cleanup sites in proximity to proposed MTP transportation projects are brownfield properties as shown on Figure 6. The following proposed MTP transportation projects would impact brownfield properties in the study area:

- US 80 Louisville Ave (Project ID 111)
- Downing Pines Rd (Project ID 116)
- I-20 (Project ID 129)
- Trenton St/S. Riverfront Ave (Project ID 214)

The cleanup sites were identified using the EPA Cleanups in My Community database. This database includes cleanup sites, facilities, and properties for which EPA collects information by law, or voluntarily via grants.

Mitigation

At this stage in project development, not enough information is available to determine impacts and mitigation. However, transportation projects affected by or affecting potentially hazardous properties will be evaluated during the LADOTD project delivery process, the NEPA process, design, and construction.

Figure 7.6: Potentially Hazardous Sites



Data Source: EPA; NSI

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Environmental Justice Populations

Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations was signed by President Clinton in 1994. It seeks to reaffirm the intent of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, NEPA, and other federal laws, regulations, and policies by establishing the following Environmental Justice principles for all federal agencies and agencies receiving federal funds, such as MPOs:

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

Figure 7.7 shows areas in Ouachita Parish where low-income households make up a greater share of the overall population. Similarly, Figure 7.8 depicts the breakdowns of minority populations. Table 7.7 presents the test projects that would impact areas that contain low-income households or minority populations that make up 50 percent or more of that Census Block Group.

Mitigation

In an attempt to prevent disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations early in the planning process, the MPO should encourage community and stakeholder engagement in the design phase of projects. Engagement is especially important for projects located in areas with a disproportionately high minority and/or low-income population. These projects are identified later in the project screening section.

Table 7.7: Test Projects Impacting Low-Income Households and/or People of Color or Minority Populations

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Minority Populations	Low-Income Households	
101	Garret Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to Millhaven Rd	Yes	No	
102	US 165-B Connector	New 2-Lane Roadway	US 165-B (Jackson St) to Wilson St	Yes	Yes	
103	LA 594 (Texas Ave)	Center Turn Lane	US 165-B (Jackson St) to I-20	Yes	No	
104	Old Sterlington Rd	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Finks Hideaway Rd	Yes	No	
105	Garret Rd	New 4-Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to I-20	Yes	No	
107	Louberta/Elm/ Central Ave	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Kansas Ln	Yes	No	
109	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Kansas Ln to LA 139 (Old Bastrop Rd)	Yes	No	
111	US 80 (Louisville Ave)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Riverside Dr to Sterlington Rd	Yes	No	
112	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Gilbert St to Kansas Ln	Yes	No	
118	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Nutland Rd to Prairie Rd	Yes	No	
120	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Center Turn Lane	Standifer Ave to Lee Ave	Yes	No	
121	Mill St/Stella St Couplet	Widen to 3 Lanes Each	I-20 to N 7th St	Yes	No	
126	Tichelli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes, and Realignment	US 165 to Garrett Rd	Yes	No	
127	Parkview Dr/S 12th St	Center Turn Lane	Winnsboro Rd to Orange St	Yes	No	
128	1-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Ouachita River to Garret Rd	Yes	No	
130	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Garret Rd to LA 594	Yes	No	
133	Ouachita Loop Southeast	New 2-Lane Roadway	Richwood Rd 2 to Russell Sage Rd	Yes	No	

Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Minority Populations	Low-Income Households
202	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	I-20 to US 80 (Desiard St)	Yes	No
203	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	US 80 (Desiard St) to Finks Hideaway Rd	Yes	No
205	US 165 Bypass	Widen to 6 Lanes	Richwood Rd 2 to I-20	Yes	No
206	Bernstein St/ Ticheli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Wilson St to US 165 Bypass	Yes	Yes
207	Richwood Rd 1	Widen to 4 Lanes	Jackson St to Brown St	Yes	No
208	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 165 Bypass to Nutland Rd	Yes	No
209	I-20 Southern Service Rd	New 2-Lane Roadway	Nutland Rd to Service Rd Terminus	Yes	No

Other Community Impacts

In addition to the community impacts already discussed, a transportation project may produce various impacts to public spaces, residences, and businesses. These impacts may relate to property, air quality, noise, or other issues and many will not be well understood until a project is substantially advanced.

Figure 7.9 shows the locations of other community resources such as cemeteries, schools, colleges, and universities in Ouachita Parish that should be considered early in the planning process. Proximity to schools and colleges/universities should be carefully considered for many reasons, including the high volume of pedestrians and presence of recreational facilities. Projects should also be careful to avoid or mitigate impacts to cemeteries.

Table 7.8 presents the test projects that would impact other community resources such as cemeteries, schools, colleges, and universities located in Ouachita Parish.

Mitigation

Impacts associated with specific projects will be assessed in conformance with local, state, and federal regulations, NEPA guidance, and the LADOTD project delivery process. Certain impacts, such as those associated with an increase in traffic-related noise, can potentially be mitigated. Also, to the extent practicable, projects should be developed using context-sensitive solutions.

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Schools Colleges, or Universities	Cemeteries
104	Old Sterlington Rd	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Finks Hideaway Rd	Yes	No
105	Garret Rd	New 4-Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to I-20	No	Yes
106	Loop Rd	Center Turn Lane	LA 840-6 (Forsythe Bypass) to US 165	Yes	No
107	Louberta/Elm/ Central Ave	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Kansas Ln	Yes	No
108	Finks Hideaway Rd (Phase 2)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Holland Dr to Raymond Dr	Yes	No
110	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Sandal St to Elkins Rd	Yes	No
111	US 80 (Louisville Ave)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Riverside Dr to Sterlington Rd	Yes	No
113	US 80 (Cypress St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Ole Highway 15 to Well Rd	Yes	No
114	LA 3033	Center Turn Lane	Cheniere Dam to LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd)	Yes	No
117	LA 15	Widen to 4 Lanes	West Study Area Boundary to Cheniere Drew Rd	Yes	Yes
118	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Nutland Rd to Prairie Rd	Yes	Yes
119	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to Caldwell Rd	Yes	No
120	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Center Turn Lane	Standifer Ave to Lee Ave	Yes	No
122	LA 594	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 139	Yes	No
123	Cheniere Drew Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 616	Yes	No
126	Tichelli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes, and Realignment	US 165 to Garrett Rd	Yes	No

Table 7.8: Test Projects Impacting Schools, Colleges, Universities, and/or Cemeteries

Environmental Analysis and Mitigation

Project ID	Roadway	Description	Limits	Schools Colleges, or Universities	Cemeteries
127	Parkview Dr/ S 12th St	Center Turn Lane	Winnsboro Rd to Orange St	Yes	No
128	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Ouachita River to Garret Rd	Yes	No
129	I-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	LA 546 to Ouachita River	Yes	No
134	Ouachita Loop Northwest	New 2-Lane Roadway	Matt Hammonds Rd to Finks Hideaway Rd Ext	No	Yes
201	LA 139	Center Turn Lane	Finks Hideaway Rd Ph 3 to LA 594	No	Yes
203	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	US 80 (Desiard St) to Finks Hideaway Rd	Yes	No
204	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Finks Hideaway Rd to LA 134	Yes	No
205	US 165 Bypass	Widen to 6 Lanes	Richwood Rd 2 to I-20	Yes	No
207	Richwood Rd 1	Widen to 4 Lanes	Jackson St to Brown St	Yes	No
210	Harrel Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	Yes	No
211	Wallace Dean Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	Yes	No
214	Trenton St/ S Riverfront Ave	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd) to Mitchell Ln	Yes	No
216	Trenton St/ Commerce St	Convert to Couplet	Wood St to Pine St	Yes	No

Figure 7.7: Block Group Demographics: People in Poverty



Data Source: 2018 ACS; NSI

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Bastrop West Monroe / Monroe Inset Collinston UNION Monroe MOREHOUSE 107 128 West Monroe OakRidge 114 Richwood LINCOLN 13 Choudrant 20 OUACHITA est Monroe 20 Richwood RICHLAND JACKSON Eros Torial . Mangham Chatham

Figure 7.8: Block Group Demographics: Minority Populations

Data Source: 2018 ACS; NSI



Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Bastrop West Monroe / Monroe Inset Collinston UNION Monroe MOREHOUSE 107 128 West Monroe OakRidge 114 Richwood LINCOLN Choudrant 20 OUACHITA West Monroe 20 **1**3 RICHLAND JACKSON Eros ++ Mangham Chatham

Figure 7.9: Other Community Resources

Data Source: HIFLD; NSI



Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

7.6 Project Screening

The MTP uses an environmental screening process to evaluate the likelihood of significant environmental impacts for all considered transportation projects. More detailed environmental analyses are conducted for each project selected for implementation.

Potential for Natural and Community Impacts

All transportation projects considered in the MTP were evaluated for proximity to environmental justice populations, as well as natural and community resources:

- Natural Resources
 - Wildlife refuges or preserves
 - Wetlands
 - Prime Farmland
 - Flood Zones
 - o Hazardous materials/superfund sites
- Community Resource
 - Historic sites
 - Parks and recreation centers
 - Schools and college/university campuses
 - Cemeteries
- Environmental Justice populations
 - People in poverty
 - Minority populations

Projects that affect these resources received fewer points in the project scoring process for "Protect the Environment & Environmental Justice" described in Table 8.1.

- Those projects that receive fewer than half of the points possible for Environmental Mitigation (natural and community resources) were labeled as "High Concern for Environmental and Community Impacts".
- Those projects that receive fewer than half of the points possible for Environmental Justice (Environmental Justice populations) were labeled as "High Concern for Environmental Justice Impacts"

Mitigating Potential Impacts

Projects labeled as "High Concern for Environmental and Community Impacts" or "High Concern for Environmental Justice Impacts" do not preclude them from being included in the MTP's fiscally constrained improvement plan. However, these projects warrant unique design considerations. For these projects, project sponsors should carefully coordinate with stakeholders and communities impacted, especially during preliminary engineering/design. Doing so will promote outcomes that are more environmentally sustainable and equitable.

Roadway capacity projects were prioritized based on the goals and objectives stated earlier in this MTP. Non-capacity roadway projects, such as safety and maintenance projects, were not prioritized. Instead, the MPO will continue to identify and prioritize these projects on a regular basis with local governments.

8.1 Roadway Capacity Project Prioritization

To maximize the amount of limited funding available within the MPA, roadway capacity projects were prioritized. Table 8.1 shows the criteria and weights that were utilized to prioritize the identified roadway capacity projects. This methodology is intended to support the previously stated goals and objectives.

The results of this prioritization exercise are shown in Table 8.2 and illustrated in Figure 8.1.

8.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Prioritization

The MPO will collaborate with local governments to select and prioritize bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MTP does not recommend specific bicycle and pedestrian projects. Instead, corridors were identified based on the Needs Assessment, existing plans, and public input. These corridors were prioritized based on the criteria and weights shown in Table 8.3.

This methodology is intended to support the previously stated goals and objectives. These highpriority bicycle and pedestrian corridors are shown in Table 8.4 and illustrated in Figure 8.2.

Several intersection projects were also identified in the public input process and Needs Assessment. These were not prioritized; the full list of projects is shown in Table 8.5 and also illustrated in Figure 8.2.

When selecting projects, local governments should consider which projects will create a connected network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Isolated projects are generally less useful than projects connecting origins to destinations. In the more rural parts of the MPO, wide shoulders can serve as adequate bicycle facilities.

Table 8.1: Pro	ject Prioritization	Methodology for Roa	Idway Capacity Projects
----------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------------

Critarian		Maaaura	Scoring Scale (Points Possible)				
Criterion	Kationale	Medsure	0	5	10	15	20
Congestion Reduction	Prioritize projects that reduce congestion.	Reduction in Vehicle Hours of Delay from baseline conditions (Existing + Committed Network)	Points awarded in increments of 5 based upon logical breaks in the delay reduction data				
Benefit Cost Ratio	Prioritize projects with congestion reduction benefits exceeding construction costs and maximize limited federal funds.	Benefit/Cost Ratio: annual dollars saved from delay reduction divided by project cost.	Points awarde	Points awarded in increments of 5 based upon logical breaks in the benefit/cost ratio data			
Safety Benefits	Prioritize projects that will improve safety conditions.	Qualitative assessment based on crash data, bridge conditions, and engineering analysis.	Minimal safety benefits	Some safety benefits	Moderate safety benefits	Significant safety benefits	Very significant safety benefits
Bicycle and Pedestrian Benefits	Prioritize projects that will allow for incidental bike/ped improvements.	Latent Multimodal Demand: Demand for biking, walking, and transit within 0.25 mile of project based on GIS analysis in Technical Report #2: Existing Conditions Analysis.	Minimal demand (or along Interstate or Expressway)	Some demand	Moderate demand	Significant demand	Very significant demand
Freight Benefits	Prioritize projects that benefit the movement of goods.	Reduction in Truck Hours of Delay from baseline conditions (Existing + Committed Network). Designation as part of the statewide freight network.	Points awarded delay reductio Network (SFN) aut SFN automatica	Points awarded in increments of 5 based upon logical breaks in the truck delay reduction data. Projects that are part of the Tier 1 State Freight Network (SFN) automatically receive maximum points. Projects on the Tier 2 SFN automatically receive at least 10 points. Projects on the Tier 3 SFN automatically receive at least 5 points.			
Supports Existing Plans	Prioritize projects that have been vetted in locally- adopted plans or existing studies and plans.	In locally-adopted plan, previous MTP, or existing study/plan.	Not in previous plan or study	In previous MTP OR existing study/plan (not in comprehensive plan)	In previous MTP AND existing study/plan (not in comprehensive plan) OR in local comprehensive plan		
Protect the Environment & Environmental Justice	Prioritize projects that reduce environmental damage or don't disproportionately affect communities.	Qualitative assessment based on GIS analysis of environmental assets and Census data.	More points v impacting or close cc	vill be awarded if the to environmentally mmunities of conce	e project is not sensitive issues or rn.		



Project Scoring Breakdown

- Congestion Reduction

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Benefits

- Protect the Environment

Table 8.2: Project Prioritization Results for Roadway Capacity Projects

Rank	Project ID	Source	Location	Limits	Length (miles)	Improvement	Cost	Congestion Reduction Score	Benefit/Cost Score	Safety Benefit Score	Bike/Ped Benefit Score	Freight Benefit Score	Plan Consistency Score	Environmental Score	Total Score
1	213	Public/Stakeholder	Arkansas Rd Ext	Trenton St to Park Ave	0.25	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	\$11,350,000	10	15	15	5	15	0	5	65
2	131	MTP ID 403	LA 143 to US 165 Connector	LA 143 (N 7th St) to US 165	4.40	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge; Elevated	\$400,000,000	10	5	15	0	15	5	3	53
3	203	Public/Stakeholder	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	US 80 (Desiard St) to Finks Hideaway Rd	3.22	Widen to 6 Lanes and New Bridge	\$21,753,000	10	10	15	10	5	0	2	52
4	109	MTP ID 204	US 80 (Desiard St)	Kansas Lane to LA 139 (Old Bastrop Rd)	1.10	Widen to 5 Lanes	\$4,015,000	5	5	15	10	5	5	2	47
5	122	MTP ID 405	LA 594	I-20 to LA 139	6.53	Widen to 4 lanes	\$23,834,500	10	5	15	5	5	5	1	46
6	212	Public/Stakeholder	US 80 (Cypress St)	Well Rd to LA 617 (Warren Dr)	1.87	Widen to 5 Lanes	\$6,825,500	5	5	15	10	5	0	6	46
7	113	MTP ID 209	US 80 (Cypress St)	Ole Highway 15 to Well Rd	2.20	Widen to 5 Lanes	\$8,030,000	10	10	5	5	5	5	5	45
8	112	MTP ID 208	US 80 (Desiard St)	Gilbert St to Kansas Lane	0.94	Widen to 5 Lanes	\$3,431,000	5	0	15	10	5	5	4	44
10	104	MTP ID 401	Old Sterlington Rd	US 165 to Finks Hideaway Rd	2.22	Center Turn Lane	\$7,326,000	5	5	10	10	0	5	3	38
11	110	MTP ID 206	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd)	Sandal St to Elkins Rd	1.12	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$4,088,000	5	0	20	0	5	5	3	38
12	111	MTP ID 207	US 80 (Louisville Ave)	Riverside Dr to Sterlington Rd	2.84	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$10,366,000	5	5	0	15	5	5	2	37
13	204	Public/Stakeholder	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Finks Hideaway Rd to LA 134	5.56	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$20,294,000	10	10	10	0	5	0	2	37
14	205	Public/Stakeholder	US 165	Richwood Rd 2 to I-20	4.50	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$16,425,000	5	5	10	10	5	0	1	36
9	132	MTP ID 404	Ouachita Loop South	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd) to US 165-B (Jackson St)	4.27	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	\$70,000,000	10	5	5	0	10	5	1	36
15	117	MTP ID 301	LA 15	West Study Area Boundary to Cheniere Drew Rd	5.00	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$18,250,000	5	0	15	0	5	5	5	35
16	119	MTP ID 303	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	LA 15 to Caldwell Rd	2.82	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$29,684,720	10	5	5	0	5	5	5	35
17	101	MTP ID 205	Garret Rd	I-20 to Millhaven Rd	0.62	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$9,260,000	5	0	15	5	0	5	4	34
18	106	MTP ID 416	Loop Rd	LA 840-6 (Forsythe Bypass) to US 165	1.05	Center Turn Lane	\$3,465,000	5	0	10	10	0	5	3	33
19	114	MTP ID 211	LA 3033	Cheniere Dam to LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd)	2.27	Center Turn Lane	\$7,491,000	0	0	15	10	0	5	3	33
20	107	MTP ID 417	Louberta/Elm/Central Ave	US 165 to Kansas Ln	1.58	Center Turn Lane	\$5,214,000	5	0	10	10	0	5	2	32
21	202	Public/Stakeholder	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	I-20 to US 80 (Desiard St)	1.44	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$5,256,000	5	5	5	10	5	0	2	32
22	127	MTP ID 418	Parkview Dr/S 12th St	Winnsboro Rd to East St	0.40	Center Turn Lane	\$1,320,000	5	0	5	15	0	5	1	31
23	118	MTP ID 302	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Nutland Rd to Prairie Rd	1.68	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$6,132,000	5	5	10	0	5	5	0	30
24	120	MTP ID 306	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Standifer Ave to Lee Ave	1.19	Center Turn Lane	\$3,927,000	5	0	5	10	5	5	0	30
25	102	MTP ID 212	US 165-B Connector	US 165-B (Jackson St) to Wilson St	0.46	New 2 Lane Roadway	\$2,484,000	0	0	5	15	0	5	3	28
26	105	MTP ID 411	Garret Rd	LA 15 to I-20	0.68,1.74	New 4 Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	\$13,015,000	5	5	5	0	5	5	3	28
27	121	MTP ID 307	Mill St/Stella St Couplet	I-20 to N 7th St	0.89	Widen to 3 Lanes Each	\$3,248,500	5	0	0	10	5	5	3	28
28	108	MTP ID 101	Finks Hideaway Rd (Ph2)	Holland Dr to Raymond Dr	0.66	Widen to 5 Lanes	\$2,409,000	5	5	5	5	0	5	2	27
29	115	MTP ID 214	Downing Pines Rd	Mane St to US 80 (Cypress Rd)	0.48	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$1,752,000	0	0	5	10	0	5	7	27
30	207	Public/Stakeholder	Richwood Rd 1	Jackson St to Brown St	1.62	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$5,913,000	5	0	5	10	5	0	2	27
31	124	MTP ID 412	Well Rd	LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd) to I-20	1.21	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$4,416,500	0	0	10	5	0	5	6	26
32	125	MTP ID 414	Finks Hideaway Rd (Ph3)	0.17 miles west of Raymond Rd to LA 139	3.46	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	\$22,184,000	5	5	10	0	0	5	0	25

33	209	Public/Stakeholder	I-20 Southern Service Rd	Nutland Rd to Service Rd Terminus	1.40	New 2 Lane Roadway	FUNDED	5	5	5	0	5	0	5	25
34	211	Public/Stakeholder	Wallace Dean Rd	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	1.54	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$5,621,000	0	0	15	5	0	0	5	25
35	214	Public/Stakeholder	Trenton St/S Riverfront Ave	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd) to US 80 (Lea Joyner Bridge)	1.60	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$5,840,000	5	5	0	10	5	0	0	25
36	103	MTP ID 308	LA 594 (Texas Ave)	US 165-B (Jackson St) to I-20	0.80	Center Turn Lane	\$2,640,000	0	0	5	10	0	5	2	22
37	116	MTP ID 215	Downing Pines Rd	Thomas Rd to Mane St	1.20	Center Turn Lane	\$3,960,000	0	0	5	5	0	5	7	22
38	208	Public/Stakeholder	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	US 165 Bypass to Nutland Rd	1.07	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$3,905,500	5	0	5	5	5	0	2	22
39	126	MTP ID 415	Tichelli Rd	US 165 to Garrett Rd	0.79,0.15	Widen to 4 Lanes, and Realignment	\$4,353,500	0	0	5	10	0	5	1	21
40	123	MTP ID 406	LA 15 (Cheniere Drew Rd)	I-20 to LA 616	2.49	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$9,088,500	0	0	5	0	0	5	6	16
41	206	Public/Stakeholder	Bernstein St/ Ticheli Rd	Wilson St to US 165 Bypass	1.11	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$4,051,500	0	0	5	10	0	0	1	16
42	201	Public/Stakeholder	LA 139	Rowland Rd to LA 594	2.88	Median Treatment	\$9,504,000	0	0	10	0	0	0	5	15
43	215	Public/Stakeholder	Norris Ln Ext	Lindsey Dr to Good Hope Rd	1.50	New 2 Lane Roadway	\$8,100,000	0	5	5	0	0	0	5	15
44	210	Public/Stakeholder	Harrel Rd	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	1.75	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$6,387,500	0	0	5	0	0	0	6	11
45	129	MTP ID 310	I-20	LA 546 to Ouachita River	7.32	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$94,732,000	10	10	5	0	15	5	0	45
46	128	MTP ID 204	I-20	Ouachita River to Garret Rd	4.10	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$47,366,000	10	5	5	0	15	5	0	40
47	133	MTP ID 407	Ouachita Loop Southeast	Richwood Rd 2 to Russell Sage Rd	7.00	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	\$41,300,000	5	5	10	0	10	5	3	38
48	130	MTP ID 413	I-20	Garret Rd to LA 594	3.36	Widen to 6 Lanes	\$45,612,000	5	0	5	0	15	5	4	34
49	134	MTP ID 408	Ouachita Loop Northwest	Matt Hammonds Rd to LA 143	7.63	New 2 Lane Roadway	\$41,202,000	5	0	10	0	5	5	5	30
50	135	MTP ID 409	Ouachita Loop Southwest	I-20 to LA 34	2.26,11.23	New 2 Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	\$68,600,000	5	0	5	0	0	5	6	21
51	216	Public/Stakeholder	Trenton St/Commerce St	Wood St to Pine St	0.15	Convert to Couplet	\$112,500	Project Added After Scoring						0	
52	217	MPO	Millhaven Rd	Garret Rd to Russell Sage Rd	3.80	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$13,870,000) Project Added After Scoring							0

Figure 8.1: Project Prioritization Results for Roadway Capacity Projects



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Category	Criterion	Measure	Tier 1			Tier 2		ïer 3	Tier 4		
			Criterion	Points Awarded	Criterion	Points Awarded	Criterion	Points Awarded	Criterion	Points Awarded	
Land Use and Demographics	Bicycle and Pedestrian Demand	Demand Analysis Tier: Methodology in <i>Technical Report</i> <i>2: Existing Conditions</i> , Table 4.2	Demand Analysis Tier 2	10	Demand Analysis Tier 3	20	Demand Analysis Tier 4	30	Demand Analysis Tier 5	40	
Travel Environment	Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Density	Crash Heat Analysis Kernal Density: Methodology in <i>Technical</i> <i>Report 2: Existing Conditions</i> , Section 4.5	Kernal Density 0-45,000	5	Kernal Density 45,000-90,000	10	Kernal Density 90,000-135,000	15	Kernal Density 135,000-180,000	20	
	Posted Speed Limit ¹	Miles Per Hour	Under 25 mph*	3	26-35mph	6	36-45 mph	9	Over 45mph	12	
	Traffic Volume ¹	ADT	0-3,000	3	3,001-6,000	6	6,001-10,000	9	Over 10,000	12	
Public Demand	Public Input	Number of comments received from public and stakeholder outreach per corridor	n/a	n/a	1 Comment	5	2 Comments	10	3+ Comments	16	

Table 8.3: Project Prioritization Methodology for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

¹Posted speed limits and ADT came from the Travel Demand Model. Roads that did not appear in this dataset that had bicycle or pedestrian project ideas were considered to have a speed limit below 25 mph or ADT less than 3000.



Project Scoring Breakdown

- Land Use and Demographics
- Crash Density
- Public Input
- Speed Limit

Table 9.4. Ligh Driggity Diguels and Dedectrian C ام زیر

Table 8.4:	High-Priority Bicycle and Pedest	rian Corridors			
Project ID	Location	Limits	Length (Miles)	Туре	Location
BP-1	Louisville Ave	Lea Joyner Bridge to Lamy Ln	2.74		City of Monroe
BP-2	US 165 S	I-20 to Cotton Bayou Ln	5.13		City of Monroe and Town of Richwood
BP-3	N 18 th St	Forsythe Ave to Desiard St	1.79		City of Monroe
BP-4	Desiard St	S 24 th St to University Ave	1.61		City of Monroe
BP-5	West Monroe Greenway	Off-road path from Otis St to BP-8	2.65		City of West Monroe
BP-6	Crosley St and Greenway Connector	Trenton St to BP-7	1.72		City of West Monroe
BP-7	Riverside Dr	Forsythe Park to Louisville Ave	1.87		City of Monroe
BP-8	Walnut St/S Grand St	Louisville Ave to Chestnut St	2.30		City of Monroe
BP-9	Northeast Dr and Bon Aire Dr	US 165 N to Warhawk Way	1.49		City of Monroe
BP-10	McGee St and Pearl St	McGee St: Wilson St to S 6 th St; Burg Jones Ln: McGee St to Pearl St; Pearl St: Burg Jones Ln to US 165 S	0.98		City of Monroe
BP-11	S 2 nd St	Calypso St to Winnsboro Rd	1.62		City of Monroe
BP-12	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Chestnut St to Standifer Ave	1.64		City of Monroe
BP-13	Wilson St	Winnsboro Rd to Bernstein St	1.18		City of Monroe
BP-14	University Ave	Desiard St to Webster St	1.10		City of Monroe
BP-15	Armand St	Lamy Ln to Ferrand St	0.92		City of Monroe
BP-16	S 24 th St and Louberta St	Desiard St to US 165 N	1.28		City of Monroe
BP-17	Trenton St	Arkansas Rd to Bridge St	1.89		City of West Monroe
BP-18	S Riverfront Dr	Bridge St to Lazarre Park	1.87		City of West Monroe
BP-19	Lamy Ln and N 21 st St	N 21 st St: Louisville Ave to Lamy Ln; Lamy Ln: N 21 st St to Louisville Ave	1.06		City of Monroe
BP-20	Renwick St	Desiard St to US 165 N	1.04		City of Monroe
BP-21	West Monroe Greenway	Off-road between Arkansas Rd and Otis St	1.28		City of West Monroe
BP-22	McMillan Rd and Greenway Connector	Lee St to Glenwood Regional Medical Center; connects to BP-7	1.48		City of West Monroe
BP-23	Thomas Ave	S Grand Dr to Wilson St	2.58		City of Monroe
BP-24	Arkansas Rd	Kiroli Rd to Trenton St	1.90		City of West Monroe
BP-25	Parkview Dr/S 12 th St	Orange St to LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	1.31		City of Monroe

Improvement Type: • Bicycle • Pedestrian • Bicycle and Pedestrian

Table 8.5: Pedestrian Intersection Projects

Project ID	Roadway	Limits	Length (Miles)	Туре	Description	Location
BP-26	US 165 S	Richwood Rd 2 to Cotton Bayou Ln	0.36		Add pedestrian lighting	Town of Richwood
BP-27	US 165 S	Ruffin Dr	n/a		Add crosswalk and pedestrian signal	City of Monroe
BP-28	US 165 S	Hadley St	n/a		Repaint or add crosswalk	City of Monroe
BP-29	US 165 S	Dellwood Dr	n/a		Repaint or add crosswalk	City of Monroe
BP-30	US 165 S	Ollie Burns Branch Library	n/a		Add crosswalk and pedestrian signal	Town of Richwood
BP-31	US 165 S	Richwood Rd 2	n/a		Repaint or add crosswalk	Town of Richwood
BP-32	US 165 S	Richwood High School	n/a		Add crosswalk and pedestrian signal	Town of Richwood
BP-33	US 165	Renwick St	n/a		Repaint or add crosswalk	City of Monroe
BP-34	Floyd Martin St	Neville High School	n/a		Repaint or add crosswalk	City of Monroe
BP-35	Park Ave	Good Shepherd Ln	n/a	•	Repaint or add crosswalk	City of Monroe
BP-36	Lexington Ave	Kentwood Dr	n/a		Repaint or add crosswalk	City of Monroe

Improvement Type: • Lighting • Crosswalk



Figure 8.2: High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridors and Pedestrian Intersection Projects

Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Federal legislation requires the MTP to be fiscally constrained. In order to demonstrate fiscal constraint, the costs of programmed projects must not exceed the amount of funding that is reasonably expected to be available.

This chapter reviews available funding sources and forecasts the amount of funding that can reasonably be anticipated to be available for transportation projects and programs in the MPA through 2045. Forecasts used in this chapter are for planning purposes only and do not commit any jurisdiction or agency to provide a specific level of funding.

9.1 Roadway Funding

Federal Funding Sources

Federal funding for transportation is authorized through the current transportation bill (The FAST Act) and includes several major "formula" programs and discretionary programs. While "formula" programs may change somewhat in future transportation bills, they have been relatively stable over time.

National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)

Overview: The NHPP provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS), for the construction of new facilities on the NHS, and to ensure that investments of Federal-aid funds in highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a State's asset management plan.

Eligible Activities: Projects or programs supporting progress toward the achievement of national performance goals for improving infrastructure condition, safety, congestion reduction, system reliability, or freight movement on the NHS.

Federal Share: 90 percent for most projects on the Interstate System and 80 percent elsewhere.

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)

Overview: The STBG provides flexible funding that may be used for just about any type of transportation-related project. The FAST Act continues the regulation that 50 percent of a state's STBG apportionment is sub-allocated to areas based on their relative share of the total state population, with the other 50 percent available for use in any area of the state. These sub-allocations to the urban areas are called attributable funds.

Eligible Activities: Most transportation projects are eligible for STBG funding. See 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(15) for details.

Federal Share: 90 percent for most projects on the Interstate System and 80 percent elsewhere.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

Overview: The HSIP seeks to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-State-owned public roads and roads on tribal lands. The HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads that focuses on performance.

Eligible Activities: Safety projects that are consistent with the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) and that correct or improve a hazardous road location or feature or address a highway safety problem.

Federal Share: 90 percent except as provided in 23 U.S.C. 120 and 130.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

Overview: The CMAQ program provides a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the NAAQS for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas).

Note: The MPO area currently does not qualify for CMAQ funds because it is in attainment of air quality standards. However, should that change in the future, the MPO would become eligible for CMAQ funding.

Eligible Activities: Projects or programs that are likely to contribute to the attainment or maintenance of a national ambient air quality standard, with a high level of effectiveness in reducing air pollution.

Federal Share: 90 percent for most projects on the Interstate System and 80 percent elsewhere.

National Highway Freight Program (NHFP)

Overview: The NHFP seeks to improve the efficient movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) and support national freight related goals.

Eligible Activities: Generally, NHFP funds must contribute to the efficient movement of freight on the NHFN and be identified in a freight investment plan included in the State's freight plan.

Federal Share: 90 percent for most projects on the Interstate System and 80 percent elsewhere.

State and Local Funding Sources

State Funding

State transportation revenues come from fuel taxes and fees and vehicles taxes and fees. The fuel excise tax is the state's largest funding source for roadway projects.

Property, Sales, and Income Taxes

Taxation contributes the most revenue to local governments in the United States. Property taxes, sales taxes, and income taxes are the most common and biggest sources of local government tax revenue. Taxes may be levied by states, counties, municipalities, or other authorities.

User Fees

User fees are fees collected from those who utilize a service or facility. The fees are collected to pay for the cost of a facility, finance the cost of operations, and/or generate revenue for other uses. User fees are commonly charged for public parks, water and sewer services, transit systems, and solid waste facilities. The theory behind the user fee is that those who directly benefit from these public services pay for the costs.

Special Assessments

Special assessment is a method of generating funds for public improvements, whereby the cost of a public improvement is collected from those who directly benefit from the improvement. In some instances, new streets are financed by special assessment. The owners of property located adjacent to the new streets are assessed a portion of the cost of the new streets, based on the amount of frontage they own along the new streets.

Special assessments have also been used to generate funds for general improvements within special districts, such as central business districts. These assessments may be paid over a period of time rather than as a lump sum payment.

Impact Fees

New developments create increased traffic volumes on the streets around them. Development impact fees are a way of attempting to place a portion of the burden of funding improvements on developers who are creating or adding to the need for improvements.

Bond Issues

Property tax and sales tax funds can be used on a pay-as-you-go basis, or the revenues from them can be used to pay off general obligation or revenue bonds. These bonds are issued by local governments upon approval of the voting public.

Forecasting Available Funds

Using analysis of historical funding from 1990 through 2019 within the MPA, the forecasted amount of federal funding that the MPO can reasonably expect to be available for roadway projects over the next 25 years was developed. These forecasts account for inflation at one (1) percent and were provided for seven categories:

Capacity projects

Enhancement

Reconstruction

Maintenance

Safety

- Overlay
- Bridges

Using the assumptions above, the amount of federal funding reasonably expected to be available for roadway projects in the MPO through 2045 is as follows:

- Capacity Projects
 - Stage 1 (2020 2025) \$61,520,151
 - Stage 2 (2026 2035) \$111,058,494
 - Stage 3 (2036 2045) \$122,677,670
- Non-capacity Funding
 - Stage 1 (2020 2025) \$92,280,226
 - Stage 2 (2026 2035) \$166,587,741
 - Stage 3 (2036 2045) \$184,016,505

The values above reflect the total funding expected within the MPA. Of this, the following are funds that can be used at the MPO's discretion and are expected to be available for capacity improvements:

- MPO Discretionary Funds Stage 1 (2020 2025) \$12,744,232
- MPO Discretionary Funds Stage 2 (2026 2035) \$23,322,284
- MPO Discretionary Funds Stage 3 (2036 2045) \$25,762,311

9.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding

This section addresses funding for independent, or stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects. Funding for bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are part of other projects (roadway, transit, etc.) are addressed in other sections.

Federal Funding Sources

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside

Overview: This set-aside program within the STBG program mentioned in Section 9.1.1 includes all projects and activities previously eligible under the now-defunct Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP).

Eligible Activities: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities, recreational trails, safe routes to school projects, community improvements such as historic preservation and vegetation management, and environmental mitigation related to stormwater and habitat connectivity.

Federal Share: 90 percent for most projects on the Interstate System and 80 percent elsewhere.

"Flex" Funding

Other federal roadway and public transit funding sources are also flexible enough to fund construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Still, most funding from these sources do not go to bicycle and pedestrian projects.

State and Local Funding Sources

State and local funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian projects are the same as those listed for roadway projects.

Forecasting Available Funds

Funding forecasts for independent bicycle and pedestrian projects are based on the Transportation Alternatives (TA) set-aside. TA funding for the MPO was forecast based on the following assumptions:

• Future State allocations will generally correlate with population. At a minimum, 50 percent of a state's TA apportionment (after deducting the set-aside for the Recreational Trails

Program) must be sub-allocated to urban and rural areas based on their relative share of the total state population.

- The MPO will receive an amount of funding from the State that is proportionate to its Metropolitan Planning Area's share of the state population (3.4 percent). In 2020, that will amount to \$409,282.
- TA revenue will increase 1 (one) percent annually.

Using the assumptions above, the amount of federal TA funding reasonably expected to be available for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the MPO through 2045 is as follows:

- Stage 1 (2020 2025) \$2,517,911
- Stage 2 (2026 2035) \$4,545,428
- Stage 3 (2036 2045) \$5,020,980

9.3 Public Transit Funding

Federal Funding Sources

There are many federal funding sources for public transit. Most of these sources are programs funded by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and administered by the State.

Urbanized Area Formula Grants (Section 5307)

Overview: This formula-based funding program provides funds for capital and operating assistance for transit service in urbanized areas with populations greater than 50,000 and for transportation-related planning.

Eligible Activities: Funds can be used for planning, engineering, design and evaluation of transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies; capital investments in bus and bus-related activities such as replacement of buses, overhaul of buses, rebuilding of buses, crime prevention and security equipment and construction of maintenance and passenger facilities; computer hardware/software; and operating assistance in urbanized areas under 200,000 in population or with 100 or fewer fixed-route buses operating in peak hours. Activities eligible under the former Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program, which provided services to low-income individuals to access jobs, are now eligible under the Urbanized Area Formula program.

Federal Share: 80 percent for capital projects, 50 percent for operating assistance, and 80 percent for ADA non-fixed route paratransit service.

Other FTA Grant Programs

The FTA has several other funding sources that each address specific issues. Most of these are more limited in funding and are competitive programs, meaning that applicants must compete for funding based on the merits of their project.

More details can be found at https://www.transit.dot.gov/grants

Flexible, Non-FTA Funds

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG): Provides funding that may be used by states and localities for a wide range of projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance of surface transportation, including highway, transit, intercity bus, bicycle and pedestrian projects.

National Highway Performance Program (NHPP): Funds may only be used for the construction of a public transportation project that supports progress toward the achievement of national performance goals for improving infrastructure condition, safety, mobility, or freight movement on the NHS and which is eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, if: the project is in the same corridor as, and in proximity to, a fully access-controlled NHS route; the construction is more cost-effective (as determined by a benefit-cost analysis) than a NHS improvement; and the project will reduce delays or produce travel time savings on the NHS, as well as improve regional traffic flow. Local match requirement varies.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ): Provides funding to areas in nonattainment or maintenance for ozone, carbon monoxide, and/or particulate matter. States that have no nonattainment or maintenance areas still receive a minimum apportionment of CMAQ funding for either air quality projects or other elements of flexible spending. Funds may be used for any transit capital expenditures otherwise eligible for FTA funding as long as they have an air quality benefit.

State and Local Funding Sources

State and local funding sources include the same potential sources as those outlined for roadways. Fare revenue and advertising revenue are also important local funding sources but are relatively small.

Forecasting Available Funds

Forecasts were developed for the two major federal transit programs that are utilized by transit providers in the region (Section 5307 and Section 5339). This forecast does not consider Section 5310 or Section 5311 funding because LADOTD, rather than the MPO, allocates these funds
Financial Plan

based on the Statewide Management Plan to meet the needs of rural and special service providers.

In addition, 100 percent of the one-time 2020 CARES Act funding allocated to the Monroe, LA Urbanized Area were included in the Stage 1 funding.

The following assumptions are utilized:

- The region will receive 100 percent of annual Section 5307 funding allocated to the Monroe, LA Urbanized Area.
- The region will receive 100 percent of one-time 2020 CARES Act funding allocated to the Monroe, LA Urbanized Area.
- The region will receive 25 percent of annual Section 5339 funding allocated to the State for small urbanized areas based on the region's share of Vehicle Revenue Miles.
- Federal funding for these programs is inflated 1 (one) percent annually. This is consistent with long-term annual increases in FTA program funding.

Based on these assumptions, the following levels of federal funding for public transit in the MPO can be expected through 2045:

- Stage 1 (2020 2025) \$20,268,125 for operating and capital projects (*includes carry over funds and CARES Act funds*)
- Stage 2 (2026 2035) \$22,126,334 for operating and capital projects
- Stage 3 (2036 2045) \$24,441,238 for operating and capital projects

In addition to the listed Stage 2 and Stage 3 funds, the MTP anticipates that unused Stage 1 funding will carry over into Stage 2 and Stage 3.

10.0 Implementation Plan

Based on the amount of funding anticipated in the financial plan, this section presents the recommended Implementation Plan. This plan advances the strategies previously outlined and incorporates the results of the project prioritization process.

10.1 Fiscally Constrained Plan

The fiscally constrained plan is the list of transportation projects that best address the needs of the region with the limited funding available. All other projects are "unfunded" and are listed later as visionary projects.

Roadways

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

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

Table 10.2 list all roadway capacity projects in the fiscally constrained plan and Table 10.3 lists all roadway non-capacity projects in the fiscally constrained plan. The roadway capacity projects are shown in Figure 10.4 and non-capacity projects are shown in Figure 10.5.

As shown in Table 10.1, the fiscally constrained capacity projects will reduce vehicle hours of delay by nearly eight (8) percent when compared to only implementing projects that are currently funded.



Figure 10.1: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Projects (Federal Funding Only)

	2045 Existing and Committed	2045 Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects	Difference	Percent Difference
Vehicle Miles Traveled	6,333,339	6,343,219	9,881	0.2%
Vehicle Hours Traveled	176,522	173,351	-3,170	-1.8%
Vehicle Hours of Delay	34,387	31,550	-2,837	-8.3%

Table 10.1: Travel Impacts of Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects

Source: Monroe Travel Demand Model; NSI

Bicycle and Pedestrian

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

The major federal source for bicycle and pedestrian projects is the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside program, administered by LADOTD. Based on historical funding levels and the region's share of the state population, this plan assumes that approximately \$12.08 million in federal TA funds will be available to the MPO from 2020 to 2045.

While the MTP does not identify specific bicycle and pedestrian projects outside of those already funded in the TIP, the MPO will encourage local agencies to make improvements along the high-priority bicycle and pedestrian corridors listed in Table 10.8 and Figure 10.8.





Public Transit

Over the next 25 years, the region will continue to provide the fixed route service operated by Monroe Transit System. Rural and on-demand providers will continue to provide their services.

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

A regional transit study should be conducted to address the need for expanded transit service in Monroe and West Monroe. It should address the following questions:

- What type of service should be provided in West Monroe and what levels of service should be provided?
- How should Monroe Transit System (MTS) be expanded or modified?
- How should transit service in the two service areas be more integrated?
- What options are financially feasible?
- What are the steps for implementation?

Figure 10.3: Fiscally Constrained Transit Projects (Federal Funding Only)



Note: Anticipated funds include carry over funds and one-time CARES Act funds.

Table 10.2: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects

Project ID	Funding	Stage	Route	Improvement	Location	Length (mi)	Туре	Cost (YOE)	Design Considerations
1	N/A	Stage 1	Arkansas Rd	Widen to 5 Lanes and Realignment	Caldwell Rd to LA 143	3.16	•	\$33,263,729	
2	N/A	Stage 1	Kansas Ln Extension	New 4 Lane Roadway	US 80 (Desiard St) to US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	3.00		\$40,565,000	
3	N/A	Stage 1	Kansas Ln to Garrett Rd Connector	New 4 Lane Roadway	Kansas Ln to Garret Rd	0.30		\$34,517,774	
101	MPO/Local	Stage 1	Garret Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to Millhaven Rd	0.62		\$9,493,357	EC
209	Local	Stage 1	I-20 Southern Service Rd	New 2 Lane Roadway	Nutland Rd to Service Rd Terminus	1.40		FUNDED	
206	MPO/Local	Stage 1	Bernstein St/ Ticheli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Wilson St to US 165 Bypass	1.11		\$4,153,600	EJ EC
203	DOTD	Stage 2	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes and New Bridge	US 80 (Desiard St) to Finks Hideaway Rd	3.22	•	\$24,148,989	EJ EC
112	DOTD	Stage 2	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Gilbert St to Kansas Lane	0.94	•	\$3,808,908	EC
105	MPO/Local	Stage 2	Garret Rd	New 4 Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to I-20	0.68,1.74	•	\$14,448,540	EC
104	MPO/Local	Stage 2	Old Sterlington Rd	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Finks Hideaway Rd	2.22	•	\$8,132,924	EJ EC
109	DOTD	Stage 3	US 80 (Desiard St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Kansas Lane to LA 139 (Old Bastrop Rd)	1.10	•	\$4,923,558	EJ EC
122	DOTD	Stage 3	LA 594	Widen to 4 lanes	I-20 to LA 139	6.53	•	\$29,228,033	EJ EC
212	DOTD	Stage 3	US 80 (Cypress St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Well Rd to LA 617 (Warren Dr)	1.87	•	\$8,370,049	EC
113	DOTD	Stage 3	US 80 (Cypress St)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Ole Highway 15 to Well Rd	2.20		\$9,847,117	EC
110	DOTD	Stage 3	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Sandal St to Elkins Rd	1.12	•	\$5,013,078	EJ EC
205	DOTD	Stage 3	US 165	Widen to 6 Lanes	Richwood Rd 2 to I-20	4.50		\$20,141,830	EJ EC
202	DOTD	Stage 3	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	I-20 to US 80 (Desiard St)	1.44	•	\$6,445,385	EJ EC
102	DOTD	Stage 3	US 165-B Connector	New 2 Lane Roadway	US 165-B (Jackson St) to Wilson St	0.46		\$3,046,107	EJ EC
114	DOTD	Stage 3	LA 3033	Center Turn Lane	Cheniere Dam to LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd)	2.27	•	\$9,186,146	EJ EC
123	MPO/Local	Stage 3	LA 15 (Cheniere Drew Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 616	2.49		\$11,145,146	EC
115	MPO/Local	Stage 3	Downing Pines Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Mane St to US 80 (Cypress Rd)	0.48		\$2,148,462	EC
207	MPO/Local	Stage 3	Richwood Rd 1	Widen to 4 Lanes	Jackson St to Brown St	1.62		\$7,251,059	EJ EC
126	MPO/Local	Stage 3	Tichelli Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes, and Realignment	US 165 to Garrett Rd	0.79,0.15	٠	\$5,338,658	EJ EC

Note 1: YOE (Year of Expenditure) costs assume a 1% annual inflation rate.

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

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

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

Figure 10.4: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Capacity Projects



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Project ID	Stage	Roadway	Sponsor	Improvement	Improvement Type	Total Cost (YOE)	Year
NC-1	Stage 1	Mane Street Ph 2	City of West Monroe	Mill and Overlay	•	\$782,822	2020
NC-2	Stage 1	Coleman Ave	City of West Monroe	Asphalt Overlay	•	\$346,515	2020
NC-3	Stage 1	S Grand St	City of Monroe	Overlay	•	\$1,100,000	2020
NC-4	Stage 1	Standifer & Jackson St	City of Monroe	Drainage Improvement	•	\$550,000	2020
NC-5	Stage 1	Tower & Bienville Dr	City of Monroe	Overlay	•	\$110,000	2020
NC-6	Stage 1	Harrell Rd	Ouachita Parish Police Jury	Overlay	•	\$874,870	2020
NC-7	Stage 1	Tanglewood Dr	Ouachita Parish Police Jury	Overlay	•	\$199,056	2020
NC-8	Stage 1	Garrett Rd	Ouachita Parish Police Jury	Overlay	•	\$433,840	2020
NC-9	Stage 1	Otis Street	City of West Monroe	Rehabilitation	•	\$448,329	2021
NC-10	Stage 1	Natchitoches St	City of West Monroe	Asphalt Overlay	•	\$643,110	2021
NC-11	Stage 1	Lee Ave	City of Monroe	Overlay	•	\$1,100,000	2021
NC-12	Stage 1	Nutland overpass	City of Monroe	Rehabilitation	•	\$1,100,000	2021
NC-13	Stage 1	Glenwood Dr	City of Monroe	Lighting	•	\$330,000	2021
NC-14	Stage 1	Richwood Rd#2 (US 16)	Ouachita Parish Police Jury	Overlay	•	\$606,100	2021
NC-15	Stage 1	Wall Williams	Ouachita Parish Police Jury	Overlay	•	\$1,473,780	2021
NC-16	Stage 1	Glenwood Dr	Ouachita Parish Police Jury	Overlay	•	\$1,697,080	2021
NC-17	Stage 1	Crosely St	City of West Monroe	Rehabilitation	•	\$2,926,955	2020
NC-18	Stage 1	N 18th St	City of Monroe	Overlay	•	\$1,100,000	2022
NC-19	Stage 1	Millhaven Rd	City of Monroe	Overlay	•	\$1,650,000	2022
NC-20	Stage 1	Kansas Lane	City of Monroe	Rehabilitation	•	\$1,100,000	2023
NC-21	Stage 1	Kansas Lane	City of Monroe	Rehabilitation	•	\$1,650,000	2023
NC-22	Stage 1	Millhaven Rd	City of Monroe	Rehabilitation	•	\$1,650,000	2023
NC-23	TBD	Louisville Ave @ Lamey Rd	LADOTD	Safety Study	•	TBD	TBD
NC-24	TBD	I-20	LADOTD	Corridor Study	•	TBD	TBD
NC-25	TBD	Thomas Rd @ Old Natchitoches Rd	LADOTD	Intersection Improvement	•	TBD	TBD
NC-26	TBD	Louisville Ave	City of Monroe	Corridor Study	•	TBD	TBD
NC-27	TBD	Cypress St @ Harrell Rd	City of Monroe	Intersection Improvement	•	TBD	TBD
NC-28	TBD	Thomas Rd	City of Monroe	Corridor Study	•	TBD	TBD
NC-29	TBD	I-20 @ Stella/Mill Interchange	LADOTD	Safety Study	•	TBD	TBD
NC-30	TBD	US 165 @ Thomas Rd	LADOTD	Safety Study	•	TBD	TBD
NC-31	TBD	Desiard St/Louisville Ave	LADOTD	Safety Study	•	TBD	TBD

Table 10.3: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects

Implementation Plan

Project ID	Stage	Roadway	Sponsor	Improvement	Improvement Type	Total Cost (YOE)	Year
NC-32	TBD	Garret Rd	City of Monroe	Safety Study	•	TBD	TBD
NC-33	TBD	Ouachita Loop Study	LADOTD	Corridor Study	•	TBD	TBD
LI-1	Stage 1	Line Item	N/A	Reconstruction		\$3,428,746	2020-2025
LI-2	Stage 1	Line Item	N/A	Overlay	•	\$18,642,903	2020-2025
LI-3	Stage 1	Line Item	N/A	Bridge	•	\$30,760,075	2020-2025
LI-4	Stage 1	Line Item	N/A	Enhancement	•	\$3,076,008	2020-2025
LI-5	Stage 1	Line Item	N/A	Safety	٠	\$7,360,019	2020-2025
LI-6	Stage 1	Line Item	N/A	Maintenance	•	\$7,140,019	2020-2025
LI-7	Stage 2	Line Item	N/A	Reconstruction	•	\$22,211,699	2026-2035
LI-8	Stage 2	Line Item	N/A	Overlay	•	\$55,529,247	2026-2035
LI-9	Stage 2	Line Item	N/A	Bridge	•	\$55,529,247	2026-2035
LI-10	Stage 2	Line Item	N/A	Enhancement	•	\$5,552,925	2026-2035
LI-11	Stage 2	Line Item	N/A	Safety	•	\$13,882,312	2026-2035
LI-12	Stage 2	Line Item	N/A	Maintenance		\$13,882,312	2026-2035
LI-13	Stage 3	Line Item	N/A	Reconstruction	•	\$24,535,534	2036-2045
LI-14	Stage 3	Line Item	N/A	Overlay		\$61,338,835	2036-2045
LI-15	Stage 3	Line Item	N/A	Bridge	•	\$61,338,835	2036-2045
LI-16	Stage 3	Line Item	N/A	Enhancement	•	\$6,133,884	2036-2045
LI-17	Stage 3	Line Item	N/A	Safety	•	\$15,334,709	2036-2045
LI-18	Stage 3	Line Item	N/A	Maintenance		\$15,334,709	2036-2045

Note 1: YOE (Year of Expenditure) costs assume a 1% annual inflation rate.

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

Improvement Type: • Pavement • Intersection/Interchange • Corridor Study • Other/Multiple

Figure 10.5: Fiscally Constrained Roadway Non-Capacity Projects



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Table 10.4: Fiscally Constrained List of Transit Projects

Project ID	Description	Туре	Sponsor	Year	Total Cost (YOE) ¹	Federal Cost (YOE) ¹
MT-1	SECTIONS 5307 AND 5339- CAPITAL ²		City of Monroe	2020	\$3,849,000	\$3,265,300
MT-2	SECTION 5307- OPERATING		City of Monroe	2020	\$2,500,000	\$1,200,000
MT-3	SECTION 5307- PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE		City of Monroe	2020	\$500,000	\$400,000
MT-4	SECTION 5307 AND 5339- CAPITAL		City of Monroe	2021	\$60,000	\$51,000
MT-5	SECTION 5307- OPERATING		City of Monroe	2021	\$2,500,000	\$1,200,000
MT-6	SECTION 5307- PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE		City of Monroe	2021	\$500,000	\$400,000
MT-7	SECTIONS 5307 AND 5339- CAPITAL		City of Monroe	2022	\$638,533	\$511,000
MT-8	SECTION 5307- OPERATING		City of Monroe	2022	\$2,500,000	\$1,200,000
MT-9	SECTION 5307- PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE		City of Monroe	2022	\$500,000	\$400,000
MT-10	SECTION 5307 AND 5339- CAPITAL		City of Monroe	2023-2025	\$1,964,890	\$1,572,000
MT-11	SECTION 5307- OPERATING		City of Monroe	2023-2025	\$7,651,000	\$3,672,000
MT-12	SECTION 5307- PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE		City of Monroe	2023-2025	\$1,530,000	\$1,224,000
MT-13	SECTION 5307 AND 5339- CAPITAL		City of Monroe	2026-2035	\$8,885,000	\$7,108,000
MT-14	SECTION 5307- OPERATING		City of Monroe	2026-2035	\$27,218,000	\$13,064,000
MT-15	SECTION 5307- PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE		City of Monroe	2026-2035	\$5,444,000	\$4,355,000
MT-16	SECTION 5307 AND 5339- CAPITAL		City of Monroe	2036-2045	\$9,814,000	\$7,851,000
MT-17	SECTION 5307- OPERATING		City of Monroe	2036-2045	\$30,065,000	\$14,431,000
MT-18	SECTION 5307- PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE		City of Monroe	2036-2045	\$6,013,000	\$4,810,000
MT-19	REGIONAL TRANSIT STUDY	•	City of Monroe	2021	\$150,000	\$120,000

¹ YOE (Year of Expenditure) costs assume a 1% annual inflation rate for transit projects.

² Includes Terminal Replacement and uses some carry over funds.

Improvement Type: • Operating • Capital • Study

Figure 10.6: Fiscally Constrained Transit Plan



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

10.2 Visionary (Unfunded) Projects

Visionary projects are identified projects that are unfunded or unprogrammed in the fiscally constrained list of projects.

Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects

Unfunded projects that could become funded with additional funding or if the fiscally constrained plan is changed.

Unfunded roadway capacity projects are not necessarily less important or effective; they just cannot be accommodated within the fiscally constrained budget. This may be due to project costs or overall feasibility.

Table 10.5 shows the list of visionary roadway capacity projects and Figure 10.7 maps these projects.

Visionary Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridors

Projects that can be programmed within the line-item budget for Transportation Alternatives projects.

The fiscally constrained plan has a line-item for Transportation Alternatives (TA) projects. Local agencies should consider the visionary bicycle and pedestrian corridors when LADOTD releases a call for TA project grant applications.

Table 10.6 lists visionary bicycle and pedestrian corridors and Table 10.7 lists visionary projects for pedestrian intersections. Figure 10.8 maps these projects.

Visionary Transit Expansion

The MTP recommends a Regional Transit Study to consider introducing fixed route service into West Monroe and enhancing existing service in Monroe. Figure 10.9 maps two (2) possible routes for a West Monroe expansion.

• West Monroe Loop North begins in downtown Monroe and mainly follows Cypress St through West Monroe to Well Rd.

- Major destinations covered include the West Monroe Convention Center, grocery stores, the Ike Hamilton Expo Center and surrounding hotels, the Glenwood Regional Medical Center, the West Ouachita Senior Center, and West Monroe High School.
- West Monroe Loop South mainly follows N 7th St, Thomas Road, Washington St, and Jonesboro Road.
 - In addition to covering downtown West Monroe, the Glenwood Regional Medical Center, and West Monroe High School.
 - This loop also reaches the residential neighborhoods in southern West Monroe, Walmart, and the commercial section of Thomas Road.

Table 10.5: Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects

Project ID	Funding	Route	Improvement	Location	Length (mi)	Туре	Cost (2020\$)	Design Considerations
204	DOTD	US 165 (Sterlington Rd)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Finks Hideaway Rd to LA 134	5.56		\$20,294,000	EJ EC
129	DOTD	1-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	LA 546 to Ouachita River	7.32		\$94,732,000	EJ EC
128	DOTD	1-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Ouachita River to Garret Rd	4.10		\$47,366,000	EJ EC
130	DOTD	1-20	Widen to 6 Lanes	Garret Rd to LA 594	3.36		\$45,612,000	EC
216	MPO/Local	Trenton St/Commerce St	Convert to Couplet	Wood St to Pine St	0.15		\$112,500	EJ EC
217	DOTD	Millhaven Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	Garret Rd to Russell Sage Rd	3.8		\$13,870,000	EJ EC
119	DOTD	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 15 to Caldwell Rd	2.82		\$29,684,720	EC
127	MPO/Local	Parkview Dr/S 12th St	Center Turn Lane	Winnsboro Rd to East St	0.40	•	\$1,320,000	EJ EC
125	MPO/Local	Finks Hideaway Rd (Ph3)	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	0.17 miles west of Raymond Rd to LA 139	3.46		\$22,184,000	EJ EC
211	MPO/Local	Wallace Dean Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	1.54		\$5,621,000	EC
103	DOTD	LA 594 (Texas Ave)	Center Turn Lane	US 165-B (Jackson St) to I-20	0.80	•	\$2,640,000	EJ EC
208	DOTD	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 165 Bypass to Nutland Rd	1.07		\$3,905,500	EJ EC
201	DOTD	LA 139	Median Treatment	Rowland Rd to LA 594	2.88		\$9,504,000	EC
213	MPO/Local	Arkansas Rd Ext	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	Trenton St to Park Ave	0.25		\$11,350,000	EC
131	MPO/Local	LA 143 to US 165 Connector	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge; Elevated	LA 143 (N 7th St) to US 165	4.40		\$400,000,000	EC
132	DOTD	Ouachita Loop South	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	LA 34 (Jonesboro Rd) to US 165-B (Jackson St)	4.27		\$70,000,000	EJ EC
111	DOTD	US 80 (Louisville Ave)	Widen to 6 Lanes	Riverside Dr to Sterlington Rd	2.84		\$10,366,000	EJ EC
117	DOTD	LA 15	Widen to 4 Lanes	West Study Area Boundary to Cheniere Drew Rd	5.00		\$18,250,000	EC
106	MPO/Local	Loop Rd	Center Turn Lane	LA 840-6 (Forsythe Bypass) to US 165	1.05	•	\$3,465,000	EJ EC
107	MPO/Local	Louberta/Elm/Central Ave	Center Turn Lane	US 165 to Kansas Ln	1.58	•	\$5,214,000	EJ EC
118	DOTD	LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	Widen to 4 Lanes	Nutland Rd to Prairie Rd	1.68		\$6,132,000	EJ EC
120	DOTD	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Center Turn Lane	Standifer Ave to Lee Ave	1.19	•	\$3,927,000	EJ EC
121	DOTD	Mill St/Stella St Couplet	Widen to 3 Lanes Each	I-20 to N 7th St	0.89		\$3,248,500	EJ EC
108	MPO/Local	Finks Hideaway Rd (Ph2)	Widen to 5 Lanes	Holland Dr to Raymond Dr	0.66		\$2,409,000	EJ EC
124	MPO/Local	Well Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 838 (New Natchitoches Rd) to I-20	1.21	•	\$4,416,500	EC
214	MPO/Local	Trenton St/S Riverfront Ave	Widen to 4 Lanes	LA 616 (Arkansas Rd) to US 80 (Lea Joyner Bridge)	1.60		\$5,840,000	EJ EC
116	MPO/Local	Downing Pines Rd	Center Turn Lane	Thomas Rd to Mane St	1.20	•	\$3,960,000	EC
215	MPO/Local	Norris Ln Ext	New 2 Lane Roadway	Lindsey Dr to Good Hope Rd	1.50		\$8,100,000	EC
210	MPO/Local	Harrel Rd	Widen to 4 Lanes	US 80 (Cypress St) to LA 616 (Arkansas Rd)	1.75	•	\$6,387,500	EC

Implementation Plan

Project ID	Funding	Route	Improvement	provement Location Le		Туре	Cost (2020\$)	Design Considerations
133	DOTD	Ouachita Loop Southeast	New 2 Lane Roadway and Bridge	Richwood Rd 2 to Russell Sage Rd	7.00		\$41,300,000	EC
134	DOTD	Ouachita Loop Northwest	New 2 Lane Roadway	Matt Hammonds Rd to LA 143	7.63		\$41,202,000	EC
135	DOTD	Ouachita Loop Southwest	New 2 Lane Roadway, Widen to 4 Lanes	I-20 to LA 34	2.26,11.23		\$68,600,000	EC

Note 1: Bicycle and pedestrian improvements should be part of the overall design phase of all projects and included unless restrictions apply consistent with FHWA guidance.

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

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

Figure 10.7: Visionary Roadway Capacity Projects



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Table 10.6: Visionary Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors

Project ID	Location	Limits	Length (Miles)	Туре	Sponsor	Total Cost (2020\$)	Federal Cost (2020\$)
BP-1	Louisville Ave	Bridge to Lamy Ln	2.74		City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-2	US 165 S	I-20 to Cotton Bayou Ln	5.13		City of Monroe and Town of Richwood	TBD	TBD
BP-3	N 18 th St	Forsythe Ave to Desiard St	1.79	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-4	Desiard St	S 24 th St to University Ave	1.61	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-5	West Monroe Greenway	Off-road path from Otis St to BP-8	2.65	•	City of West Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-6	Crosley St and Greenway Connector	Trenton St to BP-7	1.72	•	City of West Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-7	Riverside Dr	Forsythe Park to Louisville Ave	1.87	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-8	Walnut St/S Grand St	Louisville Ave to Chestnut St	2.30	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-9	Northeast Dr and Bon Aire Dr	US 165 N to Warhawk Way	1.49	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-10	McGee St and Pearl St	McGee St: Wilson St to S 6 th St Burg Jones Ln: McGee St to Pearl St Pearl St: Burg Jones Ln to US 165 S	0.98	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-11	S 2 nd St	Calypso St to Winnsboro Rd	1.62		City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-12	US 165-B (Jackson St)	Chestnut St to Standifer Ave	1.64		City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-13	Wilson St	Winnsboro Rd to Bernstein St	1.18	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-14	University Ave	Desiard St to Webster St	1.10		City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-15	Armand St	Lamy Ln to Ferrand St	0.92	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-16	S 24 th St and Louberta St	Desiard St to US 165 N	1.28		City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-17	Trenton St	Arkansas Rd to Bridge St	1.89		City of West Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-18	S Riverfront Dr	Bridge St to Lazarre Park	1.87		City of West Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-19	Lamy Ln and N 21 st St	N 21 st St: Louisville Ave to Lamy Ln; Lamy Ln: N 21 st St to Louisville Ave	1.06	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-20	Renwick St	Desiard St to US 165 N	1.04	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD

Implementation Plan

Project ID	Location	Limits	Length (Miles)	Туре	Sponsor	Total Cost (2020\$)	Federal Cost (2020\$)
BP-21	West Monroe Greenway	Off-road between Arkansas Rd and Otis St	1.28		City of West Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-22	McMillan Rd and Greenway Connector	Lee St to Glenwood Regional Medical Center; connects to BP-7	1.48		City of West Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-23	Thomas Ave	S Grand Dr to Wilson St	2.58	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-24	Arkansas Rd	Kiroli Rd to Trenton St	1.90	•	City of West Monroe	TBD	TBD
BP-25	Parkview Dr/S 12 th St	Orange St to LA 15 (Winnsboro Rd)	1.31	•	City of Monroe	TBD	TBD
			1			•	

Improvement Type:
Bicycle
Pedestrian
Bicycle and Pedestrian

Table 10.7: Pedestrian Intersection Projects

Project ID	Location	Limits	Length (Miles)	Туре	Phase	Sponsor	Fiscal Year	Total Cost (2020\$)	Federal Cost (2020\$)
BP-26	US 165 S	Richwood Rd 2 to Cotton Bayou Ln	0.36	•	ALL	Town of Richwood	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-27	US 165 S	Ruffin Dr	n/a		ALL	City of Monroe	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-28	US 165 S	Hadley St	n/a		ALL	City of Monroe	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-29	US 165 S	Dellwood Dr	n/a		ALL	City of Monroe	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-30	US 165 S	Ollie Burns Branch Library	n/a		ALL	Town of Richwood	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-31	US 165 S	Richwood Rd 2	n/a		ALL	Town of Richwood	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-32	US 165 S	Richwood High School	n/a		ALL	Town of Richwood	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-33	US 165 S	Renwick St	n/a		ALL	City of Monroe	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-34	Floyd Martin St	Neville High School	n/a		ALL	City of Monroe	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-35	Park Ave	Good Shepard Lane	n/a		ALL	City of Monroe	n/a	TBD	TBD
BP-36	Lexington Ave	Kentwood Dr	n/a		ALL	City of Monroe	n/a	TBD	TBD

Improvement Type:

Lighting
Crosswalk

120

Figure 10.8: High-Priority Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Corridors



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Figure 10.9: Visionary Transit Projects



Data Source: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Disclaimer: This map is for planning purposes only.

Appendix: Public/Stakeholder Outreach Record

Round 1

Project Website

CONNEC Ouachi	ta 2045
Connecting Ouachita 2045 The Ouachita Council of Governments (OCOG) is updating the Metropolitan Transports area. This Joan, also known as Connecting Ouachita, will serve as the region's roadmag 25 years, including improvements for roadways, bridges, railroads, waterways, airports Use this webpage to learn about the plan and share your voice.	ation Plan for the Monroe, Louisiana metro o for improving transportation over the next s, bicycling, walking, and public transit.
Share Your Voice Right now, we want to hear about your transportation priorities and needs. Later this year, we will follow up to get input on the dark plan. We held public meetings, you can still share your input by completing the short survey below. Public Input Survey Opportunity! Take 5 minutes and help shape the future of transportation in Ouachita Parish. View Renditi	Planning Process

Project Website (Continued)

Public Input Survey Opportunity!	Existing Future
Take 5 minutes and help shape the future of transportation in Ouachita Parish.	Strategies and Projects Project Prioritization Impacts
Documents Connecting Ouachita 2045 Flyer.pdf	Financial Plan Funded Visionary
Contact Us For questions or comments, email <u>co2045@Publicingut.com</u>	Finalizing the Plan Recommendations Action Plan
Planning Process	
Visioning Goals Ideas	
PLANNED Need Assessment Existing Future	
PLANNED Strategies and Projects Project Prioritization Impacts	
PLANNED Funded Visionary	
PLANNED PLANNED Recommendations Action Plan	

Facebook Ad



We want to hear your ideas to improve transportation: publicinput.com/ouachita2045

West Monroe Facebook Page



City of West Monroe

How would you improve transportation in Ouachita Parish? The Ouachita Council of Governments is developing a roadmap for improving transportation over the next 20 years, and they need to hear from you! Please consider taking a few moments to complete their short survey.

https://publicinput.com/D466



Survey!

Project Flyer



Public Meeting Boards





BUDGET PRIORITIES

Where would you spend transportation money?

You have \$100 to spend and over \$1,000 worth of transportation projects. Each sticky dot is \$10. Spread the dots around how you see fit!

Category	Sticky Dots
Maintain existing roadways (pavement, bridges, signage, striping)	
Move freight more efficiently (heavy trucks, ports, railroads, air, waterways)	
Improve safety for all users (redesign dangerous areas, biking/walking protections)	
Improve public transit (bus service, vans, new options)	
Use technology & new road designs to reduce traffic (smart traffic signals, intersection improvements, left-turn lanes in medians)	
Add new roads or widen/extend roads (expand roadway network)	
Improve bicycling infrastructure (bike lanes and paths)	
Improve pedestrian infrastructure (sldewalks, crosswalks, walking paths)	
Improve streetscape appearance (trees/plants, decorative lighting/pavement)	



Media Coverage

Help develop a transportation plan for Ouachita with this survey

Ashley Mott, Monroe News-Star Published 6:55 a.m. CT May 7, 2020

The Ouachita Council of Governments is asking residents and visitors in Ouachita Parish to provide input on transportation needs in the region.

OCOG is developing a long-range transportation plan dubbed "Connecting Ouachita" that will serve as the region's roadmap for improving transportation over the next 25 years.

All modes of transportation are included, and the plan includes improvements for roadways, bridges, railroads, waterways, airports, bicycling, walking and public transit.

More: Monroe Transit secures \$4.7 million in CARES Act funding (/story/news/2020/05/04/monroe-transit-secures-4-7-million-cares-actfunding/3080015001/)

An online community survey is available now through May 31 for the public to identify priorities and provide ideas.

The online survey helps to supplement public meetings held in March. People who did not attend these meetings can provide the same input in the survey.

A draft plan will be released for public comment later in 2020.

"Community responses to this survey are critical to developing a transportation plan that helps everyone travel safely and efficiently in Ouachita Parish in the years ahead," remarked Doug Mitchell, OCOG Executive Director. "We want to learn from the public about their concerns for safety, congestion, connectivity, and access to transit or active transportation."

The survey features eight questions and can be accessed at <u>publicinput.com/D466 (https://www.publicinput.com/D466)</u>. It takes approximately five minutes to complete.

Privacy is provided, and individual responses will not be shared.

3/12/2020

State DOTD seeks input on prioritizing road projects | Local/State Headlines | hannapub.com

https://www.hannapub.com/ouachitacitizen/news/local_state_headlines/state-dotd-seeks-input-on-prioritizing-road-projects/article_a8885a00-63b6-11ea-8adb-4b83ca0ada7d.html

TOP STORY

State DOTD seeks input on prioritizing road projects

By Taylor Costanews @ouachitacitizen.com



The Kansas Lane Connector project and construction of a Garrett Road-Interstate 20 interchange in Monroe as well as the Vancil Road interchange in West Monroe are some of the area's top transportation priorities, local officials say.

Elected officials, engineers and other public officials provided feedback to the state Department of Transportation and Development earlier this week on what infrastructure projects should be included in a 25-year plan, or Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

Ouachita Council of Governments (OCOG) hosted the feedback session for Ouachita Parish stakeholders during a meeting Monday at the Monroe Civic Center.

Public Survey

The Greater Monroe, Louisiana region (Ouachita F improving transportation over the next 25 years. F in this short survey!	Parish) is dev Help us plan	for the fu	i roadma iture by p	p for participating
First, tell us a little about yourself.				
1. Please provide your home zip code:				
Check <u>all</u> that apply. Drive Alone Carpool or Ride with Someone Else Walk Bicycle Ride the bus, paratransit, or other public transi Other:	it			
3. Rate these TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES for t What priorities are most important to you?	he Monroe	region.		
Rate these TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES for t What priorities are most important to you?	he Monroe I 1 - Least	region. 2	3	4 – Most
Rate these TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES for t What priorities are most important to you? Improving connectivity between places	he Monroe 1-Least Important	region. 2	3	4 – Most Important
Rate these TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES for t What priorities are most important to you? Improving connectivity between places Reducing traffic congestion	he Monroe I 1-Least Important	2	3	4 - Most Important
Rate these TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES for t What priorities are most important to you? Improving connectivity between places Reducing traffic congestion Improving safety	he Monroe I I-Least Important	2 C	3 () () ()	4 – Most Important
A constraining roads and infrastructure in good condition	he Monroe I	2 C C C C	3 () () () ()	4 – Most Important
Now, tet us what you think? 3. Rate these TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES for t What priorities are most important to you? Improving connectivity between places Reducing traffic congestion Improving safety Maintaining roads and infrastructure in good condition Making transit, biking, and walking more convenient	he Monroe I	region. 2 0 0 0	3 0 0 0	4 - Most Important O O O O
Alow, tea us what you think? Anow, tea us what you think? Anow, tea us what you think? Anow the set of t	he Monroe I	2 0 0 0 0	3 0 0 0 0	4 - Most Important

6.	What are the Monroe region's <u>THREE (3)</u> biggest challenges for biking and walking?
	 Lack of adequate infrastructure (sidewalks, bike paths, etc.)
	Bicycle parking
	Distance between places Maintenance of infractructure (sidewalks roads etc.)
	Safety and comfort
	Awareness and public information
	Other
7.	What are the Monroe region's THREE (3) biggest challenges for riding transit?
	Areas without transit service
	Limited night and weekend service
	Slow travel times
	Unreliability
	Safety and comfort
	Awareness and public information
	Other.
8.	What BIG IDEAS do you have for improving transportation in the Monroe region?
	Think about getting around by all modes – driving, riding transit, walking, biking, etc.

Round 2

Proof of Publication for Public Notice

OUACHITA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT 3000 KILPATRICK BLVD MONROE LA 71201- Account SHR-304416 AD# 0004409067 Net Amount \$18.29 Tax Amount \$0.00 Total Amount \$18.29 Paymer \$18.29 Sales Rep: kthor Order Taker: kthor Product # Ins Start Date SHR-MON-News Star 1 10/08/2020 SHR-MON-News Star Online 1 10/08/2020 * ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION Text of Ad: 10/05/2020 Notice is hereby give en their an public their any write be there berg. Ciry Holl Build- ing, Morroe, Louisio- rng beginning of 11:30 a.m. on October 26, 2020, in here corn; 10/05/2020	<u>PO#</u> 10/26 PH ent Method Payment Amount Amount Due Invoice \$0.00 \$18.29
Account SHR-304416 AD# 0004409067 Net Amount \$18.29 Tax Amount \$0.00 Total Amount \$18.29 Paymer \$0.00 Sales Rep: kthor Order Taker: kthor I Sales Rep: kthor Order Taker: kthor I SHR-MON-News Star 1 10/08/2020 1 10/08/2020 SHR-MON-News Star Online 1 10/08/2020 1 10/08/2020 * ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION Image: Construct of the c	PO# 10/26 PH ent Method Payment Amount Amount Due Invoice \$0.00 \$18.29
Sales Rep: kthor Order Taker: kthor Product # Ins Start Date SHR-MON-News Star 1 10/08/2020 SHR-MON-News Star Online 1 10/08/2020 * ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION Text of Ad: 10/05/2020 Notice is hereby: given that a public in the Council Chammer berd in the Chammer berd in the Council Chammer berd in the Council Chammer berd in the Chamme	
Product # Ins Start Date SHR-MON-News Star 1 10/08/2020 SHR-MON-News Star Online 1 10/08/2020 ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION * Text of Ad: 10/05/2020 Notice is hereby given find of public build in the Council Chammer build in the Council Chammer build in the Council Chammer build ing Monroe, Louision as beginning at 11:30 o.m., on October 26, 2020; *	Order Created 10/05/2020
SHR-MON-News Star 1 10/08/2020 SHR-MON-News Star Online 1 10/08/2020 ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION Text of Ad: 10/05/2020 Notice is hereby given the held in the Council Chamber of the Suid-Ing, Manroe, Louisid-ing, Manroe, Louis	End Date
ALL TRANSACTIONS CONSIDERED PAID IN FULL UPON CLEARANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION Text of Ad: 10/05/2020 Notice is hereby giv- en that a public hearing will be held in the Council Cham- ber, City Hall Build- ing, Manroe, Louisia- na beginning at 11:30 a.m., on October 26, 2020, to hear com-	10/08/2020 10/08/2020
Metropolita Transe Metropolita Transe Metropolita Transe Mil e avoila- ble October 9, 2020 for review for four- teen days at 3000 Kilpatrick Blvd., Monroe, La Monroe, La Monroe, Ja Monroe, Ja	

Meeting Boards








Public/Stakeholder Outreach Record



Meeting Minutes and Sign-In Sheet



Public/Stakeholder Outreach Record

DATE: **October 26, 2020**

ROLL CALL

	MEMBERS	PHONE #	EMAIL	PRESENT	ABSENT
~	Mayor Friday Ellis	318-329-2227	lyndamcmahan@ci.monroe.la.us		
~	Mayor Staci Mitchell	318-396-2600	smitchell@westmonroe.la.gov		
	Mr. Thom Hamilton	318-235-5998	thomhamiltonemail@gmail.com		V
	Mr. Douglas Harvey	318-243-3499	douglas.harvey@ci.monroe.la.us	V	,
8	Mr. Scotty Robinson	318-235-0672	srobinson@oppj.org		V
1	Mr. Shane Smiley	318-267-8659	ssmiley@oppj.org	ン	

PUBLIC HEARING OCOG MEETING MONROE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS October 26, 2020 11:30 A.M./12:00 noon

PLEASE SIGN IN: (Print Please)

NAME	AGENCY REPRESENTING
Shelby, Brockey Jeffry	North Delter
Neal Brown	Olachita EOC
S Mothell	LSM
Jon Witchell	OPPJ
Chane Smiley	(CPP)
Kettre Goorza	S.E. Huerco. / Cityot War Ms
Ony 2	North Duta
Doub mitche	Not Dette