

H.013284 – MRB South GBR: LA 1 to LA 30 Connector



No-Build MRB Models Technical Memorandum December 2021 Revised Final





LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION & DEVELOPMENT CAPITAL AREA ROAD AND BRIDGE DISTRICT

CDM Smith

Table of Contents

Section 1. Introduction and Purpose	1
Section 2. Future-Year Socioeconomic Forecasts	5
2.1. Historical Growth	5
2.2. Forecasted Growth	7
Section 3. Highway Improvement Assumptions	9
Section 4. Future-Year Model Development	15
4.1. External Trips	15
4.2. Trip Distribution Adjustments	16
Section 5. No-Build MRB Model Results	17
5.1. Modeled Traffic Growth	17
5.2. Modeled Mississippi River Crossing Traffic	18
5.3. Post-Processing Adjustments to Modeled Mississippi River Crossing Traffic	19
5.4. Mississippi River Crossing Traffic Volumes by Time Period	22
5.5. Additional Model Screenlines	24
5.6. Select Link Analysis	24
5.7. Impacts of the I-10 Widening Project	24
Section 6. Summary	31
Note on the CRPC Model	22
Disclaimer	35

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 - Study Area Map with MRB Model Coverage	2
Figure 3-1 - MRB Model Highway Improvement Assumptions	13
Figure 5-1 - MRB Model Screenlines	25
Figure 5-2 - 2042 Select-Link Analysis – US 190 Movements in Both Directions Across the	
Mississippi River	26
Figure 5-3 - 2042 Select-Link Analysis- I-10 Eastbound Movements Across the Mississippi	
River	27
Figure 5-4 - 2042 Select-Link Analysis- LA 70 Eastbound Movements Across the Mississippi	
River	28
Figure 5-5 - I-10 Widening Project	29



List of Tables

Table 2-1 - Historical Total Parish Population, Employment, and Occupied Dwelling Unit	
Trends, 2010-2019	6
Table 2-2 - Forecasted Population, Employment, and Occupied Dwelling Unit Trends, 2019-	
2042	8
Table 3-1 - MRB Model Highway Improvement Assumptions	10
Table 4-1 - Distribution of External Trips by Zone, 2019-2042	16
Table 5-1 - Modeled Daily Vehicles Miles Traveled by Parish and Functional Class,	
2019, 2032, and 2042	17
Table 5-2 - Modeled Daily Vehicles Hours Traveled by Parish and Functional Class,	
2019, 2032, and 2042	18
Table 5-3 - Modeled Mississippi River Bridge Traffic, 2019, 2032, and 2042	19
Table 5-4 - Modeled Mississippi River Crossing Traffic with Post-Processing Adjustments,	
2019, 2032, and 2042	20
Table 5-5 - Comparison of Volumes and Growth Rates for MRB Model and CRPC Model	21
Table 5-6 - Estimated Hourly Volumes and Time Period Shares by Bridge from the MRB	
Model	22
Table 5-7 - Volume-over-Capacity Ratios for MRB Model and CRPC Model	23
Table 5-8 - Total Modeled Volumes along MRB Project Screenlines, 2019, 2032, and 2042	25
Table 5-9 - Estimated Impacts of the I-10 Widening Projects, 2032 and 2042	30
Model Table 5-7 - Volume-over-Capacity Ratios for MRB Model and CRPC Model Table 5-8 - Total Modeled Volumes along MRB Project Screenlines, 2019, 2032, and 2042 Table 5-9 - Estimated Impacts of the I-10 Widening Projects, 2032 and 2042	22 23 25 30



List of Acronyms

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
ACS	American Community Survey
BLS	Bureau of Labor Statistics
CAGR	Compound Annual Growth Rate
CRPC	Capital Region Planning Commission
DOTD	Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
E+C	Existing and Committed
E-E	External-External
E-I	External-Internal
GBR	Greater Baton Rouge
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MRB	Mississippi River Bridge
0-D	Origin-Destination
PD&E	Project Development and Environment
SE	Socioeconomic
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone
T&R	Traffic and Revenue
V/C Ratio	Volume-over-Capacity Ratio
VHT	Vehicle Hours Traveled
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled

Y



H.013284 – MRB South GBR: LA 1 to LA 30 Connector No-Build MRB Models Technical Memorandum

The Louisiana Department of Transportation Development (DOTD) is conducting an enhanced planning investigation for a potential new bridge across the Mississippi River, south of the I-10 Horace Wilkinson Bridge in Baton Rouge and north of the Sunshine Bridge (LA 70) near Donaldsonville. In concept, the new Mississippi River Bridge (MRB) will connect LA 1 in the west to LA 30 in the east. The enhanced planning investigation includes several types of traffic analyses, beginning with the development of a project-specific travel demand model followed by the application of that model in support of the initial screening process. This screening process is designed to identify a limited number of environmentally and physically viable alternatives, after considering the full range of alternative river crossings. Subsequent traffic analyses will include the development and application of a mesoscopic model of traffic operations and the development of a traffic and revenue (T&R) model with the production of T&R estimates in a Level 1 Toll Study.

1. Introduction and Purpose

As part of the overall study effort, CDM Smith has developed a model specific to the proposed MRB for use in the analysis of the various project alternatives. The MRB Model will serve as the foundation for travel demand forecasts for each of the proposed alternative river crossings, as well as the T&R projections. The new, project-specific MRB Model is based on the latest version of the regional travel demand model developed and maintained by the Capital Regional Planning Commission (CRPC), which is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Baton Rouge. The CRPC Model was used in the development of the **MOVE2042 Metropolitan Transportation Plan** (2018). CDM Smith updated and revalidated the existing regional travel demand model within the project study area against 2019 traffic counts, inter-parish movements, travel pattern information, and other measures. The model development process was documented in the report titled **Base Year Model Validation Technical Memorandum**, dated April 2021.

As shown in **Figure 1-1**, the overall MRB Model area is outlined in purple, with the external access points indicated by the purple triangles. The focus of the MRB Model is the present and future traffic crossing the Mississippi River and traffic traveling along I-10, LA 1, and LA 30. The three bridges crossing the Mississippi River within the model and study areas are the Huey P. Long Bridge (US 190), the Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10), and the Sunshine Bridge (LA 70). These three facilities are indicated in **Figure 1-1** by red dots.

Following the validation of the Base Year MRB Model, CDM Smith began the development of the future-year No-Build models. This was done by reviewing the existing 2032 and 2042 travel demand models developed by CRPC. The underlying socioeconomic (SE) data forecasts were reviewed and compared against historical trends for reasonableness. The highway improvement assumptions included in the original CRPC Model networks were reviewed and modified based on the latest Long Range Transportation Plan, **MOVE2042 Metropolitan Transportation Plan** (2018). Lastly, the calibration adjustments incorporated into the Base Year MRB Model were carried forward into







the future-year (2032 and 2042) No-Build Models. This technical memorandum documents the development of the No-Build MRB Models and presents results in terms of traffic forecasts for the existing Mississippi River bridges.

It should be noted that CRPC was not involved in the development of the MRB Model and is therefore not responsible for its contents. Additionally, due to the project-specific nature of the validation effort, the MRB Model has limited applicability only to the MRB enhanced planning investigation for assessing relative traffic shares of the existing river crossings and the proposed new river crossing.

Lastly, the MRB Model was validated against pre-COVID-19 pandemic traffic volumes, travel patterns, and speeds, as will be summarized later in this technical memorandum. The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are not included in the base year or the future-year No-Build MRB Models. Therefore, any traffic estimates developed using these models that need to incorporate the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic will need to do so through a separate post-processing adjustment.



This Page Left Intentionally Blank



2. Future-Year Socioeconomic Forecasts

SE data serves as one of the major model inputs and the primary basis for developing trip productions and attractions. The SE data forecasts for the CRPC Model included information about population, households, occupied dwelling units, employment, and schools. The population and household data for the CRPC Model Base Year (2015) were developed by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) by the MPO based on the 2010 Census. Occupied dwelling units in each TAZ were classified based on household size, number of workers, auto ownership, and school age population. Total employment, developed from InfoUSA data, was differentiated into five industry sectors: Agriculture-Mining-Construction, Manufacturing-Transportation-Communication-Utilities-Wholesale Trade, Retail Trade, Government-Office-Services, and Other. Lastly, school attendance was included by TAZ for public and private elementary, middle and high schools, as well as for colleges, universities, and vocational/business schools. Future-year SE forecasts were developed for each of these variables by CRPC for the interim years 2022, 2032, and future year 2042.

In addition to the 2019 Base Year, CDM Smith developed two future years for the MRB Model consistent with the CRPC Model: an interim year of 2032 and a future year of 2042. The socioeconomic forecasts included in the original CRPC Model for these years were reviewed and compared against historical growth trends. That review is presented in this section. Ultimately, CDM Smith decided that the forecasts developed by the MPO were reasonable for the current application and incorporated them directly into the future-year No-Build Models without any changes or adjustments. Given the limited scope of the model development effort, it should be noted that the MRB Model has limited applicability only to the MRB enhanced planning investigation.

2.1. Historical Growth

CDM Smith reviewed historical population, employment, and occupied dwelling unit data by parish between 2010 and 2019. Population and occupied dwelling unit data were obtained for 2010 through 2018 (the latest available year) from the American Community Survey (ACS), published by the U.S. Census Bureau. Employment data were obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) between 2010 and 2019. The MRB Model includes only parts of Iberville, Livingston, and West Baton Rouge Parishes. However, the historical socioeconomic data between 2010 and 2019 were reviewed on a total parish basis. This was done to simplify the analysis since the review of historical socioeconomic data was performed as a way to check the reasonableness of the growth in future-year forecasts. All growth rates are expressed as compound annual growth rates (CAGRs).

Historical population, employment, and occupied dwelling unit data are presented in **Table 2-1**. The average growth rate between 2015 and 2018 was used to develop the estimated 2019 population by parishes. Population for the combined parishes increased by an average of 0.8 percent per year between 2010 and 2019, based on data from ACS. Livingston Parish grew the fastest, at an average of 2.2 percent per year, while the population of East Baton Rouge grew the slowest, with slight declines in recent years.



			Total P	arish Population	(1)		
				(-)	2010-2015	2015-2019	2010-2019
Parish	2010	2015	2018	Est. 2019 ⁽²⁾	CAGR	CAGR	CAGR
Ascension	102,501	114,738	121,176	123,116	2.3%	1.8%	2.1%
East Baton Rouge	435,815	444,690	444,094	439,127	0.4%	-0.3%	0.1%
Iberville	33,513	33,229	32,956	35,919	-0.2%	2.0%	0.8%
Livingston	122,798	133,949	138,111	149,268	1.8%	2.7%	2.2%
West Baton Rouge	23,274	24,669	25,860	26,159	1.2%	1.5%	1.3%
Total	717,901	751,275	762,197	773,590	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%
			Total Pa	arish Employmen	t ⁽³⁾		
					2010-2015	2015-2019	2010-2019
Parish	2010	2015		2019	CAGR	CAGR	CAGR
Ascension	34,207	45,071		46,953	5.7%	1.4%	4.0%
East Baton Rouge	253,130	269,042		265,287	1.2%	-0.5%	0.6%
Iberville	13,783	15,424		15,369	2.3%	-0.1%	1.4%
Livingston	30,507	46,831		60,655	8.9%	9.0%	9.0%
West Baton Rouge	22,131	25,723	_	29,415	3.1%	4.6%	3.6%
Total	353,758	402,091		417,679	2.6%	1.3%	2.1%
			Total Parish C	ccupied Dwelling	g Units ⁽¹⁾		
					2010-2015	2015-2019	2010-2019
Parish	2010	2015	2018	Est. 2019 ⁽²⁾	CAGR	CAGR	CAGR
Ascension	35,640	40,110	42,649	43,332	2.4%	2.0%	2.2%
East Baton Rouge	166,543	169,120	165,939	164,083	0.3%	-0.8%	-0.2%
Iberville	11,118	11,191	10,918	11,900	0.1%	1.5%	0.8%
Livingston	42,962	47,608	48,859	52,806	2.1%	2.6%	2.3%
West Baton Rouge	8,386	9,179	9,599	9,710	1.8%	1.4%	1.6%
Total	264 649	277.208	277 964	201 021	0.0%	0.4%	0.7%

Table 2-1 Historical Total Parish Population, Employment, and Occupied Dwelling Unit Trends, 2010-2019

aton Rouge, and Iberville Parishes.

Totals shown above represent the total population, employment and dwelling units for the entire parish. Measurement methodologies for employment and dwelling units within the MRB Model

differ from those used by the U.S. Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(1) Source: 2010-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau. 2019 Data Not Available.

(2) 2019 population and occupied delling unit estimates were developed by applying the average 2015 to 2018 growth rates to the 2018 estimates.

(3) Source: 2010-2019 Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Data from BLS between 2010 and 2019 indicates an average annual increase in employment of 2.1 percent. It should be noted that the estimates from BLS use a different measurement methodology for counting employment than the MRB Model, but are reasonable to perform these growth rate checks. Employment growth was strongest in Livingston Parish, with a relatively consistent growth rate of about 9.0 percent per year between 2010 and 2019. Most employment growth occurred in Livingston Parish. By contrast, employment in East Baton Rouge grew by an average of 1.2 percent per year between 2010 and 2015, but then declined by an average of 0.5 percent per year over the next four years.



The number of occupied dwelling units generally followed population trends, with slightly lower growth since 2015. This caused the average number of people per household to slightly increase from 2.71 in 2010 and 2015 to 2.74 in 2018. It should be noted that the estimates from ACS use a different measurement methodology for counting occupied dwelling units than the MRB Model, but are reasonable to perform these growth rate checks.

2.2. Forecasted Growth

The MRB Model SE dataset is based on the data produced by the MPO. The primary socioeconomic inputs to the model include population, employment, and occupied dwelling units. As part of the Base Year MRB Model development, CDM Smith updated the base year TAZ level socioeconomic dataset from the 2015 conditions included in the original CRPC model to 2019 conditions in the MRB Model based on data from ACS and BLS. As previously noted, the MRB Model includes only parts of Iberville, Livingston, and West Baton Rouge Parishes, and also assumes different measurement methodologies for employment and occupied dwelling units based on those used by the MPO. For this reason, the initial straight-line 2019 estimates of population, employment, and dwelling units based on the 2015 and 2022 model socioeconomic inputs were adjusted proportionally based on the 2015, 2018, and 2019 data from ACS and BLS.

The scope of the current study did not include the development of original socioeconomic forecasts. Instead, CDM Smith reviewed the MPO forecasts for reasonableness against historical trends and expected growth rates for a typical Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study. Ultimately, CDM Smith decided to use the MPO SE data forecasts for the current application and incorporated them into the future-year No-Build Models without any changes or adjustments. The MRB Model SE data forecasts are presented in **Table 2-2** and compared against the 2019 Base Year assumptions. As previously noted, the MRB Model includes only parts of Iberville, Livingston, and West Baton Rouge Parishes, which is reflected in the forecasts in **Table 2-2**.

Under the MRB Model assumptions, population for the combined parishes is estimated to increase by an average of 1.4 percent annually between 2019 and 2042. Livingston Parish is forecasted to grow the fastest, with lower population growth forecasted in East Baton Rouge and Iberville Parishes. The MRB Model socioeconomic forecasts between 2019 and 2042 indicate an average annual increase in employment of 1.8 percent. Employment growth is forecasted to be strongest in Ascension and Livingston Parishes and slower in East Baton Rouge Parish. As with the historical socioeconomic dataset, the forecasted growth in occupied dwelling units generally follows the forecasts of population.

Lastly, it should be noted that the socioeconomic inputs incorporated into the MRB Model were developed prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, the MRB Model itself was validated against pre-COVID-19 pandemic traffic conditions. Thus, the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are not included in the base year MRB Model or the future-year MRB No-Build Models.



				2019-2032	2032-2042	2019-2042
Parish	2019	2032	2042	CAGR	CAGR	CAGR
Ascension	123,116	170,424	202,637	2.5%	1.7%	2.2%
East Baton Rouge	439,127	508,929	530,980	1.1%	0.4%	0.8%
Iberville	24,996	28,535	30,100	1.0%	0.5%	0.8%
Livingston	119,825	166,006	202,083	2.5%	2.0%	2.3%
West Baton Rouge	25,974	33,023	38,483	1.9%	1.5%	1.7%
Total	733,038	906,918	1,004,283	1.7%	1.0%	1.4%
			Employment with	nin MRB Model		
				2019-2032	2032-2042	2019-2042
Parish	2019	2032	2042	CAGR	CAGR	CAGR
Ascension	52,138	98,490	131,546	5.0%	2.9%	4.1%
East Baton Rouge	287,694	335,141	360,639	1.2%	0.7%	1.0%
Iberville	14,517	17,178	19,774	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%
Livingston	30,507	46,831	60,655	3.4%	2.6%	3.0%
West Baton Rouge	13,319	18,299	20,941	2.5%	1.4%	2.0%
Total	398,174	515,938	593,555	2.0%	1.4%	1.8%
		Occu	pied Dwelling Uni	ts within MRB Mod	el	
				2019-2032	2032-2042	2019-2042
Parish	2019	2032	2042	CAGR	CAGR	CAGR
Ascension	46,969	65,316	78,074	2.6%	1.8%	2.2%
East Baton Rouge	186,075	217,454	227,904	1.2%	0.5%	0.9%
Iberville	8,783	10,219	10,882	1.2%	0.6%	0.9%
Livingston	45,941	63,354	77,159	2.5%	2.0%	2.3%
West Baton Rouge	10,218	13,157	15,496	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Total	297,986	369,500	409,514	1.7%	1.0%	1.4%

Table 2-2 Forecasted Population, Employment, and Occupied Dwelling Unit Trends, 2019-2042

above represent only the population, employment, and dwelling units included in the MRB Model.



3. Highway Improvement Assumptions

The MRB Model has two future years: 2032 and 2042. The highway improvements included in the 2032 and 2042 networks are based on the **MOVE2042 Metropolitan Transportation Plan** (2018), developed by CRPC. In the MOVE2042 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, highway improvements are classified as Existing and Committed (E+C), Stage I, Stage II, or Stage III. Projects listed as E+C were already completed or included in the CRPC five-year work program when the MOVE2042 Metropolitan Transportation Plan was developed in 2018. Thus, they represent projects completed between 2015 (Model Base Year) and 2018 (MOVE2042 Publication Date). Projects planned for completion between 2019 and 2022 (the first CRPC Model Interim Year), were classified as Stage I, while projects planned for completion between 2023 and 2032 (the second CRPC Model Interim Year), were classified as Stage II. Stage III projects represent those highway improvements planned for completion by 2042, the future year of the CRPC Model.

All projects completed by 2019 were included in the 2019 Base Year highway network. In addition to improvements in the 2019 Base Year, Stage I and Stage II improvements were included in the MRB Model 2032 Interim Year highway network. The MRB Model highway networks for 2042 included the Stage III improvements, along with all prior year improvements. CDM Smith reviewed the planned highway improvements and checked to ensure they were properly reflected in the network and in the correct model year.

Based on a review by DOTD, two additional highway improvements were added to the 2032 network:

- LA 1068 / Drusilla Lane between LA 73 and LA 426: Add Turning Lane and Sidewalks; and
- **Port Hudson Pride Road** between LA 964 and LA 19: Add Turning Movements, Shoulders, and Drainage.

While these important transportation improvements will be included in other modeling efforts for the overall MRB analysis, these types of improvements do not have a significant impact within the MRB Model, a regional travel demand model.

Table 3-1 presents the highway improvements incorporated into the future-year MRB Models by model year. A map of the highway improvement locations is presented in **Figure 3-1**.

One particular improvement that may impact the new MRB project is the planned widening of I-10 (Projects 2210, 2211, 2710, 2711, 3211, 3212, 4210, and 9910). With this improvement project, on the east side of the Mississippi River, I-10 is assumed to be widened to 6 lanes between Highland Road (just east of the existing I-10 bridge) and Essen Lane (just east of the I-10 / I-12 interchange). West of the Mississippi River, I-10 is assumed to be widened to 6 lanes between LA 415 / Lobdell Highway and LA 1. No widening is planned for the existing I-10 Horace Wilkinson Bridge. The I-10 widening project has been included in the 2032 and 2042 future-year No-Build highway networks. This widening project provides some level of competition to the proposed MRB, but the level of competition is minimal because the actual I-10 river crossing cannot easily be improved. The estimated impacts of the I-10 widening to the existing Mississippi River crossings are provided as a test of model performance later in this technical memorandum.



Earliest MIKB Model Year	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032
LKIP Project Type	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	E+C	Stage I	Stage I	Stage I	Stage I	Stage I	Stage I	Stage I	Stage I	Stage I	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II
Description	Construct New 4-Lane Road	Construct New 2-Lane Road and Local Connectors - Phase I	Construct New 2-Lane Road	Reconstruct Center Turn Lane	Widen to 6 Lanes	New Exit Ramp and Safety Improvements	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Reduce 4-Lane Undivided Highway to 3 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Reconstruct 2 Lanes	Construct New 4-Lane Road - Phase II	Construct New 2-Lane Road and Local Connectors	Add Turning Lanes	Construct I-10 Westbound College Dr. Flyover Frontage Road	Widen I-10 Westbound Mainline	Construct New 4-Lane Road	Widen to 4 Lanes and Construct Roundabout	Add Safety Improvements and Turning Lanes	Pave and Add Shoulders	Add Turning Lanes	Construct New 3-Lane Road	Widen to 4 Lanes	Convert Access Signal Turning Lane to 3 Lanes	Add Turning Lane and Sidewalks	Widen from 10 ft. Lane to 12 ft. Lane	Widen to 4 Lanes	Construct New 2-Lane Road	Widen to 3 Lanes	Roundabouts @ Dalrymple, Frontage Rd.	Close and Open Ramps	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen I-10 Mainline
To	LA 1026 / Juban Rd.	0.7 mi. E of LA 3064 / Essen Ln.	St. Landry Ave.	McClelland Dr.	Highland Rd.		Satsuma Ramp	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	LA 3034 / Hooper Rd.	LA 44	Lobdell Ave.	Choctaw Dr.	Edenbourne Pkwy.	LA 3064 / Essen Ln.	Picardy Ave.	LA 67 / Plank Rd.		College Dr.	Picardy Ave.	Loosemoore Rd.	Port Hudson Pride Rd.	Lower Zachary Rd.	Tiger Bend Rd.	Labdell Blvd.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	Forster Rd.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	LA 73 / Jefferson Hwy.	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	LA 964 / Old Scenic Hwy.	Tiger Bend Rd.			LA 3064 / Essen Ln.	LA 1 / Louisiana Scenic Bayou Byway	LA 22	I-12
From	LA 16 / Petes Hwy.	LA 3064 / Essen Ln.	Ashland Rd.	LA 67 / Plank Rd.	LA 73	Terrace Ave.	0.5 mi. W of Satsuma Ramp	1-12	LA 408 / Wax Rd.	US 61	East Blvd.	LA 37 / Greenwell Springs Rd.	LA30	LA 1248 / Bluebonnet Blvd.	Dijon Rd. Extension	LA 19	College Dr.	LA 3064 / Essen Ln.	LA 427 / Perkins Rd.	1-10	LA 64 / Main St.	Groom Rd.	LA 73 / Jefferson Hwy.	Ardenwood Dr.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	LA 73 / Jefferson Hwy.	LA 73 / Jefferson Hwy.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	Burbank Dr.	US 61 / Samuels Rd.	LA 73 / Jefferson Hwy.	Dalrymple Dr.	Dalrymple Dr.	Highland Rd.	LA 415 / Lobdell Hwy.	LA 73 / Old Jefferson Hwy.	Terrace Ave.
Roadway	Cook Rd.	Dijon Rd. Extension	Edenborne Pkwy.	Glen Oaks Dr.	1-10	I-110	1-12	LA 1026 / Juban Rd.	LA 3034 / Sullivan Rd.	LA 42	LA 73	N Sherwood Forest Blvd.	St. Landry Ave.	Dijon Rd. Extension	Dijon RdPicardy Ave. Connector	Groom Rd.	1-10	1-10	LA 427 / Perkins RdPicardy Ave. Connector	LA 44 / N Burnside Ave.	MacHost Rd.	McHugh Rd.	Antioch Rd.	Ardenwood DrLobdell Blvd. Connector	Cedarcrest Ave.	Claycut Rd.	LA 1068 / Drusilla Ln.	Duplessis Rd.	Gardere Ln.	Groom Rd. Extension	Hoo Shoo Too Rd.	1-10	1-10	1-10	I-10	I-10	I-10
Parish	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Livingston	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	West Baton Rouge	Ascension	East Baton Rouge
Project ID	6	10	14	7	3	26	21	11	5	1	17	4	15	937	934	938	2211	2210	932	551	917	917	926	927	612	941	N/A	927	927	628	930	3211	3212	9910	9910	502 / 927	2710

Table 3-1 MRB Model Highway Improvement Assumptions



Earliest MRB	Model Year	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032
LRTP Project	Type	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II
	Description	Construct Roundabouts to Coordinate with I-10 Ramps	New Interchange	Construct New 4-Lane Road	Construct New 2-Lane Road	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 4/5 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Construct New 4-Lane Road	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 3 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes
	To			Tiger Bend Rd.	LA 1 / Louisiana Scenic Bayou Byway	1-12	Vincent Rd.	Picardy Ave.	Vincent Rd.	Sunset Blvd.	St. James Parish Line	Ashland Rd to Burnside Ave	Iberville Parish Line	Brightside Dr.	0.5 mi. W of S Range Ave.	Magnolia Bridge Rd.	Sullivan Rd.	Millewille Rd.	O'Neal Ln.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	Pecue Ln.	Hennessy Blvd.	LA 42 / Oak Grove-Port Vincent Hwy.	Burgess Ave.	Hood Rd.	LA 16 / N Range Ave.	LA 408 / Hooper Rd. / Harding Blvd.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	I-10	LA 42	LA 44 / Burnside Ave.	LA 427 / Perkins Dr.	Duplanier, Bayou	1-10	LA 946 / Joor Rd.
	From	Washington Rd. and Terrace Ave.	LA 16 / Petes Hwy.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	LA 415 / Lobdell Hwy.	Wax Rd.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	LA 427 / Perkins Rd.	Centerville St.	LA 64 / Main St.	I-10	Ashland Rd to Burnside Ave	Brightside Dr.	Gourrier Ave.	LA 16 / Petes Hwy.	Sullivan Rd.	Blackwater Rd.	Blvd. De Provence	Millerville Rd.	O'Neal Ln.	Siegen Ln.	LA 427 / Perkins Rd.	LA 621 / Cante Rd.	Hodges Rd.	1-12	Amite River	US 190 / Airline Hwy.	I-10	LA 74	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	E Ascension School Rd.	Duplanier, Bayou	Highland Rd.	LA 427 / Perkins Dr.	LA 408 / Hooper Rd.
	Roadway	1-10	I-12	Jones Creek Rd. Extension	LA 1/I-10 Connector	LA 1026 / Juban Rd.	LA 1032 / 4H Club Rd.	LA 1248 / Bluebonnet Blvd.	LA 16 / Petes Hwy.	LA 19	LA 22 / LA 70	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	LA 3003 / Rushing Rd.	LA 37 / Greenwell Springs Rd.	LA 408 / Hooper Rd.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	LA 427 / Perkins Rd.	LA 427 / Perkins RdHennessy Blvd. Connector	LA 44 / N Burnside Ave.	LA 447 / Walker Rd.	LA 447 / Walker Rd.	LA 64 / Magnolia Beach Rd.	LA 67 / Plank Rd.	LA 73 / Old Jefferson Hwy.	LA 73 / Old Jefferson Hwy.	LA 73 / Old Jefferson Hwy.	LA 940 / Orice Roth Rd.	Lee Dr.	Lee Dr.	Lee Dr. / College Dr.	Mickens Rd.
	Parish	East Baton Rouge	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	West Baton Rouge	Livingston	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	Livingston	Livingston	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	Ascension	Ascension	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge
CRPC	Project ID	2711	642	927	714	634	641	927	637	927	927	927	902	927	636	627	927	904	927	906	927	927	701	638	713	633	943	601	602	704	606	912	911	913	915

Table 3-1 (Continued) MRB Model Highway Improvement Assumptions



Earliest MRB	Model Year	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2032	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042
LRTP Project	Type	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage II	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III	Stage III
	Description	Construct New 2-Lane Road	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Add Turnning Lanes	Add Turning Movements, Shoulders, and Drainage	Add Turnning Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 3 Lanes / Realign with Millerville Rd.	Widen to 3 Lanes	Add Turnning Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Convert Access Signal Turning Lane to Divided Highway	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 8 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Intersection Improvement	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	New Westbound Exit Ramp	Construct New 4-Lane Road	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 5 Lanes	Widen to 6 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Widen to 4 Lanes	Midae to A Lapor
	То	LA 946 / Joor Rd.	N Forester Dr.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	LA19 / Zachary-Slaughter Hwy.	LA 19	LA19 / Zachary-Slaughter Hwy.	Central Thwy.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	LA 67 / Plank Rd.	Antioch Rd.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	Burgess Ave.	Monterey Blvd.	Bluebonnet Blvd.	LA 37 / Greenwell Springs Rd.	1-110	Flortine Blvd.	Swan Ave.	LA 37 / Greenwell Springs Rd.	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	W of Mississippi River		LA 1026 / Lockhart Rd.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	Ascension Parish Line	Ashland Rd.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	Mickens Rd.	LA 942 / River Rd.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	Joor Rd.	LA 964 / Old Scenic Hwy.	I A GA / Marine C+
	From	LA 37 / Greenwell Springs Rd.	N 18th St.	LA 427 / Perkins Dr.	LA964 / Old Scenic Highway	LA 964 / Old Scenic Hwy.	LA964 / Old Scenic Highway	N Flannery Rd.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	LA 426 / Old Hammond Hwy.	LA 19 / Scotland Ave.	Jones Creek Rd.	1-110	LA 16 / Petes Hwy.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	Ascension Parish Line	Florline Blvd.	LA 37 / Greenwell Springs Rd.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	LA 408 / Harding Blvd.	Sullivan Rd.	E of Mississippi River	LA 415	LA 3064 / Essen Ln.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	LA 73 / Jefferson Hwy.	East Baton Rouge Parish Line	Iberville Parish Line	LA 44 / Burnside Ave.	LA 67 / Plank Rd.	Loosemoore Rd.	LA 73 / Old Jefferson Hwy.	LA 67 / Plank Rd.	US 61 / Samuels Rd.	Concern Da
	Roadway	N Sherwood Forest Dr. Extension	North St.	Pecue Ln.	Port Hudson Pride Rd.	Port Hudson Pride Rd.	Rollins Rd.	S Choctaw Rd.	S Flannery Rd.	Sharp Rd.	Thomas Rd.	Tiger Bend Rd.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	US 61 / Airline Hwy.	US 61 / Scenic Hwy.	Wax Rd. / Magnolia Bridge Rd.	I-10	1-10	I-12	Juban Rd. Extension	LA 1068 / Drusilla Ln.	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	LA 30 / Nicholson Dr.	LA 408 / Hooper Rd.	LA 44 / N Burnside Ave.	LA 621	LA 64 / Greenwell Springs-Port Hudson Rd.	LA 64 / Rockport St.	1 A C7 / DIada Dd
	Parish	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	West Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Livingston	East Baton Rouge	Iberville	Ascension	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	Ascension	Ascension	East Baton Rouge	East Baton Rouge	Fact Dates Davids
CRPC	Project ID	914	945	927	918	N/A	919	927	922	944	920	929	946	631	617	927	927	927	927	939	925	4210	4210	623	632	613	847	809	810	625	431	702	707	464	001

Table 3-1 (Continued) MRB Model Highway Improvement Assumptions





Figure 3-1 MRB Model Highway Improvement Assumptions

This Page Left Intentionally Blank



4. Future-Year Model Development

In addition to the socioeconomic and highway improvement inputs to the model, CDM Smith incorporated several adjustments to the future-year No-Build MRB Models. These included carrying forward the trip distribution adjustments included in the Base Year Model, revising the external trip matrices, and applying the final calibration adjustments to the future-year trip tables. This section details those adjustments to the No-Build MRB Models.

4.1. External Trips

External trips have one trip end or both trip ends outside the model area. External-Internal (EI) trips have one trip end (origin or destination) outside of the model area. External-External (EE) trips have both ends outside of the model area. The sum of these external trips is determined by traffic counts at the external locations. The four external trip purposes included in the MRB Model are:

- External-Internal Auto Trips (EIAUTO)
- External-Internal Truck Trips (EITRK)
- External-External (Through) Auto Trips (EEAUTO)
- External-External (Through) Truck Trips (EETRK)

The external trips in the Base Year MRB Model were updated with 2019 counts, separated by vehicle class (auto and truck). In addition, travel pattern information from StreetLight Data, Inc. was used to reset the proportion of external trips that are EE trips and the pattern of EE trips from each location, both auto and truck.

In light of these changes, adjustments were made to the future-year external trip matrices in order to carry forward the adjustments made in the base year. In general, these adjustments involved developing traffic growth rates for the external points and then applying those growth rates to the adjusted volumes and trip distributions included in the Base Year MRB Model. This was done by first reviewing the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes at external access points in the base year. Then CDM Smith reviewed the average annual growth rate in external AADT volumes between 2019 and 2042 for each external access point and capped the growth rate at 1.5 percent. Volumes at 2032 levels were developed for the external access points through interpolation between volumes in the base year of 2019 and volumes in the future year of 2042. This process allowed CDM Smith to capture the StreetLight trip distribution incorporated into the Base Year MRB Model. The resulting volumes and growth rates at the external access points are presented in **Table 4-1**.

CDM Smith then used the revised AADT volumes presented in **Table 4-1** to develop the distribution of trips at the external points by TAZ. For EE trips, CDM Smith applied the same adjustments to the external trip matrix as part of the model validation to the 2032 and 2042 matrices in the No-Build MRB Models. The resulting EE trips were then subtracted from the external AADT volumes to determine the EI trip ends. These EI trip ends were matched with internal TAZs using a FRATAR growth factor procedure in TransCAD using the 2019 trip table, which incorporated actual Origin-Destination (O-D) data from StreetLight. In this manner, the distribution of the external trips from StreetLight was carried forward into the future years.



			10101	70121 01 2AU				nate (chong
TAZ No.	Road Name	Model Edge	2019	2032	2042	2019-2032	2032-2042	2019-2042
3001	US 61 / Samuels Rd.	North	23,258	25,643	27,477	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%
3002	Old Scenic Highway	North	5,633	6,934	7,934	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3003	LA 19	North	6,543	8,053	9,215	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3004	LA 67 / Plank Rd.	North	8,363	9,509	10,391	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%
3005	LA 409	North	544	596	637	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
3006	LA 37	North	3,323	3,677	3,950	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
3007	LA 16	North	8,000	9,254	10,219	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%
3008	LA 449	North	2,581	2,745	2,871	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%
3009	LA 442	East	1,326	1,454	1,551	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
3010	US 190 / Florida Blvd.	East	6,868	7,593	8,151	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%
3011	I-12	East	87,434	100,143	109,919	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%
3012	LA 42	East	3,390	4,173	4,775	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3013	LA 444	East	4,882	5,110	5,286	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
3014	LA 22	East	3,646	4,020	4,308	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%
3015	I-10	Southeast	45,655	56,193	64,299	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3016	US 61	Southeast	17,330	21,330	24,407	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3017	LA 70	South	9,462	11,646	13,326	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3018	LA 44	South	3,506	4,132	4,613	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
3019	LA 77	West	1,994	2,350	2,623	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
3020	I-10	West	52,810	59,641	64,895	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%
3021	LA 76 / Rosedale Rd.	West	1,974	2,230	2,428	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
3022	US 190	West	19,743	23,266	25,976	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
3023	LA 415	Northwest	1,357	1,670	1,910	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3024	LA 3125	South	4,519	5,562	6,364	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3025	LA 3127	South	2,309	2,842	3,252	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3026	LA 308	South	1,312	1,546	1,726	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
3027	LA 1	South	4,366	5,105	5,673	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
3028	LA 69	Southwest	4,377	5,158	5,759	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
3029	LA 75	West	2,489	2,537	2,574	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
3030	LA 983	Northwest	2,116	2,605	2,981	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3031	LA 18	South	4,154	5,112	5,850	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
3032	LA 441	East	3,357	4,066	4,612	1.5%	1.3%	1.4%
	Total		348 622	405 895	449 951	1 2%	1.0%	1 1%

Table 4-1Distribution of External Trips by Zone, 2019-2042

4.2. Trip Distribution Adjustments

As detailed in **Base Year Model Validation Technical Memorandum**, dated April 2021, several updates were made to the trip distribution step during the development of the MRB Model. These included adjustments to the friction factors, K-factors, and time penalties employed during the gravity model component of the trip distribution step. The same adjustments were carried forward and applied in the 2032 and 2042 No-Build MRB Models.



5. No-Build MRB Model Results

CDM Smith developed No-Build MRB Models for 2032 and 2042 conditions within the study area. Using the No-Build MRB Models, traffic assignments were performed at 2032 and 2042 levels. This section provides a summary of the future-year model results.

5.1. Modeled Traffic Growth

Total traffic growth within the MRB Model is captured by comparing the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) on all links in each of the model years. The sum-product of modeled daily traffic volumes and link lengths on all network links is the VMT. The sum-product of modeled daily traffic volumes and link travel times on all network links is the VHT. While VMT provides a basic measure of the overall traffic level within the model, VHT tends to provide an estimate of the level of congestion within the model.

Table 5-1 contains a comparison of modeled daily VMT at 2019, 2032, and 2042 levels by parish and by functional class. Total daily VMT is estimated to increase by an average annual rate of 1.3 percent between 2019 and 2042 for the full MRB Model. As is typically observed in travel demand models, the VMT growth estimates closely follow the socioeconomic inputs, particularly those of population. For this reason, CDM Smith deems the overall traffic growth within the MRB future-year No-Build Model to be reasonable.

	Modeled Dai	ly Vehicle Miles Tra	eveled (VMT)	Compound A	nnual Growth	Rate (CAGR)
Parish	2019	2032	2042	2019 to 2032	2032 to 2042	2019 to 2042
Ascension	4,074,000	5,562,000	6,537,000	2.4%	1.6%	2.1%
East Baton Rouge	10,742,000	12,583,000	13,459,000	1.2%	0.7%	1.0%
Iberville	556,000	680,000	865,000	1.6%	2.4%	1.9%
Livingston	4,579,000	5,620,000	6,380,000	1.6%	1.3%	1.5%
West Baton Rouge	1,542,000	1,807,000	2,015,000	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%
Total	21,493,000	26,252,000	29,256,000	1.6%	1.1%	1.3%
	Modeled Dail	ly Vehicle Miles Tra	aveled (VMT)	Compound A	nnual Growth	Rate (CAGR)
Functional Class	2019	2032	2042	2019 to 2032	2032 to 2042	2019 to 2042
Interstate	7,734,000	8,988,000	9,695,000	1.2%	0.8%	1.0%
Ramp	340,000	403,000	439,000	1.3%	0.9%	1.1%
Principal Arterial	6,535,000	7,900,000	8,486,000	1.5%	0.7%	1.1%
Minor Arterial	3,587,000	4,758,000	5,726,000	2.2%	1.9%	2.1%
Collector	2,627,000	3,282,000	3,757,000	1.7%	1.4%	1.6%
Local	670,000	921,000	1,153,000	2.5%	2.3%	2.4%
				4.59/	4.40/	4 20/

 Table 5-1

 Modeled Daily Vehicles Miles Traveled by Parish and Functional Class, 2019, 2032, and 2042



Table 5-2 contains a comparison of modeled daily VHT at 2019, 2032, and 2042 levels by functional class. Total daily VHT is estimated to increase by an average annual rate of 1.6 percent between 2019 and 2042 for the full MRB Model. The higher rate of growth (VHT over VMT) indicates an expected reduction in overall travel speeds and an increase in congestion within the modeled network.

	Modeled Da	ily Vehicle Hours Ti	aveled (VHT)	Compound A	Annual Growth	Rate (CAGR)
Parish	2019	2032	2042	2019 to 2032	2032 to 2042	2019 to 2042
Interstate	157,200	187,500	212,200	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%
Ramp	11,100	13,900	15,900	1.7%	1.4%	1.6%
Principal Arterial	175,000	216,500	242,600	1.7%	1.1%	1.4%
Minor Arterial	99,700	135,800	166,000	2.4%	2.0%	2.2%
Collector	68,600	86,800	102,200	1.8%	1.6%	1.7%
Local	17,200	24,100	30,800	2.6%	2.5%	2.6%
Total	528,800	664,600	769,700	1.8%	1.5%	1.6%

Table 5-2
Modeled Daily Vehicles Hours Traveled by Functional Class, 2019, 2032, and 2042

5.2. Modeled Mississippi River Crossing Traffic

Table 5-3 contains a summary of modeled trips crossing the Mississippi River at 2019, 2032, and 2042 levels. Modeled daily traffic volumes, represented as AADTs, have been rounded. Average traffic growth using all the Mississippi River bridges is 1.1 percent annually between 2019 and 2042. This is consistent with the overall VMT growth for the full MRB Model and the level of congestion associated with the I-10 Bridge. Of the three bridges, traffic on LA 70 is estimated to increase at the fastest rate (average of 2.3 percent annually). This is likely due to the lower starting volume of the Sunshine Bridge, as compared to the other Mississippi River crossings, and the higher socioeconomic growth estimated for the nearby portions of Ascension and Livingston Parishes. For all model years, the majority of traffic crossing the Mississippi River within the study area uses the I-10 Bridge. Present-day traffic volumes on the I-10 Bridge are constrained during congested peak hours. As a result, future growth on this bridge appears as increased volumes during the shoulder hours just prior to and after the peak periods, representing a spreading of the peak periods.



	Modeled Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes			Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR		
Bridge Name	2019	2032	2042	2019 to 2032	2032 to 2042	2019 to 2042
Huey P. Long Bridge (US 190) Percent of River Crossing Trips	26,200 14.3%	32,200 15.0%	35,200 14.8%	1.6%	0.9%	1.3%
Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10) Percent of River Crossing Trips	126,400 69.0%	140,300 65.4%	151,600 63.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Sunshine Bridge (LA 70) Percent of River Crossing Trips	30,700 16.7%	42,000 19.6%	51,300 21.5%	2.4%	2.0%	2.3%
Total	183,300	214,500	238,100	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%

Table 5-3Modeled Mississippi River Bridge Traffic, 2019, 2032, and 2042

5.3. Post-Processing Adjustments to Modeled Mississippi River Crossing Traffic

CDM Smith utilized the MRB Model to develop estimates of future year traffic volumes on the existing Mississippi River crossings and the roadways within the study area. However, as noted in the report titled **Base Year Model Validation Technical Memorandum**, dated April 2021, modeled 2019 traffic volumes traveling across the Mississippi River were in total 15 percent greater than actual 2019 traffic counts. Due to this difference between modeled and actual volumes, an additional post-processing adjustment was applied to the modeled traffic volumes for the three Mississippi River bridges in order to bring them in line with actual data. This approach allowed the trip distribution and assignment elements of the MRB Model to be reflected in the future year traffic volume estimates while also adjusting for the difference between the validated model and actual counts at the three existing Mississippi River crossings. This section describes how that adjustment was developed and applied in order to generate the future year volume estimates for the existing Mississippi River crossings.

As previously noted, modeled 2019 traffic volumes traveling across the Mississippi River were in total greater than actual 2019 traffic counts. Thus, in order to bring 2019 modeled volumes in line with actual counts, overall modeled volumes for the existing Mississippi River bridges needed to be reduced by 13.0 percent. This post-processing adjustment was made by bridge, so that the volumes at each crossing would match the 2019 counts. The modeled volumes for the Huey P. Long Bridge (US 190) were reduced by 0.4 percent, the modeled volumes for the Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10) were reduced by 13.1 percent, and modeled volumes on the Sunshine Bridge (LA 70) were reduced by 23.5 percent. These percent reductions were equivalent to nominal reductions in estimated daily volumes of 100 vehicles on US 190, 16,600 vehicles on I-10, and 7,200 vehicles on LA 70. The total nominal reduction for all three existing Mississippi River crossings was 23,900 vehicles per average day.

Future year post-processing adjustments were developed by carrying forward the previously noted nominal differences between modeled 2019 volumes and actual 2019 volumes through to 2032 and 2042. Thus, the reductions of 100 vehicles on US 190, 16,600 vehicles on I-10, and 7,200 vehicles on LA 70 were applied to the modeled volumes in all model years (2019, 2032, and 2042). This approach presumes that any normal growth or estimated impacts from the assumed highway improvements will be adequately reflected in the No-Build MRB Model.



Table 5-4 summarizes the post-processing adjustments applied to each of the three Mississippi River bridges in each of the model years. As already discussed, modeled 2019 volumes were reduced by a total of 23,900 vehicles, or 13.0 percent, in order to match the actual 2019 traffic counted volumes. This same adjustment was applied in 2032 and 2042, resulting in overall reductions of 11.2 percent and 10.0 percent, respectively.

					Compound Appual
		Annual Avera	age Daily Traf	fic Volume	s Growth Rate (CAGR
Bridge Name		2019	2032	2042	2019 to 2042
Huey P. Long Bridge (US 190)	Modeled Volume	26,200	32,200	35,200	1.3%
	Adjusted Volume	26,100	32,100	35,100	1.3%
	Nominal Adjustmen	t -100	-100	-100	
	Percent Adjustment	-0.4%	-0.3%	-0.3%	
Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10)	Modeled Volume	126,400	140,300	151,600	0.8%
	Adjusted Volume	109,800	123,700	135,000	0.9%
	Nominal Adjustmen	t -16,600	-16,600	-16,600	
	Percent Adjustment	-13.1%	-11.8%	-10.9%	
Sunshine Bridge (LA 70)	Modeled Volume	30,700	42,000	51,300	2.3%
	Adjusted Volume	23,500	34,800	44,100	2.8%
	Nominal Adjustmen	t -7,200	-7,200	-7,200	
	Percent Adjustment	-23.5%	-17.1%	-14.0%	
Total River Crossings	Modeled Volume	183,300	214,500	238,100	1.1%
	Adjusted Volume	159,400	190,600	214,200	1.3%
	Nominal Adjustmen	t -23,900	-23,900	-23,900	
	Percent Adjustment	-13.0%	-11.1%	-10.0%	

 Table 5-4

 Modeled Mississippi River Crossing Traffic with Post-Processing Adjustments, 2019, 2032, and 2042

Lastly, as previously mentioned, the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are not included in the Base Year MRB Model or the MRB future-year No-Build Model. CDM Smith believes that a full recovery from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic will have been achieved prior to the opening year. Therefore, no post-processing adjustments have been made to the MRB future-year No Build Model results to account for the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 5-5 provides a comparison of average daily volumes and average annual growth rates at the three existing Mississippi River crossings under both the MRB Model and the CRPC Model. The base years for both models are provided as well, with a comparison to actual traffic counts. The base year for the CRPC Model is 2015 and the base year for the MRB Model is 2019. For the MRB Model, raw and adjusted volumes are provided in the table. As indicated in the table, the CRPC Model volumes are 31.0 percent higher than actual counts for all three existing Mississippi River crossings in the 2015 base year. By comparison, the raw MRB Model is 15.0 percent higher than actual 2019 counts at the existing Mississippi River crossings. Once the post-processing adjustments previously described are applied to the MRB model volumes, the estimated volumes match the 2019 counts.



		Modeled		CRPC Model	
	Actual	Percent Diff.	Annual Average Da	ily Traffic Volumes	CAGR
Bridge Name	2015 Counts	from Counts	2015	2042	2015 to 2042
Huey P. Long Bridge (US 190)	26,600	7.5%	28,600	44,900	1.7%
Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10)	106,000	32.5%	140,500	187,900	1.1%
Sunshine Bridge (LA 70)	22,700	51.1%	34,300	68,900	2.6%
Total	155,300	31.0%	203,400	301,700	1.5%
		Modeled		Raw MRB Model	
	Actual	Percent Diff.	Annual Average Da	ily Traffic Volumes	CAGR
Bridge Name	2019 Counts	from Counts	2019	2042	2019 to 2042
Huey P. Long Bridge (US 190)	26,100	0.4%	26,200	35,200	1.3%
Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10)	109,800	15.1%	126,400	151,600	0.8%
Sunshine Bridge (LA 70)	23,500	30.6%	30,700	51,300	2.3%
Total	150 400	15 09/	192 200	228 100	1 10/
lotal	159,400	15.0%	183,300	238,100	1.1%
		Modeled	MRB Model wi	th Post-Processing A	djustments
	Actual	Percent Diff.	Annual Average Da	ily Traffic Volumes	CAGR
Bridge Name	2019 Counts	from Counts	2019	2042	2019 to 2042
Huey P. Long Bridge (US 190)	26,100	0.0%	26,100	35,100	1.3%
Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10)	109,800	0.0%	109,800	135,000	0.9%
Sunshine Bridge (LA 70)	23,500	0.0%	23,500	44,100	2.8%
Tatal	150 400	0.0%	150 400	214 200	1 20/
Iotai	159,400	0.0%	159,400	214,200	1.3%
Note: CAGR - Compound Annual G	owth Rate				

Table 5-5 Comparison of Volumes and Growth Rates for MRB Model and CRPC Model

As noted previously, the socioeconomic forecasts developed by the MPO and used in the CRPC Model were considered reasonable by CDM Smith for the current application and incorporated directly into the future-year MRB No-Build Models without any changes or adjustments. Therefore, it would be expected that the estimated traffic growth rates between model years would be roughly similar for both the MRB Model and the CRPC Model, with some minor differences due to the adjustments to the trip distribution model, as documented in the report titled **Base Year Model Validation Technical Memorandum**, dated April 2021. The average annual growth rate for the Mississippi River Crossings in the CRPC Model is 1.5 percent between 2015 and 2042. By comparison, the raw MRB Model produces an average annual growth rate of 1.1 percent between 2019 and 2042. This rate of growth is both in line with historical trends and similar to the growth estimated under the CRPC Model, which is consistent with expectations based on the socioeconomic inputs. Comparing the growth rates for the raw and adjusted MRB Models, only minor differences were observed in the average annual growth rates between 2019 and 2042.



5.4. Mississippi River Crossing Traffic Volumes by Time Period

The MRB Model was developed to include four model time periods:

- AM Period 6:00 AM 9:00 AM
- Mid-day Period 9:00 AM 3:00 PM
- PM Period 3:00 PM 6:00 PM
- Night Period 6:00 PM 6:00 AM

The purpose of developing the model by time-period is to better represent the variations in travel behavior, network congestion, and speeds during the two peak periods and the two off-peak periods. **Table 5-6** presents the estimated average hourly volumes in 2019 and 2042 for each time period, as well as the share of daily traffic for each time period. The volumes for the MRB Model include the previously described post-processing adjustments, which have been applied at an hourly level. As indicated in the table, the greatest hourly volumes are borne by the Horace Wilkinson I-10 Bridge during the AM and PM Periods.

								-
		US	190	- I-	10	LA	70	Total Rive
	Time Period	EB	WB	EB	WB	EB	WB	Crossings
2019 Average	AM Period	1,000	600	3,500	2,300	500	800	8,700
Hourly Volumes (1)	Mid-day Period	600	600	3,300	3,200	600	700	9,000
	PM Period	1,100	1,400	2,700	4,000	1,000	700	10,900
	Night Period	300	300	1,400	1,400	300	300	4,000
Time Period as a	AM Period	22.1%	14.7%	19.0%	12.7%	13.4%	20.1%	16.4%
Percent of Total 2019	Mid-day Period	27.5%	29.0%	36.1%	35.1%	31.5%	33.6%	33.9%
Daily Volumes	PM Period	26.3%	32.2%	14.6%	21.9%	26.6%	17.7%	20.6%
	Night Period	24.1%	24.1%	30.4%	30.4%	28.6%	28.6%	29.1%
	Total Day	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2042 Average	AMPeriod	1,200	900	4,300	3,000	1,200	1,400	12,000
Hourly Volumes (1)	Mid-day Period	900	900	4,000	3,900	1,200	1,300	12,200
	PM Period	1,500	1,700	3,600	5,000	1,800	1,500	15,100
	Night Period	400	400	1,700	1,700	500	500	5,200
Time Period as a	AM Period	21.3%	15.6%	19.2%	13.5%	16.3%	19.4%	17.0%
Percent of Total 2042	Mid-day Period	29.7%	30.6%	35.4%	35.1%	32.8%	34.1%	34.0%
Daily Volumes	PM Period	25.0%	29.6%	16.0%	22.0%	25.0%	20.2%	21.1%
	Night Period	24.0%	24.2%	29.4%	29.4%	25.9%	26.3%	27.8%
	Total Day	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

 Table 5-6

 Estimated Hourly Volumes and Time Period Shares by Bridge from the MRB Model

Note: AM Period: 6:00 AM - 9:00 AM; Mid-day Period: 9:00 AM - 3:00 PM; PM Period: 3:00 PM - 6:00 PM; Night Period: 6:00 PM - 6:00 AM. (1) - Includes Post-Processing Adjustments



The average hourly volumes by time period for the MRB Model were then compared against the estimated hourly capacity for each of the existing Mississippi River Crossings. The estimated hourly capacities for the three Mississippi River crossings are 1,870 vehicles per direction on US 190, 5,250 vehicles per direction on I-10, and 2,120 vehicles per direction on LA 70. In total, the current three crossings can carry 9,240 vehicles per hour in each direction. These estimates were developed by CRPC and included in the CRPC Model based on the number of lanes and other geometric considerations.

By dividing the estimated hourly roadway capacity by the estimated average hourly volume for each time period, the Volume-over-Capacity (V/C) Ratio is determined. The V/C Ratio is a measure of how much congestion is estimated on the roadway, which determines the estimated speeds within the network. This measure can also be used to determine whether the estimated volumes for each time period are too high. The estimated V/C Ratios for the MRB Model are presented by time period for model years 2019 and 2042 in **Table 5-7**. As noted, the values presented in the table are based on the unadjusted raw model volumes in order to better reflect the congestion estimated by the MRB Model. Based on this analysis, no shifts of volume between time periods were deemed necessary for the MRB Model. For the purposes of comparison, **Table 5-7** also presents the comparable V/C Ratios for the CRPC Model for model years 2015 (Base Year) and 2042 (Future Year).

	_	US 190		I-10		LA	LA 70	
	Time Period	EB	WB	EB	WB	EB	WB	Crossings
2019 MRB Model (1)	AM Period	0.44	0.43	0.76	0.70	0.44	0.47	0.61
	Mid-day Period	0.38	0.36	0.66	0.67	0.38	0.38	0.54
	PM Period	0.55	0.54	0.86	0.91	0.54	0.54	0.74
	Night Period	0.16	0.15	0.27	0.27	0.16	0.16	0.22
2042 MRB Model (1)	AM Period	0.60	0.58	0.92	0.84	0.76	0.78	0.79
	Mid-day Period	0.51	0.51	0.80	0.81	0.66	0.67	0.71
	PM Period	0.72	0.72	1.04	1.10	0.92	0.92	0.96
	Night Period	0.21	0.20	0.32	0.32	0.25	0.25	0.28
2015 CRPC Model	AM Period	0.50	0.54	0.92	0.87	0.55	0.59	0.74
	Mid-day Period	0.40	0.38	0.69	0.70	0.42	0.42	0.57
	PM Period	0.65	0.58	1.02	1.09	0.64	0.62	0.87
	Night Period	0.17	0.15	0.28	0.28	0.17	0.16	0.23
2042 CRPC Model	AM Period	0.81	0.84	1.24	1.13	1.17	1.11	1.10
	Mid-day Period	0.62	0.59	0.93	0.94	0.85	0.85	0.85
	PM Period	1.03	0.93	1.33	1.46	1.23	1.31	1.28
	Night Period	0.26	0.24	0.38	0.38	0.32	0.33	0.34

 Table 5-7

 Volume-over-Capacity Ratios for MRB Model and CRPC Model

Note: AM Period: 6:00 AM - 9:00 AM; Mid-day Period: 9:00 AM - 3:00 PM; PM Period: 3:00 PM - 6:00 PM; Night Period: 6:00 PM - 6:00 AM. (1) - Excludes Post-Processing Adjustments



5.5. Additional Model Screenlines

CDM Smith developed five screenlines, in addition to the Mississippi River, to assist in the validation of the Base Year MRB Model. These screenlines are identified in **Figure 5-1**. As part of the validation process, CDM Smith obtained available traffic counts for the roadways along these screenlines from DOTD and CRPC. These count locations are identified in **Figure 5-1** with circles. CDM Smith reviewed modeled volumes along each of these screenlines in order to evaluate the traffic growth forecasted by the future-year No-Build Model within the MRB study area. Modeled AADT volumes and CAGRs for each of the total screenlines are provided in **Table 5-8**. As shown in the table, the modeled growth in traffic along each of the five project screenlines reflects the modeled growth in VMT by parish and the modeled growth at each of the Mississippi River crossings.

5.6. Select Link Analysis

As part of effort to evaluate the future-year No-Build Model, a series of select-link assignments were also performed for each of the existing Mississippi River crossings. A select-link analysis reviews all of the modeled trips and their network paths through the "selected" link. This tool allows specific movements and O-D pairs to be isolated, analyzed, and adjusted if necessary.

The select-link analyses conducted as part of the future-year No-Build Model development are illustrated as band-width plots under 2042 conditions for the US 190, I-10, and LA 70 crossings of the Mississippi River in **Figures 5-2**, **5-3**, **and 5-4**, respectively. US 190 is coded in the model network as a two-way link across the Mississippi River. For that reason, **Figure 5-2** shows the select link analysis for both directions combined. Since I-10 and LA 70 are coded in the network as two one-way links across the Mississippi River, only one-way eastbound movements are shown in **Figures 5-3 and 5-4**. Although only eastbound movements are shown in the latter two figures, the westbound movements on I-10 and LA 70 exhibit virtually the same modeled travel patterns,

The figures indicate the pattern of trips leading up to and dispersing away from the bridges. CDM Smith reviewed these plots, and the detailed matrices behind them, and found the modeled trip patterns to be consistent, within tolerable limits, with those included in the Base Year MRB Model. This indicates that overall O-D patterns have generally been preserved between the Base Year Model and future-year No-Build Models.

5.7. Impacts of the I-10 Widening Project

While this enhanced planning investigation is focused on the alternative locations and alignments for the new MRB, the planned widening of I-10 on either side of the Mississippi River Bridge is of particular relevance to the proposed new MRB bridge. Although the I-10 widening itself is not the subject of this study, some sensitivity tests have been included to assess the performance of the No-Build MRB Models description of this improvement project in the 2032 and 2042. The I-10 widening project is clearly part of the No-Build network.





Table 5-8Total Modeled Volumes along MRB Project Screenlines, 2019, 2032, and 2042

	Total Modeled A	nnual Average Dail	Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR			
Screenline	2019	2032	2042	2019 to 2032	2032 to 2042	2019 to 2042
Screenline 1: S of US 190	180,500	216,700	232,200	1.4%	0.7%	1.1%
Screenline 2: S of I-10	266,600	303,000	322,200	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%
Screenline 3: N of Plaquemine	207,900	277,300	305,700	2.2%	1.0%	1.7%
Screenline 4: S of Plaquemine	191,900	248,900	280,600	2.0%	1.2%	1.7%
Screenline 5: N of Donaldsonville	121,400	164,400	206,600	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%
Total	968,300	1,210,300	1,347,300	1.7%	1.1%	1.4%





Figure 5-2 2042 Select-Link Analysis – US 190 Movements in Both Directions Across the Mississippi River





Figure 5-3 2042 Select-Link Analysis – I-10 Eastbound Movements Across the Mississippi River





Figure 5-4 2042 Select-Link Analysis – LA 70 Eastbound Movements Across the Mississippi River



As previously described, I-10 is assumed to be widened to 6 lanes on the east side of the Mississippi River between Highland Road (just east of the existing I-10 bridge) and Essen Lane (just east of the I-10 / I-12 interchange). West of the Mississippi River, I-10 is assumed to be widened to 6 lanes between LA 415 / Lobdell Highway and LA 1. No widening is planned for the existing I-10 Horace Wilkinson Bridge. This is because of the physical characteristics of the I-10 Bridge (a continuous steel truss through deck), which does not allow to the bridge itself to be easily widened. Additionally, no widening of I-12 is planned within the study area. A map of the project limits is provided in **Figure 5-5**.



Given the importance of this project, test assignments were performed to develop high-level estimates of the potential impacts of widening I-10 as assumed. **Table 5-9** contains the results of these tests from the No-Build MRB Model at the 2032 and 2042 levels with and without the I-10 widening project. The first column contains results from the No Build Model without the planned I-10 Improvements and the second column contains results from No Build. Overall VMT increased by 0.3 percent both in 2032 and 2042, as a result of the I-10 widening. This increase is due to trips



taking slightly longer but faster routes as they shift from congested local arterials to the improved I-10. Additionally, overall VHT is lower with the I-10 Improvements by 500 hours and 1,100 hours in 2032 and 2042, respectively. This reduction translates into a reduction in congestion on both I-10 and local arterials as a result of the I-10 improvements. As indicated in **Table 5-9**, the congestion relief benefits of the I-10 improvements decrease overall travel time, as travel demand and traffic volumes continue to increase within the region. This is typical of urban interstate widening projects.

	Without	With		
	I-10 Improv.'s	I-10 Improv.'s		Percent
	(Test Assignment)	(MRB Model)	Difference	Difference
Modeled 2032 Daily Conditions				
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	26,186,200	26,252,700	66,500	0.3%
Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)	665,000	664,500	-500	-0.1%
Volumes at Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10)	139,700	140,300	600	0.4%
Volumes at I-10 E of Dalrymple Dr.	167,400	180,800	13,400	8.0%
Modeled 2042 Daily Conditions				
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	29,176,800	29,255,600	78,800	0.3%
Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)	770,900	769,800	-1,100	-0.1%
Volumes at Horace Wilkinson Bridge (I-10)	149,400	151,600	2,200	1.5%
Volumes at I-10 E of Dalrymple Dr.	175,200	190,300	15,100	8.6%

 Table 5-9

 Estimated Impacts of the I-10 Widening Projects, 2032 and 2042

On I-10 near the widening project, significant traffic volume increases are estimated on either side of the Mississippi River Bridge. Daily traffic volumes on I-10 east of Dalrymple Drive (on I-10 between I-110 and I-12) are estimated to increase by 13,400 in 2032 and by 15,100 in 2042 as a result of the I-10 widening. This represents an increase of 8.0 percent and 8.6 percent in 2032 and 2042, respectively.

On the I-10 Horace Wilkinson Bridge, an additional 600 vehicles per day is estimated in 2032 due to the widening of I-10, representing an increase of 0.4 percent. By 2042, this is estimated to increase to 2,200 vehicles per day, or a 1.5 percent increase. These limited impacts on the I-10 Bridge, as compared to I-10 between I-110 and I-12, are due to the continued capacity constraints of the bridge itself, as previously discussed. Additionally, the increases in traffic volumes on the I-10 bridge and Nighttime Periods. A smaller traffic increase is anticipated during the more congested AM and PM Periods. Minimal impacts are estimated for the US 190 and LA 70 river crossings. As previously noted, the I-10 widening project and the resulting traffic impacts have been incorporated into the 2032 and 2042 future-year MRB Models.

Thus, as a result of the planned widening on either side of the I-10 Bridge, but not the bridge itself, the bridge will still serve as a bottleneck during peak hours within the Baton Rouge area. The result will be some improvement in travel time for trips crossing the Mississippi River, but an even bigger improvement in travel times for trips that use I-10 completely on one side of the River or the other.

The No-Build MRB Model performed well enough in this limited test case.



6. Summary

As part of an enhanced planning investigation for a potential new bridge across the Mississippi River south of Baton Rouge, CDM Smith has developed a model specific to the proposed Mississippi River Bridge (MRB) for use in the analysis of the various project alternatives. The MRB Model is based on the latest version of the regional travel demand model developed and maintained by the Capital Regional Planning Commission (CRPC), which is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Baton Rouge. The focus of the MRB Model is the present and future traffic crossing the Mississippi River and traffic traveling along I-10, LA 1, and LA 30.

This technical memorandum documents the development of the future-year (2032 and 2042) No-Build MRB Models. This was done by reviewing the 2032 and 2042 travel demand models developed by the MPO. The underlying socioeconomic forecasts were reviewed and compared against historical trends for reasonableness. The highway improvement assumptions included in the original CRPC Model networks were reviewed and updated to reflect the latest Long Range Transportation Plan, **MOVE2042 Metropolitan Transportation Plan** (2018). Lastly, the calibration adjustments incorporated into the Base Year MRB Model were carried forward into the future year (2032 and 2042) No-Build Models.

In addition to describing the No-Build MRB Model development, the model results were also presented in terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle hours traveled (VHT), traffic forecasts for the existing Mississippi River bridges, traffic growth along five additional project screenlines, and illustrations of select links analyses performed for each of the river crossings. Average modeled traffic growth for the combined Mississippi River crossings, after post-processing adjustments, is 1.3 percent annually between 2019 and 2042. This is consistent with the overall modeled VMT growth for the full MRB Model. Of the three crossings, traffic on LA 70 is estimated to increase at the fastest rate (average of 2.3 percent annually), likely due to the higher socioeconomic growth estimated for Ascension Parish. For all model years, the majority of traffic crossing the Mississippi River within the study area uses the I-10 Bridge. Based on a review of the future-year No-Build MRB Model results, as detailed in this technical memorandum, CDM Smith believes the model is reasonable for use in producing forecasts of traffic impacts from a new Mississippi River crossing.

It should be noted that CRPC was not involved in the development of the MRB Model and is therefore not responsible for its contents. Additionally, due to the project-specific nature of the work, the MRB Model has limited applicability only to the MRB enhanced planning investigation.

Lastly, the MRB Model was validated against pre-COVID-19 pandemic traffic volumes, travel patterns and speeds. The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are not included in the Base Year MRB Model or the future-year MRB Models.



This Page Left Intentionally Blank



Note on the CRPC Model

The Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) released the latest version of its regional travel demand model. Developed for the recent **MOVE2042 Metropolitan Transportation Plan** (2018), the travel demand model operates on the TransCAD Version 7.0 software platform. The travel demand model was released to CDM Smith for use in the MRB South GBR: LA 1 to LA 30 Connector PD&E Study (H.013284). The release included copies of computer files with the transportation network, zone system, demographic data set, program control batch files, and other information necessary to operate the travel demand model.

As part of the terms of use of the CRPC travel demand model, CDM Smith acknowledges:

- The travel demand model is the property of CRPC and CRPC retains the right to change, update, or withdraw permission to use the CRPC regional travel model;
- Use of the travel demand model is limited to use by CDM Smith and approved contractors for the current PD&E Study, and use of the model by other parties or for any other projects is prohibited;
- CRPC makes no warranty or representation as to the accuracy or suitability for a particular purpose of the CRPC travel demand model or data sets provided for use with that model, and CRPC disclaims all warranties, specifically the warranties of merchantability and particular purpose; and,
- Any opinions or representations made by the CDM Smith based upon the CRPC regional travel model output data are the sole responsibility of the CDM Smith.

The MRB Model, prepared under the current enhanced planning investigation, was developed with adjustments to model networks, demographic data sets, software and model parameters. The resulting forecasts are the responsibility of CDM Smith and not of CRPC.

This Page Left Intentionally Blank



Disclaimer

CDM Smith used currently-accepted professional practices and procedures in the development of the MRB Model and the resulting traffic estimates. However, as with any forecast, differences between forecasted and actual results may occur, as caused by events and circumstances beyond the control of the forecasters. In formulating the estimates, CDM Smith reasonably relied upon the accuracy and completeness of information provided (both written and oral) by the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD), Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) and Neel Schaffer. CDM Smith also relied upon the reasonable assurances of other independent parties and is not aware of any material facts that would make such information misleading.

CDM Smith made qualitative judgments related to several key variables in the development and analysis of the MRB Model that must be considered; therefore, selecting portions of any individual result without consideration of the intent of the whole may create a misleading or incomplete view of the results and the underlying methodologies used to obtain the results. CDM Smith gives no opinion as to the value or merit of partial information extracted from this report.

All estimates and projections reported herein are based on CDM Smith's experience and judgment and on a review of information obtained from multiple agencies, including the DOTD. These estimates and projections may not be indicative of actual or future values and are therefore subject to substantial uncertainty. Certain variables such as future developments, economic cycles, global pandemics and impacts related to advances in automotive technology etc. cannot be predicted with certainty and may affect the estimates or projections expressed in this report, such that CDM Smith does not specifically guarantee or warrant any estimate or projection contained within this report.

While CDM Smith believes that the projections and other forward-looking statements contained within the report are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the report, such forward-looking statements involve risks and uncertainties that may cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. Therefore, following the date of this report, CDM Smith will take no responsibility or assume any obligation to advise of changes that may affect its assumptions contained within the report, as they pertain to socioeconomic and demographic forecasts, proposed residential or commercial land use development projects and/or potential improvements to the regional transportation network.

CDM Smith is not, and has not been, a municipal advisor as defined in Federal law (the Dodd Frank Bill) to the DOTD and does not owe a fiduciary duty pursuant to Section 15B of the Exchange Act to the DOTD with respect to the information and material contained in this report. CDM Smith is not recommending and has not recommended any action to the DOTD. DOTD should discuss the information and material contained in this report with any and all internal and external advisors that it deems appropriate before acting on this information.



This Page Left Intentionally Blank







