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1. Outreach Strategy

Choctaw Corridor

1.1. Media and Public Relations

Press Releases and Public Service Announcements (PSAs)

Press Releases and Public Service Announcements (PSAs) will be released to News, TV and Radio before and leading up to the Choctaw Corridor Visioning and Alternatives and Implementation Workshops. Press Releases and PSAs will be released initially upon confirmation of workshop venues and 1-2 days preceding each workshop, and will be approved by RDA staff before submission. Recommendations for earned media include WAFB TV, WBRZ TV, Fox 44, WVLA TV, The Advocate, The Weekly Press, and all local radio stations, including those broadcast by Citadel, Guarantee, and Clear Channel Communications, with an emphasis on stations with strong listenerships in the urban communities.

Live Radio Interviews

Live radio interviews will be sought during the promotional period with key inner-city programs.

Newsprint Advertisements

Paid advertisements in The Weekly Press will run 1-week prior to community workshops. The advertisement will be ¼-page and in color.

Website

Design of a website for Northdale has begun and research regarding setup is being completed.

E-blast Announcements Dates

E-blasts are an effective way of reaching individuals directly and instantaneously. E-blasts also serve as an effective viral means of communication, as we request recipients to share the information with their respective distribution lists. E-blasts will be drafted by the project team, but will be sent via the RDA’s email with the RDA logo attached.

E-blasts will be sent to all contacts on the following dates. All e-blasts will contain a different content message, but will include information on upcoming workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2010</td>
<td>Recap of March Workshop Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 05, 2010</td>
<td>Informational e-blasts about RDA &amp; Upcoming Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2010</td>
<td>Workshop Reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19, 2010</td>
<td>Workshop Reminder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2. Direct Canvassing

Yard Signs

Yard signs are an effective way to create buzz within an area over an upcoming event or project. Yard signs will be placed within the Choctaw Corridor Improvement Plan boundaries to generate interest and let the viewers know how they can learn more details.

A general yard sign bearing the RDA logo and reading: “Learn about your Community’s Improvement Plan,” followed by the website and a toll-free number, will be used for all CIP areas and will stay in place for the length of the project. Yard signs will be placed with permission, with the help of community stakeholders.

Of the remaining 50 yard signs, 5 are slated for the Choctaw Corridor. Councilwoman Marcelle is in receipt of 3 yard signs, Lindsey’s Diner has requested 1, and the remaining will be distributed to a business willing to display it in their yard.

Toll-Free Number

Not all residents have access to the internet. A toll-free number will be set up specifically for this project, offering details on upcoming workshops through a pre-recorded message. This message will be changed and updated as the project progresses. The toll-free number will not have a voice messaging system; therefore callers will not be able to leave a message. This number will be displayed on project yard signs and in other promotional materials.

Roadside Banners

While yard signs build an awareness of the project, larger roadside banners will be erected at high traffic intersections 2 weeks prior to CIP workshops, displaying specific workshop dates. These banners will not remain erect throughout the duration of the project, but will only be displayed before each workshop to draw particular attention to the workshop dates.

It is recommended that 6-8 banners be made, with the ability to change workshop dates and details for each workshop. The same 6-8 banners will be used and reused for all CIP areas. Banners will be printed with a permanent logo and catch-phrase, with interchangeable workshop titles, locations, and dates. Therefore, there will be a one-time cost to create the banners, and a lower follow-up cost to update the information for each workshop.

Roadside banners will be erected at the following locations the week of April 26, 2010:

Choctaw Corridor: 2 banners on Choctaw Drive and 1 at Istrouma High School
These banners will not remain erect throughout the duration of the project, but will only be displayed before each workshop to draw particular attention to the workshop dates.

### Direct Canvassing Schedule & Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yard signs</strong></td>
<td>4-5 weeks prior to initial workshops, and for length of project</td>
<td>$470.00 - $634.00, for 60 double-sided, 1-color or 2-color chloroplast yard signs (18” x 24”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toll Free Number</strong></td>
<td>For use on yard signs and press releases/PSAs</td>
<td>$3.00 to purchase toll-free number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadside Banners</strong></td>
<td>Erect 2 weeks prior to workshops</td>
<td>$84.00 per banner, $30-$35 to update information on each banner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3. Indirect Canvassing

#### School Backpacks:

Through coordination with the school board, fliers promoting the community workshops can be placed in student backpacks at the following school the week of May 3, 2010:

- Istrouma High School 3730 Winbourne Avenue (CC)
- Dalton Elementary School 3605 Ontario Street (CC)

#### Church Bulletins and Announcements

Church bulletin write-ups and pulpit announcements will be requested at churches in and around the CIP areas during the week of April 26, 2010. Flyers will also be made available to the following churches:

- Greater New Guide Baptist Church Fairfield Road (CC)
- St. Anthony of Padua 2305 Choctaw Drive (CC)
- Faith, Hope and Love Worship Center 4055 Choctaw Drive (CC)
- Bethel Istrouma AME Church 3809 Winnebago Street (CC)
Community Organizations and Homeowners Associations

Outreach to the following community organizations and homeowner associations will be made via telephone, email or letter, pending RDA approval.

Highland Gardens Association  Ms. Pattie Mason
Homeowners of Fairfields  Ms. Marion DeNova
Making a Positive Impact Together Mrs. Shawn Collins
Gus Young Non-Violence  Mr. Jerry Johnson

1.4. Outreach Schedule – Visioning Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choctaw Corridor Workshop – May 18, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Weeks prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct Stakeholder Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distribute yard signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Weeks prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send out E-blast 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach to community organizations and churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erect road-side banners with 1-800 number in CIP area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Weeks prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send out E-blast 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Press release to The Weekly Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact churches for inclusion in announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Week prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide fliers to schools for distribution in backpacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Press release / PSA 1 – pitch stories as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send out E-blast 3 (reminder e-blast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paid media in The Weekly Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send Press Release / PSA 2 (reminder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send out E-blast 4 (reminder e-blast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Stakeholder Interviews

Choctaw Corridor

Stakeholder interviews for the Choctaw Corridor Community Improvement Area (CIP) will be held the week of April 5th. Due to the large amount of stakeholders who are business owners and the lack of public libraries in the area, interviews will be held at a location convenient for the stakeholder, or at the Franklin Industries office at 1201 Main Street.

2.1. Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choctaw Corridor</th>
<th>EBR City Council District 7</th>
<th>Public Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denise Marcelle</td>
<td>EBR City Council District 10</td>
<td>Public Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Wicker</td>
<td>Louisiana Representative District 61</td>
<td>Public Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jackson</td>
<td>Bethel Istrouma AME</td>
<td>Ministerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Roslyn Satchel Augustine</td>
<td>Baton Rouge Area Chamber (BRAC)</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Lockett</td>
<td>Lindsey’s Diner</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dellafiora</td>
<td>Cayard’s Inc. Kitchen Supply</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Case</td>
<td>Ero Inc.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Bonvillian</td>
<td>Capitol Ultrasonics</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Whittington</td>
<td>Affordable Automotive Repair</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Interview Format

The Choctaw Corridor CIP project area is largely made up of commercial properties. Due to work schedules and business owners possibly residing in the area, it is possible that some businesses of the Choctaw Corridor area will not attend an evening community workshop.

For this reason, we recommend that stakeholders who are business-related do an abbreviated version of the mapping exercise that will be made available to the workshop attendees. They will also be asked what they believe could improve their business. Stakeholders that are not businesses will be asked the same questions as above. All stakeholders will be invited to participate in the workshops.

Exhibits for stakeholder interviews will include CIP maps and the project schedule.
2.3. Interim Outreach

All CIPs

Per request of the Redevelopment Authority, the consultant team proposes the following to maintain a presence in between workshop dates.

News coverage

An article recapping workshop success, including information on the community’s input, will be provided to The Weekly Press for print after Visioning Workshop and prior to the Alternatives and Implementation Workshop. These articles can be associated as a series with the title Community Improvement Plan Update: Scotlandville Gateway (for example).

The Weekly Press printed a Scotlandville update in their April 8th issue, and will print a Zion City & Glen Oaks update in their April 29th issue.

These articles will also be provided to The Advocate.

E-blasts

Three e-blast notices will be sent in between the Visioning and Alternatives workshops:

1. Post-workshop thank you
   A “thank you” highlighting major salient points of information gleaned from the first meetings, including a “Did you know?” section at the bottom highlighting a base RDA initiative.

2. Save the date for next round of meetings
   Promoting meeting dates for upcoming workshops, including another “Did you know?” section about RDA programs.

3. Reminder about upcoming meetings
   Asking folks to help get the word out, including sample flyers for distribution
## 2.4. Outreach Schedule – Alternatives and Implementation Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choctaw Corridor Workshop – August 7, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Weeks prior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send out E-blast 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach to community organizations for indirect canvassing opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Weeks prior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erect Road-side Banners in CIP area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Press release to weekly papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact churches for inclusion in announcements/bulletins for next 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Week prior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Press release/PSA 1 – pitch stories as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fliers in school backpacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact churches for inclusion in announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct Direct Canvassing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week of Workshops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send Press Release/ PSA 2a (Choctaw Corridor reminder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send out E-blast 2a (Choctaw Corridor reminder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paid media in The Weekly Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct Choctaw Corridor workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Interview Summary
Choctaw Corridor

May 14, 2010

Prepared by:
Franklin Industries
1201 Main Street, Suite B
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
(225) 768-9060
“The residents in this community are stuck in the mindset that their community cannot amount to anything greater than what it already is. They feel like the area has always looked like this, so they have no desire to change it. They need motivation.”

-Excerpt from Choctaw Corridor stakeholder interview
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Overview

As part of the Choctaw Corridor Improvement Plan underway by the East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority and its consultant Team, Franklin Industries (Franklin), as sub-consultant to Phillips-Davis Legacy & Brown + Danos, conducted 11 stakeholder interviews throughout the months of April and May, 2010.

Franklin interviewed individuals and representatives from both public and private entities, including City-Parish government and business. Stakeholder interviews were conducted as open-ended discussions, allowing the stakeholder to speak freely about the project and the positive or negative implications it may have on themselves or their organization; however, a uniform briefing and list of questions were followed to ensure needed information was captured (see Appendix B). Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes, with some running longer and some shorter.

Each stakeholder was briefed on the status on the Redevelopment Authority, its mission, and current endeavor to develop improvement plans for 5 underserved areas in north Baton Rouge. Each stakeholder was also presented a map of the project area and a project schedule (see Appendix C).

All stakeholder interviews were conducted by Perry Franklin or Kyla Hall of Franklin Industries with representatives from the RDA present as observers. This report summarizes the results of the Choctaw Corridor stakeholder interviews. The participants chosen in the stakeholder interview process were selected through a joint effort of the Redevelopment Authority and Franklin.
1. **Community Values**

Stakeholders were asked what the most valuable assets are along the Choctaw Corridor and surrounding areas. Below is a summary of their responses:

- **Businesses.** At least 3 stakeholders commented that the CVS, Family Dollar, and the Auto Store were assets to the Choctaw area. They believed that the presence of these types of businesses increases the potential of more businesses locating in the area.

- **Low traffic, convenient access to downtown.** It was stated that the Choctaw Corridor is easily accessible, coming from any direction, and that the Interstate provides easy access to and from downtown. The low traffic along the Corridor makes for easy navigation.

- **Istrouma Senior High School/St. Theresa.** The school and elderly living center are considered to be assets to the Choctaw area. Istrouma is the only high school in the area, and the St. Theresa Center is the sole elderly community living area. One stakeholder is hopeful that CATS will assign a bus stop near the area.

- **Industrial corridor.** Two stakeholders expressed that the Choctaw Corridor is ideal for warehouse/manufacturing businesses and industrial growth. The concept of an Industriplex similar to that near Siegen Lane in Baton Rouge would work in the Choctaw Corridor.

- **Fire station.** Some stakeholders envision the soon-to-be-built fire station on the corner of Choctaw Drive and Acadian Thruway to be a catalyst for safety and security in the area, 24 hours a day.

- **Low criminal activity.** One stakeholder felt unaffected by criminal activity along the corridor, except for one break-in that was resolved the very same day.

- **The people.** There are hardworking people who bought their homes in the area, and there is a sense of community.

- **The railroad.** One stakeholder commented that the railroad track that runs alongside Choctaw is an advantage for businesses involved with heavy duty freight.

- **Piggly Wiggly.** Not only is the store the closest grocery option for residents near the Corridor, but it is also used for the residents to pay bills. A notary is available there as well.
2. Landmarks

The following were mentioned as landmarks in the Choctaw Corridor area:

- Istrouma High School

3. Areas of Concern

Stakeholders were asked what most troubled them about the Choctaw Corridor. Below is a summary of their responses.

- **Blight and empty buildings.** Several stakeholders referenced the blight and empty/abandoned buildings as the most troublesome aspect of the Choctaw Corridor. They stated the closed, empty, and dilapidated businesses need to be restored to functional use. They attribute low property values to outdated housing and blight, and feel there is a lack of maintenance in the area in relation to private property upkeep, public easements, and building clean-up. They would like to see these buildings remodeled and restored to use as cafés, community/arts facilities, or new business developments. Cleaning up the abandoned buildings and occupying blighted property would stimulate economic growth for the area. One stakeholder stated that the residents lack motivation to upkeep the area, because the area has looked the same way for decades. If the area could be cleaned up and restored to functionality, it would allow the residents of the area to have a more positive outlook on their community.

- **Vo-tech school.** One stakeholder’s opinion was that the Vo-tech school does not work with the small businesses in the area, and had a major concern that the school should be more responsive to area residents and area merchants.

- Below are other concerns that were mentioned throughout the stakeholder interviews:
  - The image of Choctaw Drive being associated with crime
  - Residents who are “stuck in the mindset” that the area will always be the same
  - The train runs at odd times daily, runs slow, and disrupts flow of business, and traffic
  - Lack of fresh produce and healthy food options in the area
  - Infrastructure problems
    - Wiring and phone lines (old and few)
    - Drainage and sewage (minor issues)
4. Planning Considerations

Stakeholders were asked what planners should take into account when discussing improvements to the Choctaw Corridor. Below is a summary of their responses.

- **Provide for small business development.** Several stakeholders mentioned that the Corridor is ideal for small business/manufacturing/industrial emergences.

- **Utilize adjudicated and/or dilapidated properties.** There are several abandoned properties along the Corridor that could be used to build community centers or other small businesses.

- **Make the Choctaw Corridor more attractive.** People will care more about it as well as feel safer in the area if the area is cleaned up and maintained. One stakeholder suggested adding sidewalks to the train tracks side of the Corridor. Several stakeholders expressed the need for landscape plantings along the corridor, as well as possible bike paths or jogging paths along the train tracks side of the Corridor.

5. Long-term Vision

Stakeholders were asked what they would like to see when they think about the long-term future of Choctaw Corridor. Below is a summary of their responses.

- **A safer place to work and live.** A police presence would improve the morale of the community. Although there will be a 24-hour presence at the soon-to-be-built fire station at Choctaw and Acadian, a police substation in the area would serve as a catalyst for increased safety and security.

- **Sustainable businesses.** Having sustainable businesses that the community can support was noted as a future goal for the area. Several stakeholders commented that businesses were needed that would provide for jobs for the residents near the Corridor (i.e. manufacturing, grocery stores, pharmacies, dry goods, etc.). It was stated that an “Industriplex” style corridor would be ideal for Choctaw. Also, establishing businesses along the corridor would also support restaurant business along Choctaw, which would serve as a place for other workers along the corridor to commute to for lunch.

- **Drainage and infrastructure improvements.** Improving drainage and repairing potholes in the roads in the area would contribute to the maintenance and safety in the community.
6. Economic Development: Challenges and Aspirations

Stakeholders were asked about the challenges to economic development they see and experience along the Choctaw Corridor, as well as their aspirations for economic development. Below is a summary of their responses.

6.1. Challenges

- **Crime.** Stakeholders believe that the Choctaw Corridor and surrounding area is associated with crime, and business owners are reluctant to establish in the area.

- **Lack of vision.** Some stakeholders feel that since the Corridor is composed of mostly industrial businesses, some business owners are hesitant to establish any commercial businesses that would attract every day consumers to the area.

6.2. Aspirations

Stakeholders were asked if they had any aspirations for growth, and what tools/resources they would need to be more successful. Only one stakeholder expressed wishes of expansion. However all stakeholders felt that they need funds for repairs and upgrades to the visual aspects of their businesses.

One stakeholder envisioned a technical college system that would connect Istrouma High School and train area residents in certain trades. The concept of “dual enrollment” of adults and non-adults would be beneficial to area residents.

It was stated that in order for the area to become more prosperous and for area residents to gain an interest in the area, the solution is for more business owners along the Corridor to employ the area residents.

The following were mentioned by business owners along the corridor as reasons why they maintain their businesses in the area:

- **Sustainability.** Stakeholders’ businesses have been on Choctaw ranging from five years to over fifty years, and they feel their types of businesses fit well on the corridor.

- **Affordable real estate.** Stakeholders feel that their types of business allow them to thrive at the current locations, and that the area allows them to sustain the business at a cheaper rate.

- **Investment.** Regardless of some burglary incidents, one stakeholder is adamant about continuing to build his investment.
7. Safety Concerns

Stakeholders were asked about the safety concerns they have for the Choctaw Corridor area. Crime was an equally mentioned concern, and also tied to the reasons why some businesses have closed. Three business owners along the Corridor mentioned break-ins at their places of business within the past three years. It was mentioned that the crime in the district is the highest in the city, and there is a need for a police substation in the area (there is a misdemeanor office in the area, however they only deal with paperwork, they do not respond to emergencies or complaints). One stakeholder suggested the use of the old fire station building located at the corner of 38th Street and Gus Young as an ideal location for a police substation. Stakeholders reported a general disregard for people’s lives and property, noting the elderly in the community fear for their lives just walking from their cars into their homes. One stakeholder attributed his lack of business to high crime rates being associated with his location. Another form of crime that was a cause for concern was murder.

8. Hopes for Choctaw Corridor CIP

Stakeholder expressed hopes of giving the Choctaw Corridor area a new vision and purpose to retain current businesses, and attract new ones. It is also a hope that the Vo-tech school becomes involved with this process in order to train and retain area residents for employment along the Corridor.
Appendix A: Stakeholders Interviewed

- Representative Michael Jackson, District 61  
  Public Official
- C. Denise Marcelle, EBR Council District 7  
  Community
- Gwen Hamilton  
  Community
- Larry Case, Ero Inc.  
  Business
- Lindsey Lockett, Lindsey’s Diner  
  Business
- Robert Dellafiora, Cayard’s  
  Business
- Rick Peterson  
  Business
- Harold Williams  
  Business
- Jay Augustine  
  Education
- Roy Schmidt  
  State
- Reverend Roslyn Augustine  
  Ministerial/Community
Appendix B: Stakeholder Questions

Global questions (all interviewees)

1. Tell us about you or your organization/services/the geographic areas that you serve.
2. What do you value most about the Choctaw Corridor?
3. What are the things that most trouble you about the Choctaw Corridor?
4. What do you think should be taken into account by planners when discussing improvements to the Choctaw Corridor?
5. When you think about the long-term future of the Choctaw Corridor, what do you most want to see happen?
6. What is your vision for economic development on the Choctaw Corridor? Do you feel the area has a competitive advantage?
7. What are the challenges to economic development on the Choctaw Corridor? What kind of actions should the public and private sectors take to address these challenges?
8. What are the top two safety concerns you have for your area?
9. If you could do three things to improve the economic development/redevelopment climate on the Choctaw Corridor, what would they be?
10. What is your hope for this Community Improvement Plan effort? – most desired outcome? Biggest concern?
11. Are there any venues that come to your mind that would be accessible, welcoming and/or familiar to the community in which to hold the community meetings?

Organizational questions (Ministerial, Education, Community, Businesses)

12. What factors about the Choctaw Corridor make your efforts successful?
13. What are the primary challenges for your organization?
14. What are your highest priorities?
15. What are your aspirations for growth? What tools and resources do you need to be more successful?

Business questions (Businesses)

16. What are the challenges you face working along the Choctaw Corridor? (prompts: raising funds?
17. Attracting and retaining quality staff? Competition among entities for scarce resources?, etc)

Development questions (Businesses, CDCs and some Ministerial)

18. Tell us about the development process here? Cost of development? Securing financing (equity and debt)? Permitting process and timeframes?
19. Have you participated in public-private partnerships? To what extent? If so, have these been beneficial for you? If not, are you open to participating in partnerships?
20. Do you work with local businesses in the community? With the chamber of commerce? Other organizations?
Appendix C: Map and Chart Exhibits

Existing Land Use
Choctaw Corridor Transit Routes
East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority

Proposed Timeline: Overall

Community Improvement Plan - 5 Districts within East Baton Rouge Parish
# Choctaw Corridor & Northdale

**Notice to Proceed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website Development &amp; Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Media &amp; Direct Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Alternatives &amp; Urban Design Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Improvement Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Reconnaissance Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis &amp; Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend Code &amp; Policy Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final CIP Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Website Publishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance Analysis</th>
<th>Funding Analysis</th>
<th>November 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing Matrix including estimate of Probable Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Priorities</td>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule Status**

Community Improvement Plans - 5 Districts within East Baton Rouge Parish

**Analysis & Modeling**

1. Context Analysis
2. Land Use Analysis
3. Housing Design Modeling
4. Economic Analysis
5. Uniform Development Code Analysis
6. Brownfields Analysis
7. Transportation Analysis
8. Infrastructure Analysis
9. Safety & Crime Analysis
10. Green Space & Recreation Analysis
11. Market Analysis
Choctaw Corridor Visioning Workshop

Location: Istrouma High School
Time: May 18, 2010 5:30-8:00pm

Prepared by:
Phillips-Davis Legacy & BROWN+DANOS landdesign, inc.
May 28, 2010
Introduction

The intent of the Visioning Workshop on May 18, 2010 was to gain public input to develop the Vision for the Choctaw Corridor Community Improvement Plan. First, an introduction regarding the East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority’s mission and an outline of the 5 CIPs project was given by Walter Monsour and Karen Phillips, followed by a brief description of smart growth principles and an explanation of the first mapping exercise by Dana Brown. Following the presentation, groups discussed assets and challenges within the CIP boundaries and prioritized them to present to the room. A second brief training presentation describing the catalyst projects was given. Choctaw Corridor maps and a series of catalyst project program chips were then provided to the groups and they were invited to participate in a charrette to develop a Visioning Map. Participants worked in six groups, facilitated by consultant Team members, to graphically express ideas and opportunities for the revitalization of the Choctaw Corridor. The Phillips-Davis Legacy - BROWN+DANOS Team will develop the Choctaw Corridor Community Improvement Plan based on public charrette input from each group, technical analysis, collaboration with the RDA, and the Team’s expertise and will bring alternative designs to the public in August.
The purpose of the first mapping exercise was to determine what residents view as the assets and challenges to improvement of the Choctaw Corridor area. Groups were provided maps of the neighborhood and were asked to place blue stickers on areas that they viewed as assets and red stickers on things that they felt were a challenge to the area. Groups were then asked to give a description of each and prioritize the identified assets and challenges for presentation to the group. Facilitators at each table answered questions and kept the dialogue moving. Results of the assets and challenges mapping exercise are presented on the following pages.
Table 1

Prioritized Assets:
1. Connection to Downtown
2. Churches
3. New Fire Station

Prioritized Challenges:
1. Crime
2. No fresh produce
3. Blight
Table 2

Prioritized Assets

1. Accessibility
2. Public Transportation
3. Education

Prioritized Challenges

1. Infrastructure
2. Security
3. Education

Table 2 Assets and Challenges Map
Table 3

Prioritized Assets:

1. Industry
2. Pride in community

Prioritized Challenges:

1. Crime
2. Blight
Table 4

Prioritized Assets

1. Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center
2. Vacant Warehouse
3. Available properties

Prioritized Challenges

1. Crime
2. Blight
3. Police Station
Table 5

**Prioritized Assets:**

1. Churches
2. Schools
3. Accessibility

**Prioritized Challenges:**

1. Crime
2. Vacancies
3. No new businesses
Table 6

**Prioritized Assets:**

1. Vacant property and buildings
2. Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center
3. New Fire Station

**Prioritized Challenges:**

1. Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center
2. No nearby police stations
3. Blight
Following each group’s presentation of its prioritized assets and challenges map, a brief presentation describing catalyst projects was given by Dana Brown. The tables were provided a new map of the Choctaw Corridor area and a series of “chips” each depicting a different program or land use that could be contained within a catalyst project. The groups were asked to place the chips where they would like to see new or revitalized development and then give a specific explanation of the intended use. Facilitators encouraged groups to cluster uses together in an area in order to create a substantial, highly visible improvement and to comply with smart growth principles of mixed use and walkability.

**Catalyst Projects**

- **Healthcare** - Clinic, Pharmacy
- **Community Center** - Public Services, Recreation
- **Commercial** - Office, Shopping, Dining
- **Housing** - Condo, Apartment
- **Day Care** - Child Care, After School Care, Elderly Care

Visioning Chips Legend
Table 1 placed catalyst development throughout the Corridor with public services, daycare, and housing rehab along the central corridor and commercial development at the two nodes at Foster Drive and Plank Road. Specific commercial development programs identified were entertainment options like restaurants, theaters, and an arts district, as well as a place to purchase fresh produce, such as a farmers market. The need to generally rehabilitate housing was identified as well as a several senior housing and adult daycare opportunities.

**Program Elements:**

**Housing**
- Senior Living
- Single Family Rehabilitation

**Commercial**
- Movie Theater
- Restaurants
- Farmers Market
- Arts District

**Healthcare**
- Pharmacy

**Day Care**
- Child Care
- Adult Daycare

**Community Center**
- Recreational Center

Table 1 Catalyst Project Map
Table 2 focused the majority of development at the intersection of Plank Road and Choctaw, utilizing the existing infrastructure. The group also requested new businesses be brought in to the existing Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center. At the Plank Road intersection, specific requests included retail and dining facilities, public services such as a business incubator, and senior housing of varying degrees.

Program Elements:

**Housing**
Small Homes  
Assisted Living  
Independent Living

**Commercial**
Shopping  
Restaurants

**Healthcare**
After Hours Care

**Community Center**
Police Substation  
Community Business Incubator

Table 2 Catalyst Project Map
Table 3

Table 3 focused growth and redevelopment opportunities at three nodes along the Corridor: Plank Road at Choctaw, near the existing Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center, and Foster Drive at Choctaw. At each of the locations, they requested rehabilitation of existing buildings as well as development of new buildings. They expressed a need for both big box type stores as well as community owned retail businesses. In addition to the catalytic developments, they believe that a general clean up of the existing properties would spur interest in the Corridor.

Program Elements:

- Housing
  - Senior Living
  - Single Family
- Commercial
  - Bank
  - Gas Station
  - Restaurants
  - Retail
- Day Care
  - After School Care
  - Elderly Care
- Community Center

Table 3 Catalyst Project Map
Table 4 views the existing Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center as a primary target for catalytic development. They see the potential to make it the hub of the Choctaw Corridor. Additionally, they would like to see the Eden Park neighborhood revitalized and turned into a “community center” such as River Ranch with small homes, activities, and some commercial opportunities focused on the resident’s of the neighborhood.

Program Elements:

**Housing**
- Single Family
- Senior Living

**Commercial**
- Boutiques
- Coffee Shops
- Restaurants
- Deli

**Healthcare**
- Clinic
- Pharmacy

**Day Care**
- Child Care

**Community Center**
- Recreational Center
- Senior Community Center
- Medical Services Center
Table 5

Table 5 expressed a desire to revitalize existing buildings for catalytic development. They specifically identified the buildings at the intersection of Plank Road and Choctaw Drive as well as the existing Piggly Wiggly shopping center near the center of the Corridor. Requested development types include banking, healthcare, retail, restaurants, and entertainment.

Program Elements:

**Housing**
- Senior Housing
- Student Housing
- Single Family

**Commercial**
- Shopping
- Restaurants
- Theater
- Bank

**Healthcare**
- Multiplex Clinic
- Pharmacy
- Urgent Care

**Day Care**
- Child Care
- Senior Care

**Community Center**
- Recreation
- Bike Park

Table 5 Catalyst Project Map
Table 6

Table 6 placed catalytic development at the intersection of Plank Road and Choctaw Drive as well as the Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center with a focus on local businesses. Regarding housing, they also expressed a need for single family and multifamily infill development and single family housing rehabilitation.

Program Elements:

Housing
Multi-family
Single Family

Commercial
Shopping
Banking

Healthcare
Pharmacy

Day Care
Child Care
Senior Care

Community Center
Recreation
Group Discussions

Assets
The Visioning workshop generated interaction and revealed consensus among community members. The six randomly assigned groups identified many of the same assets and challenges. Although various locations were chosen, the themes remained the same with nearly every table identifying the following priorities:

**Assets -**
Available land and businesses
Connection and accessibility

**Challenges -**
Blight
Crime

These challenges should be addressed through the development of catalyst projects and improvements throughout the community that will be proposed in the CIP for Choctaw Corridor while being sure to protect the identified assets.

The catalyst project exercise also revealed the community’s similar visions for revitalization. The details of that analysis can be found after the maps on the following pages.
Analysis of input at the visioning workshop indicated an overwhelming lack of small businesses in the community offering the following: dining, shopping, entertainment, fresh produce, banking, and senior services as well as the need for rehabilitation of both existing housing and businesses. All six of the groups identified two primary areas for catalytic development; the intersection of Plank Road and Choctaw Drive and the existing Piggly Wiggly Shopping Center. Vacant property exists at both locations in the form of buildings as well as empty lots. A third potential location, at the corner of Choctaw Drive and Foster Drive, was identified by half of the groups and also has vacant property available. Analysis of the stakeholder’s survey also indicated a desire to bring in new small businesses and manufacturing or industrial businesses. Both residents and stakeholders indicated a general need for the entire corridor to be cleaned up and to have the existing vacant buildings rehabilitated to be brought back in to commerce.
HELP CREATE YOUR COMMUNITY’S IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP)

The East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority and its consultant team are working to create Community Improvement Plans for five unique and separate districts within East Baton Rouge Parish, including Choctaw Corridor, Melrose East, Northdale, Scotlandville Gateway, and Zion City & Glen Oaks. These revitalization plans will be community-driven and provide action-oriented strategies to affect the physical environment in ways that improve the quality of life for citizens in the targeted communities. These plans will build upon the momentum of other revitalization efforts currently underway.

Choctaw Corridor Visioning Workshop

May 18, 2010
5:30 pm - 7:30 pm
Istrouma High School
3730 Winbourne Avenue

Choctaw Corridor Alternatives & Implementation Workshop

August 7, 2010
9:00 am - 12:30 pm
Istrouma High School
3730 Winbourne Avenue

Refreshments will be provided. 1-877-311-5862 www.ebrra.org

Everyone is invited!
Attendees

Lael Holten
Abi Farlees
John Pham
Nathan Nguyen
Joseph C. Moses
Kydell Alexander
John Harper
Bud Madden
Frances Farlow
Christi Farby
William McCull
Mary Joseph
Janet Simmons
Carolyn Simmons
Louise Wilson
Regina Douglas
Arlene Johnson
Doreen Gardner
Dorothy King
LaTania Anderson
Sidi Lloyd-Shooster
Charlotte Moss
Dara Darner
Kathy L. Davenport
Morrie Duffin
Harold Porrell Briscoe
M. J. Demara
Billie Jan
Patricia Bottom
Sandra Hamilton
Joell leggings
Eugene Speed
Kevin Craver
Harold Williams
Patricia M. March
Martha Gardner
Bryan Jordan
Tamara Parry
Keslyn Augustine
Jay Augustine
Shallescia Turner
Choctaw Corridor Alternatives & Implementation Workshop

Location: Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center
Time: August 7, 2010 9:00 am - 12:30 pm

Prepared by:
Phillips-Davis Legacy & BROWN+DANOS landdesign, inc.
August 30, 2010
The intent of the Alternatives & Implementation Workshop on August 7, 2010 was to gain public input on the catalyst area concepts developed by the Phillips-Davis Legacy - BROWN+DANOS Team. The concepts were based on a market assessment and information received from the community at the Visioning Workshop on May 18, 2010. First, an introduction regarding the East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority’s mission and an outline of the 5 CIPs project was given by Walter Monsour. Karen Phillips followed with a brief description of the process completed up to this point. Following the introductory presentations, Dana Brown revealed the concept plans created for the two identified target areas within Choctaw Corridor. Attendees were given digital voting devices and were asked to vote on the concepts as a whole as well as individual components within each. Their votes were immediately displayed on the screen, which provided input to the team for “on-the-fly” revisions to the preferred concept. After voting was completed, respondents took a brief break to visit agencies of the Resource Fair while the consultant Team made adjustments to the concepts. Finally, attendees reconvened at the tables and were shown an overall vision for the area, and the preferred concepts illustrating their input were revealed. The Team will continue to develop the Choctaw Corridor Community Improvement Plan based on input received at both the Visioning and Alternatives & Implementation Workshops, technical analysis, collaboration with the RDA, and the Team’s expertise.
Analysis of input received by area residents at the Choctaw Corridor Visioning Workshop identified three potential target areas for future catalyst development. The first area, at the intersection of Plank Road and Choctaw Drive, illustrates that resident desires focus primarily on commercial development that would reuse some of the existing vacant buildings. The second area, near Choctaw Village Shopping Center, shows residents requesting additional commercial opportunities and housing taking advantage of the unused portion of that development’s parking lot and the adjacent vacant land. Finally, residents identified the intersection of Foster Drive and Choctaw Drive for a variety of uses including commercial, health care, and community centers. Market assessment of the area and research on property ownership was conducted to determine what types of development could be supported and which location would serve as the most appropriate catalyst. Conceptual designs were developed based on both this analysis and the input from community residents. Two concepts for the area near Choctaw Village Shopping Center were created for presentation to the public.
Concept Development Types

- **Single Family**
- **Townhouses**
- **Apartments**
- **Commercial**
- **Mixed Use**

*Concept development types distributed for reference at workshop*
In each of the concepts that were presented to attendees of the workshop, basic development types were defined. These included those developments set forth in the Louisiana Land Use Toolkit to be appropriate for urban areas including: Single Family, Townhouses, Apartments, Commercial, and Mixed Use. The development types were color coded on the concept plans and printed copies of the “Concept Development Types” flyer, shown on page 4, were placed at each table.

Prior to the detailed descriptions of the two catalyst concepts, attendees were asked if the goals below, collected from the Visioning Workshop, were what they would generally like to see in the Choctaw Village Area.

**Identified Catalyst Goals:**
- Retail Shopping
- Restaurants/Cafes
- Entertainment
- Banking
- Senior Living
- Recreation Center
- Farmer’s Market
- Medical Facilities
- Townhouses

[Image of attendees discussing concepts]
Choctaw Village Area Concepts

Choctaw Village Area - Concept A

Concept A focuses on placing a variety of commercial opportunities within the unused parking area of the Choctaw Village Shopping Center. The buildings are placed along Choctaw Drive with parking behind them activating the street and providing a more pedestrian focused development. An extension of Delaware Street would connect the street to the shopping center. Several townhomes as well as a mixed use building were placed along the new street. To the west of the shopping center, a new drive was provided across North 38th Street leading into a senior living facility. Along this new drive, an existing vacant warehouse is suggested for reuse as a community center, as well as two new commercial buildings with frontage on Choctaw Drive. The existing concrete channel, Ward Creek, is shown as being renaturalized to provide better stormwater management and a natural amenity to residents of the area.
Choctaw Village Area - Concept B

Concept B also places commercial development within the unused parking area of the Choctaw Village Shopping Center but adds a large mixed use building along Ward Creek and provides for shared parking within the development. The extension of Delaware Street shows only townhomes, but still connects the street to the shopping center. The new drive across North 38th Street leads to an assisted living facility and connects to the proposed community center. A mixed use building is shown fronting Choctaw Drive and utilizes a shared parking lot that would service this new development as well as the existing businesses along Acadian Thruway. The renaturalization of Ward Creek is shown in this concept as well.
Following a description of both Concept A and B, attendees were asked to vote on their favorite of the two.

Voting Results

57.1% I prefer Concept A
42.9% I prefer Concept B
Question: Within concept A, which of the following elements do you like the most? (choose 2 in order of preference)

- New Green Space
- Senior Independent Living
- Mixed use (retail & residential) development
- Cafe Seating
- Attached Commercial Building

Voting Results

- A. New Green Space: 29.2%
- B. Senior Independent Living: 20.8%
- C. Mixed use development (retail & residential): 20.8%
- D. Cafe Seating: 8.3%
- E. Attached Commercial Building: 20.8%
Question: New green space is shown at this location on North 38th Street. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

Voting Results

- **Shaded gathering area with walking trails**: 61.5%
- **Playground**: 23.1%
- **Athletic courts**: 15.4%

**Diagram**: Map highlighting the new green space location on North 38th Street.
Question: Townhomes are shown at this location. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

- I like townhomes at this location: 7.1%
- I would prefer single family homes: 42.9%
- I would prefer mixed use (retail and residential): 50.0%

Voting Results:
- I like townhomes at this location
- I would prefer single family homes
- I would prefer mixed use (retail and residential)
Question: A mixed use building (retail and residential) is shown at this location. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

Voting Results

- I like mixed use here: 57.1%
- I prefer a detached commercial building here: 35.7%
- I prefer more townhomes: 0%
- I prefer single family homes here: 7.1%

[Image of mixed use building and diagram of location]
Question: This concept shows a large attached commercial building fronting Choctaw Drive. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

- I like the attached commercial building: 64.3%
- I prefer several smaller commercial opportunities: 7.1%
- I prefer a mixed use (residential and commercial) building: 28.6%

Voting Results
Question: This concept shows a green space between the community center and the senior living facility. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

Voting Results
- I prefer a community garden here: 71.4%
- I prefer a playground here: 7.1%
- I prefer a small park with seating: 7.1%
- I prefer athletic courts at this location: 14.3%

Map of the community center and senior living facility area.
Choctaw Village Area - Concept B Questions

Question: Within concept B, which of the following elements do you like the most? (choose 2 in order of preference)

- Mixed Use Buildings
- Parking Away from the Street
- Cafe Seating
- Senior Assisted Living
- Townhomes

Voting Results:
- Mixed Use Buildings: 28.6%
- Cafe Seating: 21.4%
- Senior Assisted Living: 17.9%
- Parking Away from the Street: 10.7%
- Townhomes: 21.4%

Choctaw Village Area Concept B - Tilt Up

A. Mixed Use Buildings
B. Parking away from the street
C. Cafe Seating
D. Senior Assisted Living
E. Townhomes
Question: In this concept, a large mixed use building is shown. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

- I like mixed use (commercial & residential) in this location: 57.1%
- I prefer a large commercial building here: 35.7%
- I prefer several smaller commercial buildings here: 7.1%

Voting Results
Question: This concept shows cafe seating at the proposed entrance off Choctaw Drive. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

- I like cafe seating here: 78.6%
- I don’t want cafe seating: 7.1%
- I prefer cafe seating placed toward the parking lot: 14.3%

Voting Results
Question: A group of attached commercial buildings is shown at this location off of North 38th Street. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

Voting Results

- I like attached commercial at this location: 7.1%
- I prefer mixed use (retail & residential) in this location: 14.3%
- I prefer several smaller commercial buildings here: 78.6%
Question: In this concept, an assisted living facility is shown. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

- I like assisted living at this location: 26.7%
- I prefer senior independent living at this location: 46.7%
- I prefer townhomes at this location: 26.7%

Voting Results:
Question: A mixed use building is shown at this location near the corner of Acadian Thruway and Choctaw Drive. Do you prefer... (Choose 1)

Voting Results

- I like mixed use at this location: 78.6%
- I prefer an attached commercial building at this location: 14.3%
- I prefer several smaller commercial buildings here: 7.1%

EAST BATON ROUGE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Choctaw Corridor Alternatives & Implementation Workshop

Community Opportunities

A break was provided for attendees to visit the Resource Fair. Following the break, a concept for making connections within the community was presented. It features crosswalks, street beautification and pedestrian enhancement opportunities, renaturalization of Ward Creek, and several new street connections. Attendees were asked a series of questions regarding the elements.

A. Pedestrian Enhancements
B. Crosswalks
C. New Street Connections
D. Renaturalized Canal
Question: Would you like to have pedestrian enhancements like sidewalks, street lights, and plantings along these major streets?

Voting Results

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

Map showing the streets with pedestrian enhancements.
Crosswalk illustrations

Question: Do you think the crosswalks would be helpful to increase the safety of the area?

100%

Yes
No

Voting Results

Question: Do you like the idea of community inspired crosswalks as illustrated on the opposite screen?

100%

Yes
No

Voting Results
Question: Would you like to see the new street connections made?

Voting Results

- Yes
- No

100%
Regional Opportunities

Attendees were then shown a map illustrating Regional Connection Opportunities, possible ways to connect the community to the rest of the city.

Question: Would you walk or bike along a greenway connecting area parks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Results</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Greenway
B. Parks
C. Major Roadways
D. Pedestrian Enhancements
Preferred Concepts

As workshop attendees answered questions regarding elements of each concept, designers worked to adjust the concepts to fit their responses. While residents took advantage of the resource fair, the adjustments were completed. Following the presentation of community and regional scale connection opportunities, the preferred concept was revealed.

Resource Fair Participants

BREC
Capital Area United Way
Capital Area Transit (CATS)
City of Baton Rouge Fire Department
City of Baton Rouge Police Department
Department of Public Works
Office of Community Development
Human Development and Services
LAChip
East Baton Rouge Parish Library
The Greater Baton Rouge Literacy Coalition
Baton Rouge Black Chamber of Commerce
Baton Rouge Area Chamber of Commerce
In the original presentation of Concept A and B for the Choctaw Village area, residents indicated that they generally preferred Concept B. That concept was used as the base concept and adjustments were made regarding specific elements. In the original concept, Delaware Street was extended and townhomes were proposed along it. Respondents overwhelmingly responded against the townhomes, indicating more of a desire for single family housing. The group of commercial buildings within the vacant parking area of the Choctaw Village Shopping Center was originally shown as attached commercial, however when asked their preference in both concept A & B questions, the majority of respondents stated that they preferred smaller commercial buildings. This adjustment was made, placing green space and seating areas between buildings. While the majority of respondents would like some form of senior housing to be included in the catalyst concept, nearly half preferred independent living facilities over the assisted living that was shown in the original concept B. Finally, the open greenspace that was shown between the senior living facility and the community center was adjusted to show a small park setting with seating areas in response to community input.
Next Steps

The preferred concepts for the Choctaw Village Area will continue to be refined by the Philips-Davis Legacy - BROWN + DANOS Team. The final designs will be based off of the information received from both the Visioning and Alternatives & Implementation Workshops as well as market assessment, technical analysis, input from the RDA, and the Team’s expertise. Additionally, the Team will make recommendations for code or policy changes and funding strategies that may be necessary to provide for the success of the Choctaw Corridor Community Improvement Plan.
The following information illustrates analysis completed regarding the development opportunities within the CIP area. Documents included are the Choctaw Corridor Adaptive Reuse and Architectural Analysis Report, the Choctaw Corridor Market Overview, and the Choctaw Corridor Pro-forma Spreadsheets. These documents were completed in the spring and summer of 2010.
Choctaw Corridor Architectural Survey and Adaptive Reuse Analysis

Prepared by:
Trahan Architects
November 2010
Introduction

In order to make appropriate recommendations for the future physical change and growth of Choctaw Corridor, Trahan Architects conducted and prepared the Choctaw Architectural Survey and Adaptive Reuse Analysis. The review began with a windshield survey conducted in July 2010 in order to examine the existing general conditions of the area. Once a catalyst area was determined via input from the community and analysis by the Team, a more thorough review was conducted in October 2010 observing each building individually noting its physical condition as well as its existing use. Finally, analysis of this information was completed which lead to recommendations for the area as a whole as well as each building within the catalyst area.
Choctaw Windshield Survey Summary

OBSERVED CONDITIONS

Commercial Corridor – As Choctaw Drive is traversed from east to west, the significance of the corridor is immediately understood. Businesses are entrenched on the north side of the street. Some buildings are vacant and some are in disrepair, but investment in the area is apparent. Large scale warehouses and manufacturing facilities indicate this area is vital to greater metropolitan economy. Unfortunately, some of the businesses that once occupied this area have moved out, leaving the corridor in a state of disarray.

Commuting Artery – Choctaw Drive is an arterial road with significant volume. Residence and businesses alike use the corridor on an everyday basis. The high volume of traffic creates opportunities, but at the same time the speed of the traffic creates a disconnect between the user and the built environment.

Empty Facilities – The significance of the commercial corridor is offset by vacancy in the area. Many of the large scale facilities stand empty. These ultimately affect the viability and value of the neighborhood.

Presence of People – The number of consumer-driven businesses create an ever present movement of people. In the Choctaw Village Shopping Center, people not only patronize the existing businesses, but also setup small markets in the parking lot. This is a quality that could be vital to future development.

Disconnect between Commercial and Residential – There is a significant scale change between the commercial and industrial buildings on the north side of Choctaw Drive and the residential neighborhood to the north of these buildings. Single family homes face buildings that occupy one quarter of a square block. These abrupt changes in scale compromise both programmatic elements of the neighborhood.

Accessibility – Choctaw Corridor is situated between an interstate and a major highway. It can easily be accessed by vehicle from downtown, adjacent neighborhoods, and the rest of the city. However, these same vehicular methods of access present challenges for pedestrian movement to and from the corridor.

Deferred Maintenance – Many of the vacant buildings along Choctaw Corridor do not seem to be actively maintained. The viability of putting these buildings back into service is compromised by this deferred maintenance, but opportunities should be evaluated on a case by case basis as not to overlook anything.

EMPIRICAL BOUNDARIES

Choctaw Dr – An inadequate number of crosswalks combined with the speed of traffic along Choctaw Drive creates a barrier between the neighborhoods on either side of the street.

Railroad Line – Lines running along the south side of Choctaw Drive create a physical and visual barrier that further separates adjacent neighborhoods.
Choctaw Adaptive Reuse 
General Recommendations

Analysis from the Visioning Workshop indicates people who live in and around the Choctaw Corridor want existing buildings to be reoccupied and would like to see infill projects occupy the abundant amount of vacant land. Programmatically, residents and stakeholders identified dining, shopping, entertainment, fresh produce, banking, and senior services as their priorities. The two sites identified by area residents for potential catalyst projects, the intersection of Choctaw Drive and Plank Road and The Choctaw Village Shopping Center, both have large scale unoccupied buildings in serviceable condition and in the case of Choctaw Village Shopping Center, a larger amount of vacant land.

The industries that once occupied these buildings have moved out of this neighborhood along with the demand for such spaces, so the following adaptive reuse survey focused on unoccupied building and vacant land rather than the reuse of occupied buildings so the existing problems are not exacerbated.

Visual assessment of the buildings recommended for adaptive reuse at both sites (see maps that follow) indicate the large spaces created by buildings of this scale could be converted into markets or entertainments venues. In fact, a portion of the warehousing complex at the northwest corner of the intersection of Choctaw Drive and Plank Road was at one time a theater.

Is there a particular program that can utilize existing spaces and meet the needs of the residences and stakeholders identified in the Visioning Workshop? One possible programmatic solution might be urban agriculture, which is the process of cultivating, processing, and distributing food within an existing urban environment. Vacant land and unused parking in and around the Choctaw Village Shopping Center could be cultivated and the existing vacant buildings could house the processing and distribution of the food. This program would provide access to fresh produce and create demand for support businesses and infrastructure.
A vacant warehousing complex on the northwest corner of Choctaw Drive and Plank Road could be put back into use as a warehousing facility or is sized to accommodate a variety of commercial or light industry programs. The complex could also be divided into smaller spaces for use as retail or office space. All of these programmatic uses have their own unique structural, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing requirements that would have to be verified before the building could be put back into use.

A vacant warehousing complex on the southeast corner of Choctaw Drive and Plank Road is sized to accommodate a variety of commercial or light industrial programs. The building could also be converted into a large scale market. The size of the building is unique in the neighborhood and would probably present more value if it is kept as continuous space rather than being subdivided into smaller spaces. All of these programmatic uses have their own unique structural, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing requirements that would have to be verified before the building could be put back into use.
A vacant warehousing complex on the southeast corner of North Acadian Thruway and Seneca Street is sized to accommodate a large scale outdoor market or a manufacturing facility. All of these programmatic uses have their own unique structural, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing requirements that would have to be verified before the building could be put back into use.

An unused parking lot and vacant land in front of the Choctaw Village Shopping Center could accommodate normative improvements such as commercial, residential or mixed-use programs or a more innovative urban agriculture program (as outlined in the introduction) could be implemented. All of these programmatic uses have their own unique structural, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing requirements that would have to be verified before the site could be put into use.
Architectural Ranking

Following the Visioning Workshop, information the community provided along with analysis by the Team was used to identify a catalyst area in Choctaw. It is the objective of the architectural ranking to better understand the built environment in this area. Two questions were asked of each structure, “is it apparently architecturally sound and viable for redevelopment?” and “if so, in what capacity?”

Choctaw Village Shopping Center is the site identified via input from residents and analysis by the Team for catalyst development and was examined in October 2010 for the purpose of this survey. In general this is a commercial and light industrial district along an arterial road with single family homes tucked behind. Some of the commercial buildings have fallen into disrepair and others are unoccupied. The opportunity to repair and/or reoccupy the buildings combined with vacant land creates an opportunity for mixed use, commercial, or assisted living redevelopment.

To determine how a building should be addressed, a rating of A, B, or C was given to each one. A rating of “A” indicates the building is in extremely poor condition and should be removed due to safety concerns. A rating of “B” indicates the building is in poor condition but can and should be rehabilitated. In this case, commercial building owners can explore available rehabilitation programs. A rating of “C” indicates the building is viable and any development should retain the building. The catalyst area and each building’s rating is diagrammed in the map to the right. Below is a brief description of each building’s existing use and condition and where viable, its reuse opportunities. The information in this survey is based on visually observed conditions from the exterior of the structures. Prior to any action taken regarding each property, further analysis should be completed.
BUILDING 01
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 02
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 03
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in good condition. Any development should retain the building.
BUILDING 04
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 05
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 06
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.
BUILDING 07
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 08
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 09
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.
BUILDING 10
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 11
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 12
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.
BUILDING 13
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 14
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 15
PRIORITY C
The building is in good condition and appears to be occupied. Its current use is unclear. Further analysis is needed, but any development should plan to retain the building.
BUILDING 16
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 17
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 18
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.
BUILDING 19
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 20
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 21
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING 22</th>
<th>PRIORITY C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING 23</th>
<th>PRIORITY C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING 24</th>
<th>PRIORITY C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUILDING 25
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 26
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 27
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.
BUILDING 28
PRIORITY C
This is a single family residence in fair to good condition. Any development should retain the building.

BUILDING 29
PRIORITY B
The building is in fair to poor condition and is currently occupied. Its existing use is appropriate for the area and would serve catalytic development well. If a thorough analysis proves this building to be viable, it should be considered a candidate for façade enhancement opportunities.

BUILDING 30
PRIORITY B
The building is in fair to poor condition and is currently occupied. Its existing use is appropriate for the area and would serve catalytic development well. If a thorough analysis proves this building to be viable, it should be considered a candidate for façade enhancement opportunities.
BUILDING 31
PRIORITY B
The building is in fair to poor condition and is currently occupied. Following a thorough analysis to determine the viability of this building, it may be an excellent candidate for façade grants.

BUILDING 32
PRIORITY B
The building is in fair condition and is not occupied. Following a thorough analysis to determine the viability of this building, appropriate uses could include an outdoor market or a manufacturing facility.

BUILDING 33
PRIORITY B
The building is in poor condition and is currently unoccupied. Replacement of this building could be considered in order to reduce blight and create new opportunities for development. Appropriate uses for this site would include assisted living, commercial, or mixed use developments.
BUILDING 34
PRIORITY B

The building is in poor to fair condition and is occupied. If the existing business could be relocated, the land could be converted to a more appropriate use, but if that is not possible, it may be a candidate for façade grants.

BUILDING 35
PRIORITY B

The building is in poor to fair condition and is currently unoccupied. Replacement of this building could be considered in order to reduce blight and create new opportunities for development. Appropriate uses for this site would include assisted living, commercial, or mixed use developments.

BUILDING 36
PRIORITY B

The building is in poor condition and is currently unoccupied. Replacement of this building could be considered in order to reduce blight and create new opportunities for development. Appropriate uses for this site would include commercial or mixed use developments.
BUILDING 37
PRIORITY B
This commercial building is in poor to fair condition and is currently occupied. Its condition, combined with poor site planning, would suggest temporarily relocating the business and building a new structure. If this is not possible, a façade grant could be a possibility.

BUILDING 38
PRIORITY A
The building is in poor condition and is currently unoccupied. The building appears to have been vacant for an extended period of time and does not seem to have been maintained. It appears not to be viable for reuse at this time. Replacement of this building could be considered in order to reduce blight and create new opportunities for development.

BUILDING 39
PRIORITY C
The building is in good condition and its existing land use is appropriate. Any development proposals should retain the building.
BUILDING 40
PRIORITY C
The building is in good condition and its existing land use is appropriate. Any development proposals should retain the building.

BUILDING 41
PRIORITY C
The building is in good condition and its existing land use is appropriate. Any development proposals should retain the building.

BUILDING 42
PRIORITY C
The building is in good condition and its existing land use is appropriate. Any development proposals should retain the building.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND

The East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority (RDA) has engaged the services of the Brown + Danos consultant Team to assist in creating a series of Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) for five distinct districts in East Baton Rouge Parish: (1) Melrose East, (2) Zion City & Glen Oaks, (3) Northdale, (4) Scotlandville Gateway, and the (5) Choctaw Corridor. ECONorthwest is a sub consultant to the Team and is responsible for discussing factors that affect redevelopment in the 5 CIP areas. In addition, the scope includes preparing financial development pro-formas and recommendations for redevelopment financing and implementation.

The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the market and discuss the factors that affect redevelopment in the Choctaw Corridor. The report will help facilitate discussion among residents, the RDA, the technical advisory committee, and the consultant Team.

The balance of this document is organized as follows:

» Data and methods describe available data and documents and explain other sources of information used in the market overview.

» Framework provides an overview of the neighborhood and the geographical approximations used for data collection.

» Factors that affect redevelopment include an analysis of the factors that will shape future growth in the Choctaw Corridor.

» Implications recommendations list the implications and recommendations for planning future development in the Choctaw Corridor.

1.2. DATA AND METHODS

This document assesses demographic and real estate market trends. It is not a market analysis for a specific site or use. We reviewed the following available data and documents: 1) Census Bureau: population, household demographics and income, housing ownership and costs, 2) Claritas: demographics and forecasts, 3) Economic census: per capita spending at certain types of stores, 4) Bureau of Labor Statistics 5) Consumer Expenditure Survey: proportion of income spent on certain products.

Growth factors, demographics, and development market trends were assessed by the Team. The Team and the RDA conducted interviews with several entities including developers, brokers, property owners, and other stakeholders.

2. FRAMEWORK

2.1. THE STUDY AREA

This document discusses the market in the context of the Choctaw Corridor Community. In some cases, it would be inaccurate to consider a census tract as belonging to one neighborhood because significant portions of the tract are closer to the adjacent neighborhood.
The neighborhood is located in the City of Baton Rouge, which is within East Baton Rouge Parish. The darker green shading approximates the boundaries of the neighborhood while the lighter blue illustrates the census tract boundaries. Exhibit 1 shows the location of the neighborhood relative to surrounding parts of the City and Parish.

**Exhibit 1. Vicinity map with census tracts, East Baton Rouge, 2010**

A portion of our assessment relies on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, which can be analyzed at different size geographies: (1) state, (2) parish (3) city (4) tracts (5) block groups and (6) blocks. The state, parish, and city geographies are too large to provide accurate information about characteristics of the 5 CIPs. Alternately, block groups and blocks are not large enough to yield necessary information about income and housing. Therefore, we use census tracts for this analysis, as they provide the best available balance of geography and data. Exhibit 1 illustrates the relationship between census tract boundaries and the neighborhood boundaries. Note that although census tracts do not correspond to the exact boundaries of the 5 CIP neighborhoods. Instead of identifying census tracts by number, we use the neighborhood names to refer to the census tracts.

An overview of market factors can help a community prepare for future growth and change. It can assess whether public policies about land use, public facilities, financial incentives, and economic development are compatible with market forces. A market overview can help identify the degree to which likely demand for development matches the underlying ability of the area to provide built space at expected prices to meet that demand. The analysis in this document focuses on market factors that affect the potential
development of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Many factors can influence the future supply and demand for development in a specific area. Key among them are 1) growth (or decline) in population and employment in the downtown, the city, the surrounding area, and selected neighborhoods, 2) the demographic make up of expected growth, 3) characteristics of employment, 4) location and access to transportation and amenities, (5) availability and affordability of residential units and commercial services, and 6) land use regulations that determine how and where growth will occur. A logical way to get to the specific questions about the type of development that is desirable and possible is to start more broadly with the region, the Parish, and the City. First it is important to have an idea of what type and how much growth has occurred and where new growth is likely to locate. Some rough estimate of the amount and distribution of growth provides a context for our evaluation of specific development issues in selected neighborhoods.

3. FACTORS THAT AFFECT REDEVELOPMENT

The commercial and residential market within the neighborhood must be understood in the context of the City of Baton Rouge, the Parish, and the larger region. This section describes key demographic and market trends that affect redevelopment in the Choctaw Corridor.

3.1. POPULATION GROWTH

Exhibit 2 shows population in the United States, Louisiana, the Baton Rouge MSA, City of Baton Rouge, and the Choctaw Corridor in 1990, 2000, and 2008/2009. Population grew by less than 5% in Louisiana over the 28-year period, adding about 200,000 new residents. Much of the growth in Louisiana after 2000 can be attributed to natural increase, as net out-migration from Louisiana was nearly 300,000 for the decade. Population in the Baton Rouge MSA grew by 0.97% annually between 1980 and 2008, accounting for nearly 90% of population growth in the State over the 28-year period. The City of Baton Rouge grew by 4% between 1990 and 2000, an increase of over 8,000 people. Between 2000 and 2008, the City’s population declined by 2% or over 4,000 people. Census tracts representing the Choctaw Corridor decreased by nearly 4,000 people between 1990 and 2009, or about 1% a year, totaling 17% of the area’s population.

Statewide population trends were affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. The region saw an influx of nearly 43,000 evacuees from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, according to the Louisiana Public Health Institute. While the population of the Parish grew by 13% between 1990 and 2008, the Parish’s share of the regional population growth declined from 61% to 55%.

---

3 Under high migration assumptions, the State forecasts average annual growth of 0.72% in Louisiana and 1.48% in the Baton Rouge MSA. Under low migration assumptions, the State forecasts average annual growth of 0.34% in Louisiana and 0.59% in the Baton Rouge MSA.
The Louisiana State Census Data Center projects population growth by parish over the 2010 and 2030 period. The State developed forecasts under three different sets of in-migration assumptions. Exhibit 3 shows the State of Louisiana’s population projections for Louisiana and the Baton Rouge MSA for the 2005-2030 period under middle migration assumptions. The Baton Rouge MSA is forecast to grow at 0.98% annually between 2010 and 2030, which is consistent with the population growth rate in the MSA over 1980-2008 period. Population growth in the Baton Rouge MSA is forecast to account for about 39% of statewide population growth over the 20-year period.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Louisiana</th>
<th>Baton Rouge MSA</th>
<th>East Baton Rouge</th>
<th>City of Baton Rouge</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>249,464,396</td>
<td>4,219,179</td>
<td>624,709</td>
<td>380,699</td>
<td>219,531</td>
<td>22,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>4,468,976</td>
<td>705,973</td>
<td>412,852</td>
<td>227,818</td>
<td>20,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>304,059,724</td>
<td>4,410,796</td>
<td>774,327</td>
<td>428,360</td>
<td>223,689</td>
<td>18,544*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change 1990-2008**

- **Number**: 54,595,328 to 191,617
- **Percent**: 22% to 5%
- **AAGR**: 1.11% to 0.25%

**Source**: U.S. Census Population Estimates, Claritas 2009

**Note**: Baton Rouge MSA includes Ascension, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberville, Livingston, Pointe Coupee, St. Helena, West Baton Rouge, and West Feliciana parishes.

**Note**: Choctaw Area shows 2009 Claritas estimates for East Baton Rouge Census Tracts 5, 6.02, 8, 9, and 10.

### Exhibit 3. Population projections under middle migration assumptions, Louisiana and Baton Rouge MSA, 2005-2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Louisiana</th>
<th>Baton Rouge MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,510,170</td>
<td>731,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,369,760</td>
<td>793,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,477,680</td>
<td>827,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4,588,310</td>
<td>868,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4,699,260</td>
<td>914,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4,813,420</td>
<td>965,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change 2010-2030**

- **Number**: 443,660 to 171,810
- **Percent**: 10% to 22%
- **AAGR**: 0.48% to 0.98%

Exhibit 4 shows projected population change over the 2010-2030 period for the nine parishes in the Baton Rouge MSA under middle migration assumptions. Only Ascension and Livingston Parishes are expected to add population over the period.

The key findings for the State forecasts of population growth are:

» The Baton Rouge MSA will continue to grow at an average annual rate about twice that of Louisiana between 2010 and 2030 but will only account for 39% of statewide growth over the 20-year period. The MSA accounted for 90% of population growth over the 1980 to 2008 period.

» All population growth in the Baton Rouge MSA is expected to take place in Ascension and Livingston Parishes, which are projected to nearly double in size between 2010 and 2030. The population of East Baton Rouge is projected to decrease over the 20-year period at an annual rate of -0.14%.

» Growth is occurring in outer parishes, southern parts of East Baton Rouge Parish, and in Central/Zachary. Between 1990 and 2008, the City of Baton Rouge grew by 0.10% annually compared to 0.66% in the Parish as a whole, which suggests that unincorporated areas outside the City of Baton Rouge and other municipalities in the parish grew faster than the City.

» Slow growth in the City and the Parish suggest that declining populations in North Baton Rouge neighborhoods may continue absent significant changes to policy and economic conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>AAGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>109,030</td>
<td>196,140</td>
<td>87,110</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Baton Rouge</td>
<td>443,700</td>
<td>421,500</td>
<td>-12,200</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Feliciana</td>
<td>20,040</td>
<td>17,060</td>
<td>-2,980</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville</td>
<td>30,830</td>
<td>24,640</td>
<td>-6,190</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>129,420</td>
<td>242,780</td>
<td>113,360</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Coupee</td>
<td>22,240</td>
<td>19,380</td>
<td>-2,860</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>-1,780</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Baton Rouge</td>
<td>22,720</td>
<td>21,070</td>
<td>-1,650</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Feliciana</td>
<td>15,260</td>
<td>14,260</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-0.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.2. EMPLOYMENT (EMPLOYEES BY INDUSTRY)

Exhibit 5 shows labor force participation and unemployment in East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor in 2009. The labor force participation rate was lower in the Choctaw Corridor (56%) than Parish-wide (65%). The unemployment rate in the Choctaw Corridor was 13% compared to 6% in the Parish.
Exhibit 5. Labor force participation and unemployment, East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor Area 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Baton Rouge Parish</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 16+</td>
<td>338,349</td>
<td>13,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force</td>
<td>220,749</td>
<td>7,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force Participation</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>13,211</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas 2009

Note: Only population above the age of 16 shown

Exhibit 6 shows relative employment by sector in East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor in 2009. The major industry sectors in the Choctaw Corridor Area were health care and social assistance, retail trade, and accommodation and food service. These three industries had below-average weekly wages in the Baton Rouge Regional Labor Market in 2009. Choctaw Corridor had a low percentage of residents employed in professional, scientific, and technical services and finance, insurance, and real estate compared to the Parish as a whole. These industries had average- to above-average weekly wages in the Baton Rouge Regional Labor Market in 2009. 4


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>East Baton Rouge Parish</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail Trade</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate (Rental &amp; Leasing)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support and Waste Management</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Care and Social Assistance</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation and Food Administration</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (Except Public Administration)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employment</strong></td>
<td><strong>207,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,715</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas 2009

---

Exhibit 7 shows where residents of the City of Baton Rouge worked in 2008. It provides a useful illustration of where major employment centers are located relative to the Choctaw Corridor. The largest employment center in the Parish is located southeast of the Choctaw Corridor along Florida Boulevard, and another large concentration is located downtown to the southwest of Northdale. This area includes the Louisiana State Capitol.

3.3. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Racial composition

Exhibit 8 shows the racial composition of Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish, and the Choctaw Corridor Area in 2009. The population of the Choctaw Corridor Area was 97% African American, roughly two to three times the percentage of Louisiana or the Parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Louisiana</th>
<th>East Baton Rouge Parish</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>4,455,166</td>
<td>434,260</td>
<td>18,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1,444,782</td>
<td>197,745</td>
<td>18,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black or African American</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas 2009

Educational attainment

Exhibit 9 shows the highest level of educational attainment for population above the age of 25 in Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish, and the Choctaw Corridor Area in 2009. Seventy-two percent of the Choctaw Corridor residents do not have formal education beyond high school, compared to 42% of Parish residents and 57% of Louisiana residents. In contrast, 32% of the Parish and 19% of the State had bachelor’s degrees or better, compared to just 8% in the Choctaw Corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment for Population 25+</th>
<th>Louisiana</th>
<th>East Baton Rouge Parish</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25+</td>
<td>2,869,067</td>
<td>266,760</td>
<td>10,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas 2009
Age

Exhibit 10 shows age for residents of Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish, and the Choctaw Corridor in 2009. The Choctaw Corridor had a larger proportion of people under the age of 18 (29%) than the Parish or State as a whole (both 25%). Above the age of 18, age categories were fairly similar between the Choctaw Corridor, the Parish, and the State. The Choctaw Corridor had a slightly higher proportion of its population above the age of 64 than the Parish.

The Choctaw Corridor is located in a portion of East Baton Rouge Parish with some of the lowest life expectancy in the State. The life expectancy for residents of Central East Baton Rouge Parish are expected to live 71-74 years, compared to 76-77 in the rest of the Parish and 77-78 in West Baton Rouge Parish. 5

Exhibit 10. Age in Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor Area, 2009

Exhibit 11 shows the age composition portion of the State population forecast for Louisiana and the Baton Rouge MSA in 2010 and 2030. The State projects that the greatest growth will be in population over 60 years old, consistent with national trends. The percent of population above the age of 60 is projected to increase over the 20-year period from 18% to 23% statewide and 16% to 20% in the Baton Rouge MSA.

The State forecasts that the fastest growing age group in the region will be people 60 years and older, with the share of people in this age group in the Baton Rouge MSA increasing from 16% to 20% over the 20-year period. As an area with a slightly higher portion of seniors than the Parish as a whole, the Choctaw Corridor is likely to experience similar, if not more pronounced population aging than the MSA.

5 Louisiana Human Development Report 2009
Exhibit 11. Age distribution, Louisiana and Baton Rouge MSA, 2010 and 2030

Exhibit 12. Per capita income, average household income, and families below poverty, East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor Area, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Baton Rouge Parish</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income</td>
<td>$ 23,796</td>
<td>$ 11,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income</td>
<td>$ 61,151</td>
<td>$ 30,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>110,862</td>
<td>4,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families below poverty line</td>
<td>14,327</td>
<td>1,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of families below poverty</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas 2009

Note: Average household income was calculated by dividing aggregate household income in each census tract and dividing by the total number of households. Calculating median income for each census tract was not possible with block group-level data. The Census poverty threshold in 2009 for a family of four was about $22,000

3.4. LOCATION AND ACCESS

The Choctaw Corridor has several important locational advantages and disadvantages relative to other communities in the Parish. These are described below.

» Proximity to downtown and employment centers. The Choctaw Corridor is located within close proximity to downtown and other employment centers relative to other neighborhoods in the Parish. The Choctaw Corridor is located northeast of downtown Baton Rouge, which is home to the Capitol,
and numerous employers, cultural institutions, and churches. This location gives the neighborhood an advantage over other areas in the City, as it offers shorter commute distances and access to downtown activity.

» **Proximity to higher educational institutions.** The neighborhood is situated almost equidistant from Louisiana State University (LSU), Southern University, and Baton Rouge Community College (BRCC), although this neighborhood is closest to BRCC (3.5 miles). This proximity to higher education, technical skills, and job training, in conjunction with proximity to downtown, is a potential advantage for the neighborhood.

» **Access to medical facilities.** The Choctaw Corridor neighborhood is located within relatively close proximity to Baton Rouge General Medical, which is an amenity for residents and employees.

» **Access to I-110.** The Choctaw Corridor has relatively convenient access to I-110, which provides direct routes to downtown, employment centers, and commercial services via Chippewa Street and Plank Road. Note that while convenient interstate access exists, the interstate itself presents a significant physical and psychological barrier for the neighborhood: between Choctaw Corridor and adjacent neighborhoods and between Downtown Baton Rouge.

» **Transit.** The Choctaw Corridor is served by the Capitol Area Transit System (CATS), which operates a bus system throughout the region. Buses do not run on Choctaw Drive, but the area is served by Plank route 41 and Fairfield route 13, which runs both north and south of Choctaw on Winbourne Avenue and Fairfields Avenue, respectively. Route 41 runs about twice per hour between 5:00 am and 10:00 pm on weekdays/Saturdays and once per hour on Sundays. Route 13 runs once per hour on weekdays/Saturdays, with no service on Sunday.  

» **Access to vehicles.** In 2000, 18% of the Choctaw Corridor did not have access to a vehicle, compared to 9% in East Baton Rouge Parish. The amount of travel a household demands is strongly related to the availability of vehicles. According to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, persons in households with vehicles in 2001 took on average 50% more trips than households that did. Households with income less than $25,000 were almost 10 times more likely to not have a vehicle than households making above $25,000. A reliable and convenient transit system can help compensate for the lack of access to vehicles.

» **Proximity to airport.** The Choctaw Corridor is located within close proximity to the Baton Rouge Metropolitan Airport, compared to other neighborhoods in the Parish. This proximity gives the neighborhood a competitive advantage, not only for access to the airport, but also as a potential location for employers seeking convenient airport access (distribution, airport services, logistics, transportation).

### 3.5. COMMERCIAL SERVICES

Exhibit 15 illustrates the market area around the Choctaw Corridor plan area. For the purposes of this analysis and after discussion with the consultant Team, a center point located at Choctaw Drive and Plank Road was selected. Exhibit 14 shows a 1.0 and 2.0 and 3.0-mile radius.

---

7 U.S. Census 2000, H44 Summary File 3
8 Bureau of Transportation Statistics.
Residents of the neighborhood indicated a desire for commercial services, such as restaurants, coffee shops, banks, gas stations, pharmacies, health care clinics. The Choctaw Corridor contains three small commercial nodes at Plank Road, North 38th Street, and North Foster Drive. The area around the Foret and McCall shopping center (Choctaw/Plank) includes a general merchandise discount store and a pharmacy. Choctaw Village Shopping Center at North 38th Street contains a grocery store and other smaller commercial services (beauty supply, shoe store, fast food). There are numerous convenience stores throughout the neighborhood, while full service grocery stores are located at Choctaw Village Shopping Center at Choctaw and N. 38th (Piggly Wiggly) and on Government Street and Foster Drive (Albertston’s) about 3.3 miles away. The next nearest opportunities to access commercial services are located further east of the neighborhood, Choctaw Drive/Airline Highway and Cortana Mall (5-6 miles away) or the Village Shopping Center, located in South Baton Rouge on I-10 (6-7 miles).

Exhibit 15. Market area (1-, 2-, and 3-mile radius from Choctaw Drive and Plank Road)

Source: Claritas, 2010
Exhibit 16 shows the estimated retail demand and supply for selected types of retail stores within a 2-mile radius and a 3-mile radius of the intersection of Choctaw Drive and Plank Road.

The difference between demand and supply represents a rough estimate of the opportunity “gap” or “surplus” available for each merchandise line within the given radius of the plan area. When the demand is greater than the supply, the area is experiencing leakage (i.e., people within the targeted area are spending their money for goods and services elsewhere) and there is a potential opportunity “gap” or an opportunity for more retail sales to take place within the market area. For example, a positive value represents an opportunity gap, while a negative value represents a surplus.

Exhibit 16. Retail sales opportunity gap, selected retail categories, 1- and 2-mile radius from intersection of Choctaw and Plank, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Category</th>
<th>Demand (Consumer Expenditures)</th>
<th>Supply (Retail Sales)</th>
<th>Opportunity Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-mile radius</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service and Drinking Places</td>
<td>$ 8,308,194</td>
<td>$ 4,750,234</td>
<td>$ 3,557,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Service Restaurants</td>
<td>$ 3,675,864</td>
<td>$ 2,805,175</td>
<td>$ 870,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets, Grocery Stores</td>
<td>$ 15,326,403</td>
<td>$ 4,630,859</td>
<td>$ 10,695,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$ 8,283,757</td>
<td>$ 2,660,617</td>
<td>$ 5,623,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies and Drug Stores</td>
<td>$ 7,185,808</td>
<td>$ 2,046,711</td>
<td>$ 5,139,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories</td>
<td>$ 5,985,705</td>
<td>$ 869,282</td>
<td>$ 5,116,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Clothing Stores</td>
<td>$ 2,322,924</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 2,322,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-mile radius</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service and Drinking Places</td>
<td>$ 29,133,082</td>
<td>$ 37,620,417</td>
<td>-$ 8,487,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Service Restaurants</td>
<td>$ 12,900,583</td>
<td>$ 17,686,099</td>
<td>-$ 4,785,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets, Grocery Stores</td>
<td>$ 48,538,932</td>
<td>$ 32,983,315</td>
<td>$ 15,555,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$ 25,767,025</td>
<td>$ 20,152,172</td>
<td>$ 5,614,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies and Drug Stores</td>
<td>$ 22,391,582</td>
<td>$ 16,525,377</td>
<td>$ 5,866,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories</td>
<td>$ 18,826,765</td>
<td>$ 11,164,893</td>
<td>$ 7,661,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Clothing Stores</td>
<td>$ 7,277,370</td>
<td>$ 4,443,026</td>
<td>$ 2,834,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas RMP Opportunity Gap data 1-mile radius and 2-mile radius from the intersection of Choctaw Drive and Plank Road, 2009.

Note: Claritas RMP data is derived from two major sources: the demand data is derived from the Consumer Expenditure Survey. The supply data is derived from the Census of Retail Trade, which is made available by the U.S. Census. Expenditures represent what residents within the radius spend, regardless of where they spend. Retail sales represent what is sold at stores within the 2-mile radius, regardless of where the customers live.

The above indicates there may be modest demand for certain types of commercial services in or near the Choctaw Corridor. These include grocery stores, pharmacies/drug stores, clothing stores, and restaurants. The opportunity gap for foodservice and drinking places exists within the one-mile radius, while it turns into a surplus at the two-mile radius. This indicates that while the immediate neighborhood is experiencing some leakage in restaurant spending, that spending is likely occurring just outside the immediate neighborhood. This indicates possible opportunities for neighborhood oriented restaurants and coffee shops. The opportunity gap for clothing stores exists within both the one- and two-mile radii.
This suggests that residents are shopping for clothes elsewhere in the City, likely at stores that are located within a community/regional shopping center. This does not preclude potential opportunities for small-scale or specialty clothing stores. Foodservice, clothing, and other smaller retail outlets will require critical mass and careful design to increase the likelihood of success.

Exhibit 16 also indicates modest unmet demand for grocery stores, pharmacies, and clothing stores within the one or two-mile radii. The level of consumer demand for these uses, however, is not likely high enough to support a grocery store or pharmacy. For instance, a medium-sized grocery store would be approximately 40,000 to 55,000 square feet in size. At $200 to $300 per square foot in sales, a typical grocer of that size would need to generate approximately $16 million per year. Even if a grocery store were able to capture 100% of the sales leakage, sales would not likely justify a medium to large grocery store. Similarly, a typical pharmacy is 9,000 to 15,000 square feet in size and would need to generate approximately $5 to $7 million in sales, which is slightly more than the unmet consumer demand in the one and two-mile radii. Furthermore, note that it is unlikely that 100% of the sales leakage could be recovered for these categories of retail, as there are invariably products and services that residents will continue to seek outside the one or two mile radius, at regional shopping centers (groceries, household goods, clothing, pharmaceuticals).

### 3.6. HOUSING

#### Unit type, size, and tenure

Exhibit 18 shows the prevalent household structure types in East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor in 2009. The Choctaw Corridor had a high proportion of single-unit detached units (86%) compared the Parish (67%). About a third of housing units in the Parish were multifamily, compared to just 13% in the Choctaw Corridor. Less than 4% of residents lived in large apartment complexes (20 or more units) compared to the Parish total of 11%.

#### Exhibit 18. Units in structure, East Baton Rouge Parish, and the Choctaw Corridor Area, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units in Structure</th>
<th>East Baton Rouge Parish</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-unit detached</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-unit attached</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-19 units</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49 units</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 units or more</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile or manufactured</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>186,078</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,911</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas 2009

---

10 ECO will work with the consulting team and local brokers and developers to prepare financial development proformas for different types of commercial buildings and uses identified here. Our initial research and discussions with brokers/developers suggests that commercial rents in North Baton Rouge are lower than other areas in the Parish and in many cases, not high enough to support the cost of construction. Baton Rouge Trends estimates that rents for all types of retail commercial buildings in the areas north of Choctaw Drive and northeast of Airline Highway averaged $10-$14/square foot in the spring of 2010, compared to $14-$18/square foot for areas south of I-10 and West of Airline. Local brokers also estimate that existing commercial building rents range from $2.00 to $6.00 per square foot. For newer buildings, retail rents average $10-$14/square foot (depending site location factors, such as proximity to other shops and a street corner).
Exhibit 19 shows tenure and household size in East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor in 2009. Fifty-four percent of households in the Choctaw Corridor were owner-occupied, compared to 62% in the Parish. The Choctaw Corridor had a higher proportion of households with 4 people or more (29%) than the Parish (23%). Fifty-two percent of the Choctaw Corridor households had one or two people, compared to 59% in the Parish.

**Exhibit 19. Tenure and household size, East Baton Rouge Parish and the Choctaw Corridor Area, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Baton Rouge Parish</th>
<th>Choctaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-person households</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-person households</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-person households</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-person households</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-person households</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-person households</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- or more person households</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,683</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas 2009

Exhibit 19 suggests that the Choctaw Corridor has slightly larger households than the parish as a whole. The neighborhood has a lower percentage of one and two-person households than the parish as a whole, but both have a slightly higher percentage of three-, four-, and five-person households.

Average sale price of single-family homes Parish-wide was $197,374 between March 2009 and March 2010 (a 6.5% decrease from the previous year). The average sale price of condominiums and townhouses in the March 2009 to March 2010 time period was $146,988 (a 25% decrease from the previous year).

Average rents in the fall of 2009 in East Baton Rouge Parish for multi-unit apartment complexes ranged from $539 for a studio to $1,524 for a four-bedroom unit. Rents per square foot average $0.850/square foot parish-wide. Rents in the north and east parts of the parish were slightly lower: $402 for a studio, up to $715 for a four-bedroom unit. If these rents were converted to mortgage payments, the payments would support $75,000 to $115,000 sale price for a home. The average rents per square foot in the northern parts of the parish were $0.654. Apartment vacancy rates were slightly higher in the northern parts of the parish (6%) than the south and southeastern parts of the parish (4.9%). According to the American Community Survey, the median contract rent in East Baton Rouge Parish was $588 in 2008, while the median gross rent (contract rent plus utilities) was $759.

The Choctaw Corridor has experienced a decline in population over the last decade, which impacts current and future demand for housing. If the area were to grow at the same rate or similar rates as the Parish and the Region, the area might see about 1.0% average annual growth, or about 2,985 people over the next 15 years.

---


13 This sale price assumes a mortgage under the following terms: a 30-year, fixed loan at 6.25% interest with 20% for a down payment.
years (from 18,544 to 21,529). At an average of 2.9 persons per household, that is a potential demand for 1,029 units over the next 15 years, or about 69 per year.

If we expand the area to include the population within the 2-mile market radius used for the commercial analysis, an area of about 40,000 people, 15 years of growth at 1% annually would equal about 6,000 people, or possibly 2,000 units in the next 15 years. This would be an average of 133 per year. (For comparison purposes: the number of residential building permits issued in the entire City of East Baton Rouge for the last 5 years was about 800-1,100 per year).

The above discussion is intended only to provide an order-of-magnitude picture of how much growth the area could potentially expect over the next 15 years. It likely overstates the demand for housing. There are a variety of factors that could affect this outcome. In order to slow or reverse the trend of declining population, we would need to assume significant Parish-wide policy changes that will improve secondary education, public safety, and infrastructure. Furthermore, the relatively high percentage of vacant and adjudicated properties could affect demand for new housing units, especially if a significant number of existing vacant homes become inhabited or are rehabilitated.

3.7. **LAND OWNERSHIP AND PARCEL SIZE**

The Choctaw Corridor contains very few vacant and/or adjudicated properties. Land ownership patterns can be a challenge to redevelopment when existing parcels are small and owned by many different owners. Any mid-to large-scale development will require assembly of smaller parcels into one larger site. When these parcels are owned by a variety of people who may or may not be willing to sell, land assembly can be an impediment.

Availability of vacant land can be an important asset, because that area is more likely to attract new development than areas with less vacant land. Note that many of the vacant parcels are also adjudicated, which can significantly increase the cost and risk associated with redevelopment (RDA control of these parcels creates great opportunities for redevelopment).

3.8. **ZONING**

City-Parish policy can play a significant role in the revitalization of an area. Regulations do not necessarily have to be a barrier to redevelopment: they can place restrictions on development while helping to ensure that new development achieves the community’s goals. Zoning can play a key role in the redevelopment potential of an area. The Choctaw Corridor contains a mix of commercial and industrial zones, and land uses are commercially oriented and do not necessarily reflect existing zoning.

3.9. **FINANCIAL INCENTIVES**

Similar to zoning, financial incentives offered by the City-Parish can play a significant role in revitalization. Incentives can be put in place to encourage the kinds of development a community wants. In many cases, such development requires public financial support due to market constraints or other factors that limit the feasibility of revitalization projects. Appendix A includes a full description of the various financial resources that may be available.
4. IMPLICATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The challenges facing north Baton Rouge are well documented: Baton Rouge is home to both the highest and lowest levels of human development in the State. Residents in the southern portion of the Parish have highest incomes, educational attainment, and life expectancy. Residents in the northern parts of the Parish have the lowest income, educational attainment, and life expectancy. A resident in the south part of the Parish can expect to live five years longer, earn twice as much, have a bachelor’s degree, and be three times less likely to have dropped out of high school than a resident in the north part of the Parish.

Our analysis thus far bears out what is described above: The Choctaw Corridor has experienced a decline in population, have fewer employment opportunities, lower incomes, less access to health care, lower rates of homeownership, higher proportion of vacant/adjudicated properties, and lower commercial and residential rents than the rest of the Parish. The advantages and opportunities are perhaps less well known (or articulated). These include: active and involved residents, community and religious organizations, and close proximity to downtown, higher education, and transportation facilities. With the formation of the East Baton Rouge Redevelopment Authority and its focus on north Baton Rouge, the area now has access to significant financial resources.

Though recognized that the Choctaw Corridor faces significant challenges that will require consistent effort at many levels (neighborhood, City, Parish, and state), these recommendations focus on actions that residents and the RDA (and its partners) can take to help the neighborhood achieve its goals for enhancing economic opportunity and revitalization:

» **Focus on neighborhood scale commercial uses.** For reasons described in Section 3.5, consumer demand may not support large- or medium-scale commercial development. Given the location of the Choctaw Corridor (i.e. within proximity to other shopping opportunities), preliminary recommendations are to focus on neighborhood-scale commercial uses that are designed to serve a relatively small area, such as coffee shops, neighborhood restaurants, and specialty clothing stores.

» **Consider adaptive reuse of existing industrial buildings.** Existing industrial buildings along the Choctaw Corridor may present opportunities to be adaptively reused for another purpose, such as “high-cube” spaces for light industry, fabrication, small assembly, and other similar uses (i.e. commercial photographers, graphic designers). These spaces are attractive to entrepreneurs, small businesses, and artists seeking space in between an industrial environment and a traditional office building, as well as competitive rents given the close-in location.

» **Generate critical mass.** Critical mass is essential to the success of neighborhood-scale commercial uses. A critical mass of activity and a mix of uses will provide a focal point to help draw people to a small area. Redevelopment projects that contain a mix of uses, particularly a residential use coupled with commercial uses, can create a convenient central place for residents and customers. Coupling different uses together usually helps each use in the project succeed. Mixed-use does not necessarily

---

14 Human development is an index developed by the American Human Development Project that measures a variety of dimensions, including life expectancy, educational attainment, and earnings.

15 A Portrait of Louisiana: Louisiana Human Development Report 2009, American Human Development Project of the Social Science Research Council
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have to take the form of a five or ten-story building with apartments above and retail on the ground floor. Mixed-use developments can take on a variety of shapes and forms. For instance, a smaller scale “vertical” mixed-use project may have one to three floors of housing over commercial, or office over retail. A “horizontal” mixed-use project could contain five to ten townhouses that share parking or a courtyard with a restaurant, coffee shop, bank, clothing store, or other commercial use. Mixed-use projects can also incorporate existing buildings that are adapted for new uses.

» **Activate the corners/create a node.** Activity on four corners at a street intersection provides an opportunity to create critical mass. Corners create the feeling of a “center” that focuses activity and draws in customers. Corners are also the most attractive spaces for commercial tenants and can support the highest rents.

» **Emphasize connections to downtown.** Proximity to Downtown Baton Rouge is one of the most significant advantages of the Choctaw Corridor. Though physically close to downtown, the neighborhoods are cut off from downtown by the rail lines, Scenic Highway, and Interstate 110. The Choctaw Corridor can take advantage of this proximity and future investments in Downtown by emphasizing connections: (1) beautification/improved pedestrian facilities on Scenic Highway and North 22nd Street and (2) increased activity on both sides of these streets. Activity at or near the overpass crossings increases safety and makes the journey more appealing for pedestrians, drivers, and cyclists.

» **Focus on converting renters into owners.** The Choctaw Corridor area includes higher percentages of renters than the Parish as a whole. Given this and the relatively modest growth forecast for the neighborhoods, preliminary recommendations are to focus on converting renters into owners, rehabilitating the existing housing stock, and constructing new, affordable housing units at price points that are appropriate for new owners.

4.1. **GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

» **Refine a strategy to resolve adjudicated properties.** Vacant and adjudicated properties in the neighborhood will continue to hamper redevelopment efforts unless those properties are assembled by the RDA and disposed of in a strategic manner that brings a mix of uses into the community.

» **Implement a robust and consistent code enforcement program.** Preliminary analysis, interviews, and workshop feedback suggest that the neighborhood needs additional code enforcement for buildings and parcels that are in dilapidated or unsafe condition. This will help turn the image of the area around for both existing residents and future investors.

» **Enhance transit links and connections.** Convenient access to a transit network is a key component of revitalization, especially in neighborhoods with less access to vehicles than elsewhere in the Parish. Transit is especially important as a means to provide residents with access to employment opportunities, workforce training, higher education, and medical facilities.
» **Leverage public financial resources to stimulate private investment.** This document describes above a number of financial resources available, not only through the RDA, but also through the Parish, the state, and federal programs. These resources can be leveraged to attract private investment in development projects that earn reasonable returns for private investors and provide projects that will enhance and benefit the community. Leveraging can take the form of public investment into infrastructure improvements that are linked to fostering private development and/or direct investment of public funds into a private development project to help make it pencil out.

» **Implement/facilitate policies that enhance economic opportunity for residents.** In addition to financial resources that may be available for specific (re)development projects, we also recommend that the RDA work with the City-Parish as it develops a long range economic development strategy (FuturEBR) to find areas where residents and the RDA can facilitate or implement additional opportunities and programs that would be focused in 5 CIP neighborhoods. These could include life skills development, workforce training, entrepreneur mentoring, economic gardening, and an enhanced micro-loan program.
### Assumptions / Building value bottom line

**About the development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>use</th>
<th>square feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor retail</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface parking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (w/o parking)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>% assumption</th>
<th>dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$98,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer fee (as % of construction)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$4,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs (as % of construction)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$29,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (as % of soft &amp; hard costs)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$6,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$169,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assumptions / Building value bottom line

#### About the development

- **Acreage**: 42,264
- **Square feet**:
  - Apartments: 42,264
  - Retail: -
  - Surface parking: -
  - **TOTAL (w/o parking)**: 42,264

#### Development costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% assumption</th>
<th>dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site acquisition</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$469,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$4,957,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer fee (as % of construction)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$1,487,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (as % of soft &amp; hard costs)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$322,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,484,494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Revenues and expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income/expense</th>
<th>$/SF assumption</th>
<th>annual income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential rent (per month)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$1,163,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail rent (per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,163,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/operations (as % of revenue)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$162,952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Management/operations STABILIZED NOI

- 1%

#### Other assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent increase per year</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost increase</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy, Yr 1</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy, Yr 2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy, Yr 3 and stabilization</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap rate</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bottom line

- **Fair Market Value**: $12,404,282
- **Created value (FMV - costs)**: $4,919,788

### Scenario 1 (35/65)

#### Equity

- **Equity required**: 35% $2,619,573
- **Equity terms**:
  - term (yrs): 7
  - interest rate: 15%
- **Total equity repayment (balloon payment at end of term)**: $4,407,490

#### Bank loan

- **Bank loan required**: 65% $4,864,921
- **Bank loan terms**:
  - term (yrs): 30
  - interest rate: 7%
- **Annual payment**: $392,046

#### Bottom line

- **Loan to value ratio**: 0.39
- **Debt coverage ratio**: 2.21
- **Financing gap**: $0
- **Equity repayment gap (or surplus)**: $879,797
- **STABILIZED NOI**: $392,046

This sheet allows the user to manipulate four development and financing scenarios by changing the variables that are highlighted in BLUE. All scenarios reference the same development program. All scenarios reference the same revenue and cost assumptions, but these assumptions can be changed on this page. The key difference in the scenarios is the structure of the financing.
### Choctaw Corridor Pro Forma Spreadsheet - Prototype: Mixed Use (Residential & Retail)

#### Assumptions / Building value bottom line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About the development</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor retail</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface parking</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (w/o parking)</td>
<td>41,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development costs</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>item</strong></td>
<td>% assumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site acquisition</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$4,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$872,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer fee (as % of construction)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$18,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs (as % of construction)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$872,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (as % of soft &amp; hard costs)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$261,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,153,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues and expenses</th>
<th>Annual income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>source of income/expense</td>
<td>$/SF assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential rent (per month)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail rent (per year)</td>
<td>$297,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL revenue</td>
<td>$357,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/operations (as % of revenue)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABILIZED NOI</td>
<td>$231,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other assumptions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent increase per year</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost increase</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy, Yr 1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy, Yr 2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy, Yr 3 and stabilization</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap rate</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Bottom line                   |               |
| Fair Market Value             | $4,285,233    |
| Created value (RMV - costs)   | ($1,867,887)  |

#### Scenario 1 (35/65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity required</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$2,153,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity terms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest rate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total equity repayment (balloon payment at end of term)</td>
<td>$3,623,467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank loan</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank loan required</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$3,999,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term (yrs)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest rate</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual payment</td>
<td>$322,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 2 (20/80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity required</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$2,153,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity terms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest rate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total equity repayment (balloon payment at end of term)</td>
<td>$2,070,553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank loan</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank loan required</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$4,922,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term (yrs)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest rate</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual payment</td>
<td>$396,686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 3 (with public loan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity required</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$213,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity terms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest rate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total equity repayment (balloon payment at end of term)</td>
<td>$167,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank loan</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank loan required</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>$3,507,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term (yrs)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest rate</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual payment</td>
<td>$282,639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sheet allows the user to manipulate four development and financing scenarios by changing the variables that are highlighted in BLUE. All scenarios reference the same development program. All scenarios reference the same revenue and cost assumptions, but these assumptions can be changed on this page. The key difference in the scenarios is the structure of the financing.
### About the development

**Use**
- Ground Floor retail: 8,370 square feet
- Surface parking: 6,300
- **TOTAL (w/o parking):** 8,370

**Equity**
- **Scenario 1 (35/65):**
  - Equity required: 35% $464,964
  - Term (yrs): 7
  - Interest rate: 15%
  - Total equity repayment (balloon payment at end of term): $782,312

- **Scenario 2 (20/80):**
  - Equity required: 20% $265,694
  - Term (yrs): 7
  - Interest rate: 15%
  - Total equity repayment (balloon payment at end of term): $447,036

- **Scenario 3 (with public loan):**
  - Equity required: 5% $66,423
  - Term (yrs): 7
  - Interest rate: 15%
  - Total equity repayment (balloon payment at end of term): $111,759

### Development costs

- **Site acquisition:** $186,000
- **New construction:** $872,114
- **Developer fee (as % of construction):** 5%
- **Soft costs (as % of construction):** 20%
- **Contingency (as % of soft & hard costs):** 5%
- **TOTAL:** $1,328,469

### Bank loan

- **Scenario 1 (35/65):**
  - Bank loan required: 65% $863,505
  - Term (yrs): 30
  - Interest rate: 7%
  - Annual payment: $69,587

- **Scenario 2 (20/80):**
  - Bank loan required: 80% $1,062,775
  - Term (yrs): 30
  - Interest rate: 7%
  - Annual payment: $85,645

- **Scenario 3 (with public loan):**
  - Bank loan required: 60% $797,081
  - Term (yrs): 30
  - Interest rate: 7.0%
  - Annual payment: $64,234

### Revenues and expenses

- **Residential rent (per month):** $0
- **Retail rent (per year):** 12.5 $88,931
- **TOTAL revenue:** $88,931
- **Management/operations (as % of revenue):** 5%
- **STABILIZED NOI:** $4,447

### Bottom line

- **Loan to value ratio:** 0.82
- **Debt coverage ratio:** 1.13
- **Financing gap:** 0
- **Equity repayment gap (or surplus):** -$682,151

- **Scenario 1 (35/65):**
  - **Net annual income:** $64,477

- **Scenario 2 (20/80):**
  - **Net annual income:** $85,645

- **Scenario 3 (with public loan):**
  - **Net annual income:** $64,234

### Other assumptions

- **Rent increase per year:** 3%
- **Operating cost increase:** 3%
- **Vacancy, Yr 1:** 20%
- **Vacancy, Yr 2:** 5%
- **Vacancy, Yr 3 and stabilization:** 5%
- **Cap rate:** 7.5%

### Bottom line

- **Fair Market Value:** $1,484,963
- **Created value (FMV - costs):** $1,048,203

This sheet allows the user to manipulate four development and financing scenarios by changing the variables that are highlighted in blue. All scenarios reference the same revenue and cost assumptions, but these assumptions can be changed on this page. The key difference in the scenarios is the structure of the financing.
The following information illustrates data collected in order to inform decisions and recommendations within the CIP area. Documents included are a series of GIS maps, existing street and drainage conditions and types, and CATS ridership information. This information was gathered throughout the CIP planning process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th># LANES</th>
<th>SURFACE COMPOSITION</th>
<th>SIDEWALKS YES/NO</th>
<th>TYPE DRAINAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CHOCTAW DRIVE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>YES · NORTH SIDE</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MONROE AVENUE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DITCHES · BOTH SIDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HIAWATHA STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DITCH · EAST SIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 TECUMSEH STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>YES · BOTH SIDES</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 OSCEOLA STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>YES · BOTH SIDES</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 PLANK ROAD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>YES · BOTH SIDES</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 26TH STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DITCH · EAST SIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 28TH STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 30TH STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DITCH · EAST SIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 31ST STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DITCHES · BOTH SIDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 NORTH ACADIAN THRUWAY</td>
<td>4 DIVIDED</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>YES · WEST SIDE</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 38TH STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 39TH STREET</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 EAST BELFAIR DRIVE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 RHODES AVENUE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 ADAMS AVENUE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 BARTLETT STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 EATON STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DITCH · EAST SIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 MISSION DRIVE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASPHALT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>STORM DRAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MARTIN AVENUE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcel Information
### Property Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Light Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 35,000</td>
<td>Light Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,001 - 150,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,001 - 459,950</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459,951 - 1,374,100</td>
<td>Dark Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,374,101 - 2,999,990</td>
<td>Maroon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Legend**

- Roads
- Railroads
- Streams
- Waterbodies
- Parcels
- Buildings

**1 inch = 600 feet**
Source: City Parish Planning Commission - August 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>8:35am</th>
<th>9:09am</th>
<th>9:48am</th>
<th>10:50am</th>
<th>11:45am</th>
<th>12:45pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd.</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphine</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Rose</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Eugene</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odgen</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearthstone</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Blvd.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd.</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus Young</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipperwa</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tech Institute</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winbourne</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th St.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Dr.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougherty</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootsie</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelli</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Olive B.C.</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofc of Fam Support</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Office</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Place</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Dr.</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCour's Flooring</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobdell</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Bon Mache Dr.</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Carre</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Dr.</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobdell</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Dr.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocctaw</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid South Door Co.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza Man Co.</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardenwood</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobers</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Foster Dr.</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Total Passengers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield E. Belfair</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Carleton</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield 38th St.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield 37th St.</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield* North Acadian</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian Gus Young</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian Bogian Walk</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian Zion</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian North St.</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian Laurel</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian Florida Blvd.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acadian Convention</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd. Greta</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd. Gottlieb</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd. N. Eugene</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd. 25th St.</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd. 23rd St.</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Blvd. 22nd St.</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminal</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 7 4 14 9 17 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>30 30 26 15 30 30 23 22 37 35 30 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>