LAFAYETTE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

2035 TRANSIT PLAN

0.0 Executive Summary

The 2035 Transit Plan is a comprehensive, one-volume guide to major transportation developments being planned for the parish and the metropolitan area's future. The 2035 Transit Plan serves as the reference document for implementing agencies, as the document is a reflection of the transit objectives in the Lafayette Metropolitan Study Area.

The 2035 Transit Plan is divided into three main parts: a review of types of transit systems, a review of funding, and a presentation of short-term and long-term plans. The plan describes what currently exists and what is anticipated for the area. It also provides a blueprint for the area's development over the next twenty years.

The transit system review considers three variables: transportation types (bus, light rail, etc), the cost of fuel, and the negative and positive factors associated with each choice. A discussion of all three variables leads to a conclusion that traditional transit buses are appropriate for the short-term plans and that elevated cable cars (pod) systems are appropriate for long-term planning.

In 2010, the Lafayette Metropolitan Planning Area may in all probability exceed a population of 200,000 through natural growth, migration, and expansion of the planning area. As a result, new Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines will be implemented to reduce transit funding annually by about $1.3 million. If no new source of local funding is found to replace the FTA $1.3 million, then a reduction in transit services may need to occur or a consolidation of transit services will be required. Each of these options would require some review and consideration of the plan by policy makers.

To aid in that review, this plan has been prepared. Various funding sources are considered, but no single source is recommended by the plan. The final funding decision belongs to policy makers. If no source of additional funding is provided by the Lafayette City-Parish Council, then a methodology is provided that will allow for a reduction in bus service and a consolidation of transit services as a budgetary measure to continue providing much- needed public transit services.

The long-term plans propose providing transit services to outlying areas of the Lafayette Metropolitan Area as it continues to grow. The City of Lafayette is known as the "Hub City," and would continue to be the center of transit services for the next twenty years.

1.0 Transit Systems

Transit systems can be compared using three components: transit type, fuel, and mitigation factors. Various types of transit systems can range from simple surface buses to complex subways. Beyond the simple comparison of transit type is the comparison of the

ridership needed for each kind of transit system. The fuel provided to run the various systems evaluates not only costs per unit of fuel consumed, but also the infrastructure required to operate the system. The mitigation factors are those effects that are negative and that require additional steps to reduce impact on the physical environment. For example, elevated trains tend to require mitigation in the form of sound walls.

1.1 Classification of Transit Types

As seen in Table 1.1A, the capital cost is shown to provide various types of transit service indicated by transportation type. As the Lafayette area has a high water table, subway systems are not appropriate. The table presents viable options without on cost and demographic factors to present seven types of transit systems. These seven types are shown in photographs.

Considering the cost, the most appropriate transportation type is the transit bus for the present system and the pod for a future system. One can eliminate the other transit types after studying the required residential units per acre, service type, and distance between stations. For example, heavy and commuter rail requires one hundred million square foot non-residential space requirement (for office and retail). This requirement is equivalent to one hundred "Malls of Acadiana." Streetcars, heritage trolleys, and special lane buses require the acquisition of significant right of way. Buses and pods utilize existing rights of way and are priced within the short and long budgets.

Table 1.1A Comparison of Cost and Various Features of Transit Systems

ID	Transport Type	Projected Cost Per Mile (Million)[1]	Service Type	Residential Unit/Acre	Additional Right of Way (Feet)	Distance Between Stations (Miles)
1	Heavy Rail	$50-$250	Regional, urban	1-2[1]	25-33	1-5
2	Light Rail	$20-$60	Regional, urban	9	19-33	1
3	Streetcar	$10-$25	Urban circulator	9	19-24	.25
4	Heritage Trolley	$2-$12	Urban circulator	9	1-24	.25
5	Bus Special Lane	$4-$40	Regional, urban	15	12	.25-2.0
6	Bus	$1-$2	Regional, urban	4	0	.25
7	Pod	$20	Regional, urban	?	0	.25

* One hundred million square feet of non-residential space required

[1] The cost does not include relocation of utilities.

Heavy Rail in Atlanta, Georgia


Light Rail in Sacramento, California


Streetcar in Portland, Oregon


Dedicated Bus Lane in Portland, Oregon

Heritage Trolley in New Orleans, Louisiana

Transit Bus (2004) in Lafayette, Louisiana

Further explanation for selecting a transit bus for the short-term planning solution and a pod for the long-term solution to public transportation involves observing certain mitigation factors. The table below lists conflicts and issues that affect the social services and the built environment in such a way that additional improvements are required. These improvements mitigate or reduce the ill effects of a selected alternative. As can be seen in the table below, the bus and pod system have the least number of features that are required to be mitigated.

Table 1.1B--**Mitigation Factors Associated with Transit Types**

ID	Issues/ Conflicts	Heavy Rail	Commuter Rail	Light Rail	Streetcar	Heritage Trolley	Bus Rapid Transit - Dedicated Lane	Bus	Pod
1	Overhead clearance	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
2	Driveway conflict	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3	Pedestrian facilities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
4	Mail service	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
5	Utility relocation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
6	Maintenance yard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	?
7	Frequent headways	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
8	Stop facilities required	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
9	Shelters	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	?
10	Easily accessible	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
11	Park and ride lots	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
12	Lighting needed	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	?
13	Second story privacy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
14	Seasonal traffic	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

1.2 Classification of Fuel Types

To draw a conclusion utilizing the table below, the most appropriate fuel type is bio-diesel. The constraints of vehicle costs, refueling infrastructure, and emissions support bio-diesel as the best choice of fuel type.

Table 1.2—Classification of Fuel Types

No.	Fuel Type	BTU/US gal	Infrastructure	Fuel Economy	Vehicle Cost	Emissions
1	Bio Diesel	126,200	No major infrastructure upgrade needed	Energy content per gallon of B100 is 11% lower than that of petroleum diesel	Same as diesel	Lower of PM, NMH and CO than diesel; Modest increase in Nox
2	Natural Gas	90,800	Requires fueling and maintenance facility modification; facilities incur an additional electrical cost to power the compressors used to compress the natural gas.	Significant fuel economy penalty compared to diesel (approximately 12%).	15% to 25% more than diesel	Lower carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions
3	Gasoline	125,000	Requires standard pumping stations	Equivalent to Diesel	Same as diesel	Similar to diesel
5	Hydrogen Fuel Cell	33,696	Significant investment required to develop hydrogen fueling infrastructure	Hydrogen storage capability is a major limiting factor in fuel cell development, affecting vehicle range and fueling infrastructure	10 times the cost of an equivalent diesel	Zero-emissions vehicles
6	Diesel	138,700	The distribution and maintenance infrastructures are already in place and the fuel is widely available	Lower than hybrid diesel-electric propulsion	Lowest life cycle costs	Current technology does not meet 2010 EPA emissions standards
7	Hybrid Electric		Uses existing fueling infrastructure	May increase fuel economy by up to 40% or more	60% over diesel	Generally lower emissions of both regulated pollutants and greenhouse gases

In conclusion, an assessment of the transportation types, mitigation factors, and fuel types indicates that the bus and pod systems are appropriate for the Lafayette Metropolitan Area.

2.0 Current and Potential Funding of Existing Services

A description of the current status of transit in Lafayette Parish, an analysis of funding of the Lafayette Transit System (LTS), and a consideration of potential funding mechanisms for shortfalls will be addressed in this section of the 2035 Transit Plan.

2.1 Lafayette Transit System (LTS) Fixed Routes System

The people living in the City of Lafayette utilize LTS for the purpose of taking more than one and half million trips every year. To make those trips happen, some 36 employees work in various positions-- from janitor to bus driver to mechanic to transit manager. They operate a fleet of 18 "big buses" which are 35 feet long and hold about 36 passengers. These buses operate on 12 circular-fixed routes from a central terminal known as the Rosa Parks Transportation Center, and travel more than 500,000 miles annually. The buses are owned and operated by Lafayette Consolidated Government (LCG).

The LTS services are funded by federal grants under the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), under Section 5307 for transit bus systems in large urban cities. The amount received is based on a formula using population, population density, and level of transit service. Funds may be used for a broad range of purposes: planning, engineering designing, and evaluating transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies. In addition, funds may be used for capital expenditures such as 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.

5307 Funding includes a set of strict funding guidelines for urban areas with more than or less than a 200,000 population benchmark. These guidelines place risk on the city of Lafayette's eligibility to receive funding. For MPO areas under the benchmark, operating assistance is an eligible expense. Indicated in the 2000 Census, Lafayette's population was 190,503 citizens. As a result of the census, approximately $1.3 million in federal operating assistance will not be forthcoming each year. However, as this document is being written in 2009, the current state-estimated population of the MPO area is more than 213,000 people. Thus, it is anticipated that the population enumeration during the 2010 Census will probably exceed the benchmark and an alternate source of Lafayette Transit System (LTS) funding operations will need to be identified. The alternative sources of funding are discussed in Section 2.7, "Potential Sources of Additional Funding."

Under the existing transportation act, the operating assistance for urbanized areas that grew to be greater than 200,000 in population or became part of a larger urbanized area received partial payments of the operating assistance grant: 50% the first year of the funding cycle and 25% the second year of the funding cycle. By the third year, the entire operating assistance grant is to be phased out.[2]

[2] http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Urbanized_Formula_Fact_Sheet_Sept05.pdf

2.2 The Distribution of Operating to Capital Expenditures

The operating and capital expenditures for the last ten years is shown in the table below. The highest expenditures were in 2003 when a number of new buses were added to the fleet and older buses were retired. The year with the least expenditures was in 1999 when no new buses were purchased nor other capital-intensive projects were undertaken. The expenditures for 2007 were nearly twice the expenditures of the first year in 1998.

Table 2.2 - Funding Sources of LTS Operating and Capital Expenditures, 1998-2007

Year	Operating			Capital			GRAND TOTAL
	Federal	Other	Total	Federal	Other	Total	
1998	0	2,390,461	2,390,461	0	40297	40,297	2,430,758
1999	1,395,095	748,293	2,143,388	173	1,625	1,798	2,145,186
2000	450,000	1,863,594	2,313,594	796,236	898,859	1,695,095	4,008,689
2001	450,000	1,887,978	2,337,978	777,877	990,929	1,768,806	4,106,784
2002	500,000	1,936,633	2,436,633	1,226,489	347,818	1,574,307	4,010,940
2003	500,000	1,876,270	2,376,270	3,441,889	1,078,458	4,520,347	6,896,617
2004	679,067	2,107,602	2,786,669	1,757,033	459,489	2,216,522	5,003,191
2005	1,287,081	1,985,565	3,272,646	983,250	1,229,303	2,212,553	5,485,199
2006	1,418,969	1,969,787	3,388,756	76,018	95,195	171,213	3,559,969
2007	1,656,828	2,156,304	3,813,132	401,410	517,498	918,908	4,732,040

2.2.1 Federal Operating Expense Funding

The amount of federal funding for transit operating and capital expenditures is dependent on congressional funding cycles in the transportation bill. In the above table, there are three patterns in federal operating funding. Prior to 2000, the funding was absent one year and present the next, requiring the moving of funds to adjust so that roughly the same amount of grant total funding was provided from one year to the next. However, with passage of the transportation bill in 2000, the funding for the next four years is approximately $500,000. To this point, one notices in the chart above that in 2004 about a 25% increase occurred in funding and then a doubling in the subsequent year of 2005 and then about 10% to 15% each subsequent year to about $1.7.

The increase in funding from 2000 to 2007 is the result of two major hurricanes. Hurricane Katrina and Rita caused a surge in the population of Lafayette, as people who had lost their homes in New Orleans and the coastal areas of Louisiana migrated to the city of Lafayette. According to local estimates, Lafayette Parish increased by as much as 10,000 persons during those years. An increase in the total unlinked trips provided by the transit system increased as well-- from nearly one million in 2002 to nearly 1.5 million trips in 2007.

2.2.2 Operating Expenses

In 1998, a significant change occurred in the Federal Transportation Bill, TEA-21, regarding operating expenses. For cities with more than 200,000 citizens, prior legislation did not include preventive maintenance as part of capital expenditures. Under the current SAFETEA-LU legislation, two general categories are included in capital expenditures that had previously been covered only in Section 5307 for urban areas of less than 200,000 population. Due to the fact that LTS is growing above the benchmark, vehicle and non-vehicle maintenance as part of capital expenditures will not be funded.

Preventive maintenance includes all the activities, supplies, materials, labor, services, and associated costs required to preserve or extend the functionality and serviceability of the asset in a cost effective manner-- up to and including the current state of the art for maintaining such asset. These capital maintenance expenses are eligible to use FTA formula funding programs for vehicle maintenance functions and non-vehicle maintenance: all activities associated with revenue and non-revenue (service) vehicle maintenance, including administration, inspection and maintenance, and servicing (cleaning, fueling, etc.) vehicles. In addition, vehicle maintenance includes repairs due to vandalism and accident repairs of revenue vehicles. Non-vehicle maintenance involves all activities associated with facility maintenance including administration, repair of buildings, grounds and equipment as a result of accidents or vandalism, operation of electric power facilities, maintenance of vehicle movement control systems, fare collection and counting equipment, structures, tunnels and subways, roadway and track, passenger stations, operating station buildings, grounds and equipment, communication systems, general administration buildings, grounds and equipment, and electric power facilities.[3]

Not eligible under TEA-21 are capital expenses, maintenance labor, revenue-vehicle operator labor and fuel.[4] For the year 2007, the labor expenses can be estimated from the LCG budget and are summarized in the table below.

Table 2.2.2 - Un-funded Operating Cost Categories for Transit Systems in Cities Greater than 200,000 using Estimated Labor and Metered Fuel Cost for LCG Budgetary Year 2007 [5]

Annual Cost Category	Annual Wages ($)	Annual Wages Plus Benefits 30%	Annual Cost
3 Fleet mechanics	35,856	46,612	139,838
25 bus drivers	22,899	29,769	744,217
193,238 gallons	2.21	n/a	427,056
TOTAL			1,311,111

[3] http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm#N, http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm#P, http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm#V

[4] http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1215/is_1998_Nov/ai_53333930

[5] See page 356 of the LCG Budget for bus operators' wages and page 329 for fleet mechanics' wages.

2.3 Comparison of Transit Systems in Louisiana Cities

As can be seen in the above table, LTS system operates a more efficient transit system in relation to comparable cities in Louisiana by evaluating total trips, operating cost per hour, operating cost per mile, total annual miles, annual operating hours, and cost per trip. New Orleans, with its heritage trolley system and transit bus, provides a per trip service at more than three times the cost of the Lafayette Transit System (LTS). The para-transit service offered in New Orleans is over twenty times more expensive than the LTS system.

Table 2-3 Cost Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness for Louisiana Cities 2005

Fixed Route:	**Alexandria**	**Baton Rouge**	**Gretna**	**New Orleans**	**Monroe**	**Shreveport**	**Lafayette**
Unlinked Trips	623,871	4,752,816	3,058,393	6,372,721	967,547	2,814,415	1,335,222
Operating Exp/Hour	$49.40	$67.49	$99.55	$224.36	$52.29	$63.32	$60.61
Operating Exp/Mile	$3.28	$4.22	$6.58	$17.25	$3.50	$4.10	$4.49
Annual Miles	441,638	2,760,991	1,863,840	3,213,056	681,949	2,129,295	653,681
Annual Hours	29,367	172,754	123,196	246,983	45,656	137,892	48,454
Cost per Unlinked Trip	$2.33	$2.45	$4.01	$8.70	$2.48	$3.10	$2.27
Para-transit Service:							
Unlinked Trips	15,845	57,620	68,006	37,865	7,105	32,637	42,245
Operating Exp/Hour	$45.37	$39.40	$72.38	$292.35	$40.73	$57.51	$23.43
Operating Exp/Mile	$2.84	$3.12	$7.50	$30.57	$6.71	$2.31	$1.59
Annual Miles	109,615	346,180	362,242	223,481	27,576	296,456	210,623
Annual Hours	6,874	27,439	37,561	23,372	4,545	11,919	14,329
Cost per Unlinked Trip	$19.68	$18.76	$39.98	$180.45	$26.05	$21.00	$7.95

Source: National Transit Database, Federal Transit Administration.
See http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm

2.4 Demographics

There are twelve existing transit fixed routes for big buses in Lafayette Parish as shown on the three maps, Lafayette Transit System Routes, Service Population by 2000 Census Blocks. The new paths for routes 20, 24 and 65 are shown in addition to existing routes when this plan was being prepared. The method of measuring ridership is by placing a centroid in the center of a census block and then selecting those nodes that are within a distance as a quarter mile to the route.

The service population is summarized in the table below.

Table 2.4 – Demographic Characteristics of Transit Routes

Route	Square Miles	Population	Population Density per Sq. Mile	% Non-White	Housing Units	Housing Unit Size	Housing Units per 100 Acre
10	1.84	7,340	3,989	80.12	3,157	2.32	37.30
15	3.62	10,899	3,011	20.80	4,824	2.26	48.03
20	6.33	17,729	2,801	36.49	6,477	2.74	62.55
25	4.50	13,982	3,107	14.53	6,104	2.29	47.18
30	2.27	9,325	4,108	66.70	3,621	2.58	40.12
35	1.94	7,959	4,103	78.16	2,832	2.81	43.84
45	4.92	10,906	2,217	51.21	4,505	2.42	69.90
50	2.03	7,225	3,559	76.79	2,716	2.66	47.84
55	3.77	11,426	3,031	30.12	4,705	2.43	51.28
60	1.84	7,164	3,893	73.76	2,801	2.56	42.04
65	7.53	22,199	2,948	16.59	7,870	2.82	61.24
66	6.56	17,532	2,673	15.61	8,119	2.16	51.71
70	4.28	9,215	2,153	21.95	4,931	1.87	55.55
Total/Average	51.43	152,901	2,973	44.26	62,662	2.44	52.53

2.5 Other Transit Systems

Outside of the bus operation, there are six transit operators who provide specialized transit services for specific populations. These specialized services incorporate demand-response scheduling to special populations. The special populations include the under employed, the disabled, and the developmentally challenged as well as the local parish school system and University of Louisiana (UL) student bus system.

2.5.1 Lafayette Transit System (LTS) Para-Transit System

LTS contracts to provide a para-transit service during the daytime for populations with disabilities and during nighttime for late-shift employees. Rather than the big busses, five smaller vehicles provide seating for 15-20 passengers in vehicles about 20 feet long. Acadiana Transit, Inc. operates the smaller busses. This transit service provider is a private-for-profit locally owned service. The routes are dispatched based on a call-and-response system.

The Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)[6] provides funding for the LTS transit program under Section 5310 and Section

[6] This is the current transportation bill and was preceded by a number of transportation bills, each with a unique name (SAFETEALU, TEALU, TEA21) and each lasting six years. The current transportation bill will expire on September 30, 2009.

5316. Section 5310 provides funding for LTS to contract with private carriers or to operate and purchase buses, vans, radios, wheelchair lifts, computers and other equipment for the provision of transporting elderly citizens and people with disabilities for whom big bus services are unavailable or insufficient. Funding from Section 5310 also provides for meal delivery service for homebound individuals, if the service does not conflict with providing public transit service or reduce service to passengers. As mentioned below, there are three additional carriers in the area funded under this program.

Section 5316 funds a specialized program for nighttime employees. The program is called by its local name, Night Owl Service; however, the program has two recognized references: Access and Reverse Commute and the program's acronym, JARC. The program provides funds for the transportation of eligible low-income individuals and welfare recipients to and from places of employment or employment during night or on weekends when conventional transit services are either reduced or non-existent. The program seeks to link trips for special populations because many employment-related trips are complex for low-income persons, often involving multiple destinations, including reaching childcare facilities and other services as part of the work trip. This program is contracted to Acadiana Transit, Inc., a company that has twelve vans and serves 200 clients monthly.

2.5.2 Lafayette Council on Aging Para-Transit

The Lafayette Council on Aging, Inc. currently has three vans with lifts for its general program to serve the elderly population of Lafayette. This program provides transportation for approximately 330 clients on a monthly basis. The Lafayette Council on Aging also runs a daybreak adult program for adult day health care clients along with 114 general clients. Both programs are funded through the Section 5310 and Adult Day Health Care (ADHC) Medicaid waivers, and Older American Act Grants. Both programs operate only on weekdays.

2.5.3 SMILE Community Action Agency Para-Transit

The SMILE Community Action Agency has two vans with lifts and one van with a ramp. The program has 1,358 total round trips and approximately 314 individuals are served each month. Most of the routes are demand-response, but a few are fixed routes.

SMILE has been providing transportation services in the Lafayette, Saint Martin and Iberia parishes for nearly four decades. The agency provides weekday demand- response service for medical and social service appointments, job training/education programs, grocery stores, and banks. The program includes elderly & disabled transportation, rural public transit, medical needs, and employment seekers. Since Lafayette Parish is a regional medical center, some of the riders come to the city of Lafayette from rural areas in the three-parish service area for crucial hospital and medical appointments. SMILE receives funding from the following sources: Section 5310 Funding, Medicaid and Medicare funding, STEP (formerly Project Independence and FIND Works), and Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

2.5.4 Lafayette Association for Retarded Citizens (LARC)

The LARC program is a subscription-based service and is funded through Section 5310 grants. The program provides nine vans that have both lifts and ramps and operate only on weekdays from 6 am to 5 pm. The program is employment-related, transporting individuals with mental disabilities to job sites. LARC's vocational services provide training for mobile work crews who provide packaging, collating, and document shredding services. With the assistance of a job coach, individually placed clients receive on-the-job training. The clients learn to use big bus public transit, open a savings account, and improve their social and communication skills. Much like a typical school bus route, instructors at the job sites drive the vans. The program is limited to residents with mental disabilities, and about 150 clients are served monthly.

Originally founded in the 1950's, LARC evolved from a fund raising vehicle to a residential community. In 1983, LARC opened its first group home. Since the opening of the first group home, three more homes have been added including the Civitan, Guidry, Lowe and Trahan Homes. These homes seek to provide an opportunity for adults with developmental disabilities to live as independently as possible within the community. Clients are taught about personal care, daily living, social skills, community readiness and budgeting. The homes are staffed with professional 24-hour personnel. Social workers, psychologists and qualified mental retardation professionals visit the homes on a routine basis. LARC operates its residential facility on a 34-acre campus that adjoins Acadian Village, a tourist attraction and local festival site. The program receives $4.7 million in funding each year from private contributions, program services, investments, sales, special events, and the operation of Acadian Village, a wholly owned subsidiary. They receive no government funding for most of their services. Unlike other programs that involve dispersing riders throughout the parish, the LARC Transportation operates from a central point and radiates outward.

2.5.5 Lafayette Parish School Board Bus System

The desegregation plan of May 2000 implemented by the Lafayette Parish School Board and approved by the federal courts is unique. Typically, plans require busing to fulfill racial quotas to represent proportions found in a particular community. Conversely, this is not the case in Lafayette. The uniqueness of the Lafayette Parish School Board Plan is the degree to which students are allowed to select a school.

There are four essential guidelines regulating how students might select their schools:

1. The admission to specialized academies providing vocational and career training is based on a mix of criterion referenced testing and a lottery. Students are tested and then ranked. The qualifying students are then randomly selected to participate in the limited enrollment program.
2. Statewide standards are used to classify institutions into non-performing and performing schools. A student may select to transfer from a non-performing school to a performing school.
3. Students may transfer from their designated district school to another school that has students from families with a different socio-economic status.

4. Students may select special programs based on their individual abilities, needs, and exceptionalities. These programs range from special education, (talented and gifted as well as educationally challenged) as well as French language programs.

A complex transportation system is required to fulfill these parameters. The system uses over 300 school buses to transport about 88% of the student population to and from school. The result is that over 51,000 trips per day are provided in a system of more than 600 routes, which translate to more than 900,000 trips annually. The LTS system currently transports 1,500,000 trips annually. Complex and sophisticated software is used to provide bus stop information, travel times and, location monitoring of buses en route.

2.5.6 University Student Transit Services

The UL Transit System utilizes14 student-driven buses for the purpose of transporting students from Cajun Field and Bourgeois Hall on Cajun Dome Boulevard, to the center of campus at Rex Street and St. Mary Boulevard. The buses are similar to secondary school buses used by the Lafayette Parish School Board. The route is 2 miles with headway of about 20 minutes. The buses run continuously from 7:00 to 19:00 Monday through Thursday and from 7:00 to 14:00 on Fridays. The number of buses running at any given time is proportional to the demand. The buses run only in the Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters and cease when UL is not in session.

Campus Edge Apartments, a privately owned facility, provides a free shuttle to and from the main UL Campus. The apartments are located at 400 N. Bertrand Dr, Lafayette, LA 70506, about a half-mile from the Cajun Dome and about 2.5 miles from the main campus.

2.6 Service Gaps

There are several service gaps in transit services in the urban area ranging from servicing populations with special needs to physically challenged to time of day needs.

2.6.1 Physically Challenged

At present, the New Freedom Program under Section 5317 of the current transportation act is not being implemented in Lafayette parish. The New Freedom Act would provide transportation funding for services resembling those being provided by LARC for its specialized population of developmentally challenged individuals. Some of these individuals are currently serviced by SMILE, but others are not because of their location in rural areas or because of the programmatic status. Transit service for rural specialized populations could be provided for employable populations who are physically disabled, rather than just the developmentally challenged as is the case now.

2.6.2 Day of the Week

A second service gap entails the lack of available transit on weekends. Currently, the only service provider that operates on Saturday is the Lafayette Transit 5316 program. The program is

limited to providing service for employment related activities. If more federal funding is given to the Lafayette urban area, money could be used to expand service on weekends.

2.6.3 Rural Populations

Lafayette Parish is an urban parish that receives 5307 funding to operate big bus transit. This type of funding essentially precludes the receipt of Section 5311 funding for Rural and Small Urban Areas. Many parts of the parish are not included in the Census Bureau's Lafayette Urban Area; therefore, are not serviced by a concerted program. Some citizens are being serviced by SMILE and LARC, while others are not living in the service area of the two organizations and, as a result, do not receive transit services.

2.6.4 Time Sensitive Riders

The typical headway between LTS buses is thirty minutes.[7] Much to passenger dismay, the regularity of service is not always an exact 30 minutes. As a result, if a rider misses a ride because the bus is running early, he may have to wait for over an hour for the next bus, meaning that the total wait time might be as much 60 minutes. The question is whether or not a reduction in waiting time or an increase in regularity of service would indeed increase ridership. The cost question: to half the headway to 15 minutes could double operating, maintenance, and capital costs.

2.7 Potential Sources of Additional Funding

Whatever the source of new funding, the allocation of funds should be part of a larger plan that addresses other system improvements. Either a sales tax or a property tax, if enacted, could be presented to the voters as part of an area wide apportioned plan for local transit projects. The same distribution ratio could be used for general budget funding from the city council or from other sources. Below is an example of proposed funding of sales or property tax revenues:

Table 2.7 – Distribution of Proposed Funding

Proposed Distribution of New Funding	**Percentage**
Administration	5%
Security	5%
Transit Stops	10%
Per Capita Funding for Transit to Municipalities	20%
Transit System Discretionary Funding	60%
TOTAL	**100%**

As noted in the table above, per capita funding by municipalities is a potential source of funding for this regional plan. The discussion in the following sub-sections discusses the City of Lafayette where the current transit service area is located. This discussion should be considered as examples of potential funding sources not only for the City of Lafayette and Parish of Lafayette, but also for the other current MPO municipalities of Breaux Bridge, Broussard, Carencro, Duson, Maurice, Scott, and Youngsville. Other potential municipalities and their

[7] The time difference between the arrival of one bus and the next is called a headway.

surrounding unincorporated areas in various parishes might be included as a result of the 2010 Census MPO urbanized area: Crowley, Rayne, Opelousas, Sunset, Grand Coteau, Parks, Loreauville, New Iberia, Delcambre, Erath, and Abbeville. This regional strategy may seek local government or agency funds from whatever source is deemed locally appropriate. A second technique to raise funds may be a regional mobility authority through which participating jurisdictions implement common techniques to raise revenues.

2.7.1 Dedicated Sales Tax

The sales tax data analysis shows that even a tiny increase in sales tax rates would yield the most amount of money for transit systems out of all the options listed in this document. Sales taxes are rarely assessed at the half-cent (½ ¢) level, but would yield over sixteen million dollars for transit services. Even at one-tenth of this rate, a sales tax would garner enough money for the transit system to replace the FTA operation funds being lost due to the shift in program status to an MPO urban area with more than a population of 200,000 people.

Table 2.7.1 - Annual Sales Tax Revenue from Various Tax Rates Based on 2002 Lafayette Parish Sales Tax

All Taxable Sales	$274,055,168	$274,055,168	$274,055,168	$274,055,168	$274,055,168
Tax Rate	**0.50%**	**0.31%**	**0.25%**	**0.12%**	**0.05%**
Estimated Annual Revenue	**$16,443,310**	**$10,194,840**	**$8,221,655**	**$3,946,392**	**$1,644,324**

2.7.2 Property Tax

Using the figures for 2008, an increase of one mill would generate an increase of about $400,000 annually while a half mill increase would yield $200,000 annually. The parish of Lafayette current collects 85 mills and the city of Lafayette collects 17 mills or a total of 102 mills. An increase of two and half mills would mean about 2.5 % increase in the property tax rate or about $1,000,000, a figure that would cover the amount need to cover the lost operational FTA subsidy.

2.7.3 Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

The I-49/I-10 TIF District proposes to provide funding for transit services in the I-49 and I-10 Corridor which spans from the Intersection of I-49 and I-10, along the Evangeline Thruway, to the Airport near Kaliste Saloom Rd. Within this area, a proposed high school is being planned with attendance drawn from throughout the parish. Among the amenities will be a transit hub that services both school ridership and the general public ridership. Additionally, bus stops and pedestrian ways will link to the planned high school.

2.7.4 Transit-Oriented Development

High-density residential and mixed-use developments are being planned for the I-49 Corridor as well at select intersections of major arterials or nodes. These provide the opportunity to develop transit oriented (TOD) developments as an incentive to developers to build new construction and convert old construction to uses that would be linked by transit services. Some of the incentives that might be considered for locating on a transit route are increased residential and business density and decreased parking requirements.

2.7.5 Tourist-Oriented Transit

A tourist-oriented transit system is a system that provides transportation for short-term visitors and long-term residents in Lafayette Parish. In 1993, a study was conducted to determine existing and proposed tourist sites and how they might be served with transportation services.

While many people come to Lafayette for the "Cajun experience," there are few existing sites that exemplify the Cajun way of living. Rather, tourists tend to have a dispersed visiting pattern. The most tourist-visited sites identified in a 1993 studies include Jungle Gardens, various boat and water tours, and agricultural tours. Since that study, well-organized tours include sites on the National Register of Historic Places, Avery Island, Vermilionville, Cajun Dome, LITE Computing Center, UL alumni returning to the UL campus for Homecoming, as well special events like Festival Acadiens et Creole and Festival International.

Proposed sites include an excursion train, river walk, water taxi, dinner boat trip, horse drawn carriage tour, and dinner train. Some of the plan for a water taxi was developed with a boat and dock near the Pinhook Bridge.

Other plans transit services in the downtown area and Johnston Street on weekend nights to service riders who are traveling to hotels, lounges, restaurants, and movie theatres. Local residents and tourists would use these services. A fee would be paid by vendors along the route to defray the cost of the service.

2.7.6 Fares

The existing fare structure is being modified as this plan is being written. The existing fare structure has five ridership classes (full fare, student, reduced, transfer, child) while the new plan currently being implemented has three classes (full fare, student, reduced).

The approved transit fare increase of 25¢ will raise approximately $103,000 annually. Another 25¢ proportional increase would bring another $103,000 annually to the transit system.

There are five ridership classes as shown in Table 2.7.7, The Existing Fare Structure. The cost for each class was established as a result of a fee study conducted as part of the last transit plan.[8] As can been seen, fares generated $352,814.

[8] Wilbur Smith and Associates, Inc, Lafayette parish Transit Study, Technical Memorandums No. 1, 2 and 3.

Table 2.7.7A - The Existing Fare Structure						
Rider Class	Full Fare	Student	Reduced	Transfer	Child	Total
Fare ($)	0.75	0.50	0.35	0.00	0.00	
Estimated Annual Trips	413,215	44,720	58,694	473,466	11,575	528,204
Percent of Riders (%)	41.25	4.46	5.86	47.27	1.16	100
Estimated Annual Income ($)	309,911	22,360	20,543	0	0	352,814

A new fare structure was implemented in the fall of 2008 after considering two alternatives as shown in the two tables below. The fares on Table 2.7.7B were implemented in order to meet increasing fuel cost that occurred in the summer of 2008 when oil reached $140 per barrel up from the mid $20's per barrel on September 11, 2001. As a result of panic in the financial markets during the winter of 2008, the price has plunged to the mid $40's per barrel. The second alternate (2.7.7C) was considered, but placed in reserve if future revenues were needed.

Table 2.7.7B - The New Fare Structure: Alternative 1				
Rider Class	Full Fare	Student	Reduced	Total
Fare ($)	1.00	0.90	0.50	
Estimated Annual Trips	413,215	44,720	58,694	516,629
Resulting Percent Retention in Ridership	96.40	74.40	93.60	
Estimated Annual Trips	398,339	33,272	54,938	486,549
Estimated Annual Income ($)	398,339	29,945	27,469	455,753

Table 2.7.7C - The New Fare Structure: Alternative 2				
Rider Class	Full Fare	Student	Reduced	Total
Fare ($)	1.25	1.00	0.60	
Estimated Annual Trips	413,215	44,720	58,694	516,629
Resulting Percent Retention in Ridership	96.40	74.40	93.60	
Estimated Annual Trips	398,339	33,272	54,938	486,549
Estimated Annual Income ($)	497,924	33,272	32,963	564,159

2.7.7 Certificates of Participation

One of the most recent developments in transit finance is the ability to transfer future federal transit formula grants as partial security for loans. While it is not possible to pledge the FTA funds, lenders have reviewed a transit system's record of grant receipts over the years as a basis to judge the credit worthiness of the borrower. Based on this record of FTA receipts, LCG would issue debt with maturity up to 12 years. Because LCG is receiving its future FTA revenues ahead of time, LCG is required to make the interest payments due on the debt and establish a reserve fund to pay loan payments in case of default.

The use of COP's to pay for an operating subsidy that is not funded directly would run counter to the intent of the original legislation. Thus COP's could not be used directly to replace the operating assistance grant. However, LCG can channel its local funds into bus operations. It could then replace those funds with COP.

2.7.8 Contributions from the General Fund/Local Government Funding

The FY 2007-2008 budget for Lafayette Consolidated Government was $550 million. In FY 2006-2007, the transit system's operating expenses were $3.8 million. $1,9 million of those expenditures were a contribution from Federal Transit Administration, leaving another $1.9 million to be raised from local sources. About 18% of the local contribution is from fare box sources. A 6% increase in the contribution from the general fund would allow for an extra $100,000 in transit funding. To replace all of the FTA funding would require only an allocation of 0.34% of the total general fund.

2.7.9 New DOTD Transit Programmatic Funding for Transit

The state of Louisiana provides very little in funding for transit. LaDOTD should develop an increased program in Louisiana for funding transit, perhaps a capital program. For instance, the Illinois DOT provided substantial state funding for the building of a light rail line in the Illinois portion of the St. Louis metro area. The Washington State DOT has a substantial variety of public transit funding programs, ranging from intercity bus lines to capital improvement programs. New funding would require a concerted effort in the legislature by the cities providing transit services.

2.7.10 Change in FTA Funding Formula Allocation

The 100-Bus Coalition was formed by several small cities to change the FTA formula for transit operations funding. Transit systems operating in urbanized areas over 200,000 in population and operating less than 100 peak fixed-route buses would retain the use of federal operating funds. The 100 bus definition is consistent with FTA's National Transit Database reporting and the American Public Transit Association's definition of a small transit system. Lafayette Transit has only buses, allowing it to qualify for extended federal funding under the proposed changes.

2.7.11 Local Parking Program

By regulating parking, a local government can reduce vehicle traffic and increase transit ridership. Differential parking rate structures and enforcement strategies can be utilized as part of a parking plan. These tools can be used in different neighborhoods.

Parking near UL has been problematic in past years, as enrollment has increased. A parking garage was constructed at the corner of Taft St and St. Mary St in 2008, but it has been under-utilized. Additionally, UL has a parking lot near the Cajun Dome with a transit service to the main campus. There are two fee paid lots on campus near the intersection of St. Mary St, and McKinley St. as well as free permit parking, subject to a lottery on campus. The faculty receives

preference for parking permits, but the remainder of prime permits (on campus) are sold to students in the fall and spring through the parking lottery in which the winning numbers are randomly generated by a computer and posted so that winners may purchase their permits on the designated date. Lotteries occur in the fall and spring. Non-prime parking permits are also provided at locations off the main campus, such as Cajun Field, and on campus after 3:00 PM for night classes.

The current parking permit cost is $40 per semester while faculty parking on campus is either $50 or $100 depending on location. There is no charge to utilize the park and ride transit system linking Cajun Field and the main campus.

In the vicinity of UL, curbside parking is controlled through parking signage regulating where and what times and days parking is allowed. Curbside parking within the right of way is regulated by the LCG. Student parking generally occurs from Jefferson St. to UL, from the Oil Center to Girard Park, from Taft St. to Pinhook Rd., and St. Mary St. to University Ave. Some of these areas are metered, some restricted, and others entirely open. Curbside parking is generally free.

A potential source of revenue is to collect fees for parking within the public right of way. The plan should be coordinated with UL as part of their lottery for zoned areas, a separate system using zoned area parking permits or regulated independently through the use of parking meters. There are separate systems of enforcement for the two systems. These services again may be coordinated or operate separately. The use of curbside parking in narrow right of ways can be used as a traffic calming device.

2.7.12 Fixed Guideway Funding

If construction of a Lafayette public automated transit or a related system is selected, then funding maybe available under Section 5309 of the current transportation bill. The New Starts Program provides funds for construction of new fixed guideway systems or extensions to existing fixed guideway systems. Eligible purposes includes not only traditional light rail, rapid rail (heavy rail), commuter rail, monorail, bus way/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facility, or an extension of any of these, but also automated fixed guideway system (such as a “people mover”), a system that has been under consideration locally. Projects become candidates for funding under this program by successfully completing the appropriate steps in the major capital investment planning and project development process.

Funding is allocated at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation, although Congress earmarks available funding. The statutory federal match is 80%, but a formal directive issued by Congress is to not fund a project higher than 60 % and encourages participants to request the lowest possible federal match to enhance the likelihood of funding. There is a five-tired rating (high, medium-high, medium, medium-low or low) given to each project with a requirement that a project receive at least a medium evaluation.

The factors used in the rating process are listed below.

1. Cost Effectiveness
- Incremental Cost per Hour of Transportation System

2. User Benefit Transit Supportive Land Use and Future Patterns
- Existing Land Use
- Transit Supportive Plans and Policies
- Performance and Impacts of Policies

3. Mobility Improvements
- Normalized Travel Time Savings
- Low-Income Households Served
- Employment Near Stations

4. Operating Efficiencies
- System Operating Cost per Passenger Mile

5. Environmental Benefits
- Change in Regional Pollutant Emissions
- Change in Regional Energy Consumption
- EPA Air Quality Designation

Successive funding for modernization and improvement of the existing system is available under Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization.

2.7.14 Refunds of State Taxes on Transit Fuel

The state of Louisiana provides funding for transit services, yet taxes the consumption of transit fuel. At the Louisiana State Transit Conference in New Orleans, William Ankner, PhD., the Secretary of Transportation of Louisiana stated that he supports either not taxing or refunding the twenty cents per gallon Louisiana state tax collected from public transit operators. The consumption for the annual period ending in 2008 showed that about 190,000 gallons were consumed by the local transit system. That amount translates into $38,000.

2.7.15 Regional Mobility Authority

The Safe Light and Safe Speed (SLSS) program has generated over one million dollars in the past year. The SLSS program utilizes cameras to photograph the license plate and the driver of vehicles running red lights at selected intersections in the parish. The program has resulted in a reduction of crashes by a factor of more than 50% at some intersections and lowered the crash rate in the parish. A regional mobility authority (RMA) could be created to use the same techniques on the extended highway network in the MPO area. A portion of the fund collected may be allocated to transit funding.

2.7.16 Low Sulfur Bio-Diesel

The use of low sulfur diesel in recent years has increased maintenance cost. Sulfur was a low cost additive that increased lubricity, but now that it's use has been curtailed, the lubricity of low sulfur fuel has increased wear and tear on mechanical parts. To address these maintenance costs, biodiesel should be used. It is a commercially blended diesel with vegetable oils. The introduction of biodiesel has created problems with fuel filters and fuel jets requiring increased

labor maintenance as the new fuel is introduced into the fleet. However, the 2008 case of Monroe, Louisiana is telling[9]. The city introduced biodiesel one bus at a time with a series of blends from 5%, 10%, 15% and 20% of commercially available fuels. Over time, the entire fleet was converted from low sulfur diesel to biodiesel. During this time, a significant increase in ridership occurred because of a publicity campaign that emphasized that the transit system was using ecologically friendly fuel and reduced pollution. A federal grant program is available to fund the approximately 5 to 15 cent increase in the cost of the fuel.

3.0 Alternative Funding Parameters

This section of the plan considers alternatives if funds to replace the operating subsidy are not identified.

Alternatives can be divided into two groups. The first group reduces existing services by reducing services through shrinking the transit service area, increasing the headways of existing routes, and reducing the number of routes. The second group of alternatives replaces the existing fixed route model with another model using dispatched vehicles. The demand dispatch system versus the fixed route system is not an "either/or" choice. Several types of hybrid systems exist; including deviated fixed routes and strategically located cabstands. The demand dispatch system might be based in part in consolidation of small buses services for non-profits and consolidation of big bus routes operated by the LTS.

3.1 Reducing Services

The methodology to select new routes is to compare four variables:

1. The total population density per square mile per transit route mile measured by using 2000 Census blocks.

2. The minority population density per square mile per transit route mile measured by using the 2000 Census blocks.

3. The worker density per square mile per transit route mile measured by using 2030 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ)

4. The estimated income density per square mile per transit route mile measured by using the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ)

A comparison of the demographics of each route would enable the ranking of those routes using these key features to establish a priority system by which to reduce services. The first two factors have been computed in Section 2.4, "Demographics."

3.2 Consolidation of Services

[9] This case study was presented the transit director of Monroe at the 2008 Louisiana Public Transportation Conference in December of 2008.

There are two broad categories of transit routes: fixed and demand. Fixed routes provide riders with a defined pathway. Demand routes change depending on which riders need to use the service. A blend of these two systems is a deviated fixed route. In addition to boarding the bus at specified stops listed on the bus schedule, passengers who cannot get to the bus stop may schedule a bus to pick them up at their home or other location. Some systems provide limits on how far a rider may live from the fixed route, while other systems do not have restrictions.

Lafayette Parish has six transit providers; three provide fixed routes systems. The Lafayette Transit System, as operated by Lafayette Consolidated Government, ULL Transit system, and the Lafayette Parish School Board provide the fixed routes. The remaining three private transit services are provided by private non-profit agencies. Lafayette Association of Retarded Citizens (LARC), the Lafayette Council on Aging (COA) provides services to special populations. SMILE Community Action Agency, on the other hand, provides services generally to low to moderate-income individuals.

Consolidation of services might be achieved so that some or all of the systems listed above are brought under a hybrid deviated fixed route, where fixed routes are known, but change slightly depending on the demand. This consolidation of services provides LCG with opportunities to develop relationships and collaborate with the community to find common solutions to common problems. Such a program would require three components:

3.2.1 Rider Qualification Program

Some form of rider qualification program for reduced fares would be needed such as existing qualifications for food, medical or assistance payments to families with dependent children, unemployment insurance, school and university attendance, and reduced fare for lunch program. If a transit passenger did not pre-qualified under existing programs, then he or she would be required to pay a fare that would cover some portion of the fare not covered by public financing.

3.2.2 Unified Dispatching Program

A unified scheduling and dispatching program would be required. The routes would be a deviated system providing parish wide transit services. The major routes would be known in advance, but some variation would be expected to diverge along a central pathway, as services would be required. Taxi voucher system might be created whereby a person without timely access to a publicly funded dispatched vehicle can receive transportation from the public for a fee tax service.

3.2.3 Fixed Routes

Some fixed routes with high ridership would continue to operate between major transit generators such as hospitals, schools and universities, and commercial districts. In order to insure success, the fixed route system could be implemented over a series of years. The process of consolidation would not necessarily lead to a specific set of routes planned in advance, but

would rather be dependent on actual demand for service. The configuration of the routes would be completed over a time frame of five years.

4.0 Time Horizons

There are three planning horizons considered in this report: short term plans of less than two years; near-term plans of two to five years; and mid and long-term plans of five to twenty years. Whatever items are not funded during one planning horizon will be placed in the subsequent time period.

4.1 Short Term Plans

Short-term plans are for a period of less than two years. The plans include agenda items that already encumber funds for the November 2008 to November 2009 LCG fiscal year and a continuation of the current funding for the subsequent fiscal year. That set of funding options assumes local funding will be found to offset possible cuts in FTA funding of maintenance as described in Section 2.1 Lafayette Transit System (LTS) Fixed Routes System.

Short-term funding also includes the 2009 stimulus funding proposed by the Obama administration. The estimated level of funding in February 2009 (when this document was being prepared) included about $2.6 million in funding as shown in the table below.[10]

No.	Project	Estimate ($)
1	Bus Arrival Kiosks	80,000
2	Design Hurricane Force Bus Shelters	100,000
3	Bus Shelters	150,000
4	Upgrade Bus Communications	300,000
5	(2) Hybrid 35 foot buses	1,300,000
6.	(6) Inter-Urban Bus shuttles	350,000
7.	Solar lighting on buses	50,000
8.	Handicap Accessible Bus Stops	100,000
9.	Security Cameras	75,000
10.	Fare collection equipment	75,000
	TOTAL	**$2,580,000**

4.2 Near-Term Plans

The near-term plans are for a period of between two and five years.

A system of transit stops, passenger shelters, and pull through lanes (“bump outs”) on major arterials on well established routes such as Johnston Street and Louisiana Avenue are to be developed.

[10] Policy makers may modify this preliminary budget.

4.3 Mid Term and Long Term Plans

The mid to long-term plans include the next five to twenty years and beyond for inter-metropolitan service between the major cities in the southern part of the state and intra-metropolitan service between the cities of the Lafayette Metropolitan Area.

4.31 Inter-Metropolitan Transit System

An inter-metropolitan transit system is proposed that will connect Lafayette to the smaller cities in the metropolitan area and also connect Lafayette to Baton Rouge, New Orleans, and Lake Charles. Existing weekly service exists along the Amtrak rail using the Sunset Limited Route between New Orleans, Schriever (near Morgan City), New Iberia, Lafayette, LA and Lake Charles. Greyhound Bus Line provides services between New Orleans and Baton Rouge and Baton Rouge, Lafayette, and New Orleans. No direct link via Greyhound Bus exists between Lafayette and New Orleans. A set of interconnections between Amtrak and Greyhound, might be developed with a bus service like Louisiana Swift [11], a service that now connects Baton Rouge with New Orleans. The goal of this system would be to provide weekly and semi-weekly direct bus service between Lafayette, Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, and New Orleans. A daily service could be developed between Lafayette and the different cities in the Lafayette metropolitan area with linked trips occurring between smaller cities of the Lafayette metropolitan area and the other metropolitan areas in Louisiana.

4.32 Intra-Metropolitan Transit System

The intra-urban transportation system is composed of two parts. The first part includes smaller cities surrounding Lafayette and the second part includes the adjoining metropolitan cities. As a regional city, Lafayette is the core area of transportation in the Acadiana Region. The development of an inter-urban system connecting the outlying communities shown on the map, Acadiana Intra-Urban Transportation System, shows the 2000 Census urbanized areas and the highway routes that connect them. Utilizing the map, one understands that Eunice, located at the northern most point in the system along the circular route, connects Kaplan to New Iberia. The mileage between these and other cities are shown in the table and the population of the cities reported in the 2000 Census is also included. Not all routes need to be established at one time, but each leg could be added when ridership becomes large enough to justify services. Accordingly, the map shows the connections between Acadiana for long-term planning-- perhaps as long as one hundred years.

[11] http://www.laswift.com/