STAGE 0
Preliminary Scope and Budget Checklist

A. Project Background

District 04 **Parish** Caddo

Route LA 3132 **Control Section** 427-01

Begin Log Mile 10.22 (LA 3132@ LA 523 terminus) **End Log Mile** 12.80 (LA 1@ Port Gate B)

Project Category (Safety, Capacity, etc.): Additional Capacity/New Infrastructure

Date Study Completed: July 2012

Describe the existing facility: The existing LA 3132 extension to LA 523 was constructed from approved Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) design plans in January 2005. The project extended the existing LA 3132 from its existing terminus at Bert Kouns Industrial Loop (LA 526) to Flournoy Lucas Road (LA 523) with exit ramps. This roadway is designed based on the LADOTD Freeway-2 design criteria with a 60 MPH design speed, 4-12' lanes, and 10' outside shoulders.

Functional classification: F-2 classification **Number and width of lanes**: 4-12' lanes

Shoulder width and type: Portland cement concrete shoulder: 4' inside, 10' outside **Mode**:

Access control: Controlled Access **ADT**: Refer to Appendix A- Title Sheet **Posted Speed**: 60 MPH

Describe any existing pedestrian facilities (ADA compliance should be considered for all improvements that include pedestrian facilities): There are no existing pedestrian facilities within the project area.

Describe the adjacent land use: Please refer to the Appendix C: Environmental Checklist.

Who is the sponsor of the study? Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD)

List study team members: Buchart Horn, Inc., Providence Engineering, Alliance Transportation Group

Will this project be adding miles to the state highway system (new alignment, new facility)? If yes, has a transfer of ownership been initiated with the appropriate entity? Yes, not to date.

Are there recent, current or near future planning studies or projects in the vicinity? Yes- Stage 1

If yes, please describe the relationship of this project to those studies/projects. Yes, the proposed LA 3132 extension will connect to the future I-69 alignment that was presented in the 2005 I-69 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Provide a brief chronology of these planning study activities: Previous planning activities have been conducted for LA 3132 that lead up to this Stage 0 Feasibility Study.

B. Purpose and Need

State the Purpose (reason for proposing the project) and Need (problem or issue)/Corridor Vision and a brief scope of the project. Also, identify any additional goals and objectives for the project.

Refer to the Sections 1.0 – 3.0 of the Draft LA 3132 Extension Stage 0 Report.

C. Agency Coordination

Provide a brief synopsis of coordination with federal, tribal, state and local environmental, regulatory and resource agencies.

Meetings have been conducted with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), LADOTD, LADOTD district 4, Caddo Parish, City of Shreveport and the Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments (NLCOG) to obtain input regarding the proposed alternatives.

What transportation agencies were included in the agency coordination effort?

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), LADOTD, LADOTD District 4, City of Shreveport and the Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments (NLCOG)

Describe the level of participation of other agencies and how the coordination effort was implemented.

The aforementioned agencies provided comments regarding the proposed alternatives. LADOTD also assisted in coordinating meetings with the public and other agencies.

C. Agency Coordination (Continued)

What steps will need to be taken with each agency during NEPA scoping?
Schedule and arrange a formal interagency scoping meeting to occur after the Notice of Intent (NOI) is published. Appropriate public officials and interested stakeholders will also be invited to this meeting per the direction of FHWA and DOTD.

D. Public Coordination

Provide a synopsis of the coordination effort with the public and stakeholders; include specific timelines, meeting details, agendas, sign-in sheets, etc. (if applicable).
On January 24, 2012, the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) and the project team provided the opportunity for the public to participate in an interactive workshop informational meeting regarding the LA 3132 extension to Flournoy Lucas Road (LA 523). A second public meeting will be conducted to discuss the findings of the study. Further information on the public meetings will be given in the Final Stage 0 Preliminary Scope and Budget Checklist and Report.

E. Range of Alternatives – Evaluation and Screening

Give a description of the project concept for each alternative studied.

What are the major design features of the proposed facility (attach aerial photo with concept layout, if applicable).
Please refer to Appendix A: Alternative Exhibits.
Will design exceptions be required? None are identified with the proposed alternatives at this time.

What impact would this project have on freight movements? It will promote Intermodal Connectivity and facilitate the movement of goods to and from rail and port facilities.

Does this project cross or is it near a railroad crossing? Yes, Build Alternative A & C have an overpass across existing rail.

Was the DOTD's "Complete Streets" policy taken into consideration? No, F-2 Design Criteria

- **If so, describe how. Include a brief explanation of why the policy was determined to be feasible or not feasible**. N/A

How are Context Sensitive Solutions being incorporated into the project? N/A

Was the DOTD's "Access Management" policy taken into consideration? If so, describe how. Yes.
The project complies with the design criteria established in LADOTD guidelines for limited access along LA 3132 and LA 1.

Were any safety analyses performed? If so describe results. No

Are there any abnormal crash locations or overrepresented crashes within the project limits? Crash data was not provided for this study.

What future traffic analyses are anticipated? A traffic study was conducted on existing and future traffic conditions. No further analyses are anticipated.

E. Range of Alternatives – Evaluation and Screening (Continued)

Will fiber optics be required? If so, are there existing lines to tie into? No

Are there any future ITS/traffic considerations? Not at this time.

Is a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) required?

- **Is this project considered significant as defined in EDSM No. VI.1.1.4**? No
- **If yes, describe the mobility and safety analysis and assessment that was conducted as required in the development of a TMP**. N/A
- **What further data will need to be collected to address the content and scope of the TMP in the design stage/phase of this project**? N/A

Was Construction Transportation Management/Property Access taken into consideration? Yes

Were alternative construction methods considered to mitigate work zone impacts? This should be taken into consideration during the NEPA process.

Describe screening criteria used to compare alternatives and from what agency the criteria were defined.
LADOTD established the scope to be evaluated and presented in the Stage 0 Report.

Give an explanation for any alternative that was eliminated based on the screening criteria.
There are no alternatives eliminated from evaluation.

Which alternatives should be brought forward into NEPA and why? At this time, it was determined that all alternatives should be brought forward and should be evaluated or screened during the NEPA process.

Did the public, stakeholders and agencies have an opportunity to comment during the alternative screening process? Yes

Describe any unresolved issues with the public, stakeholders and/or agencies.
None

F. Planning Assumptions and Analytical Methods

What is the forecast year used in the study? 2015 & 2032

What method was used for forecasting traffic volumes? Synchro version 8.0 & 2010 Highway Capacity computer software

Are the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with the long range transportation plan? Refer to the Objectives section of Appendix E: Draft LA 3132 Extension Stage 0 Report.

What future year policy and/or data assumptions were used in the transportation planning process as they are related to land use, economic development, transportation costs and network expansion? Refer to Appendix E (Chapter 3- Projected Conditions): Traffic Study.

G. Potential Environmental Impacts

See Appendix C: Stage 0 Environmental Checklist.

H. Cost Estimate

Provide a cost estimate for each feasible alternative: **Refer to Preliminary Cost Estimates on the following page.**

- Engineering Design: _____
- Additional Traffic Analyses: _____
- Environmental (document, mitigation, etc.): _____
- R/W Acquisition: (C of A if applicable) _____
- Utility Relocations: _____
- Construction (including const. traffic management): _____

TOTAL PROJECT COST _____

I. Expected Funding Source(s) (Highway Priority Program, CMAQ, Urban Systems, Fed/State earmarks, etc.) LADOTD

ATTACH ANY ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION

Disposition (circle one): (1) Advance to Stage 1 (2) Hold for Reconsideration (3) Shelve

Preliminary Conceptual Cost Estimate	
Alternative A[1]	
Cost Category	**Estimated Cost**
Engineering Design (8% of Construction)	$6,061,600
Environmental Assessment (EA)	$400,000
Right-Of-Way & Control of Access Acquisition[(A)]	$6,760,000
Utility Relocation	$9,000,000
Construction	$75,770,000
Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)	*$8,080,000*
Mainline (Bridge Structure)	*$12,690,000*
LA 523 Diamond Interchange Extension[(B)]	*$15,000,000*
Trumpet Interchange at LA 1	*$40,000,000*
Subtotal	**$97,991,600**
Contingency (15%)	**$14,698,740**
Total	**$112,690,340**

[1]When considering a Single Point Urban Interchange at LA 523 for this Alternative:

[(A)] Replace this line item with a cost of $6,685,000;

[(B)] Replace this line item with a cost of $20,000,000.

Preliminary Conceptual Cost Estimate	
Alternative B1[1]	
Cost Category	**Estimated Cost**
Engineering Design (8% of Construction)	$13,621,520
Environmental Assessment (EA)	$400,000
Right-Of-Way & Control of Access Acquisition[(A)]	$8,915,000
Utility Relocation	$13,000,000
Construction	$170,269,000
Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)	*$16,718,000*
Mainline (Bridge Structure)	*$18,551,000*
LA 523 Diamond Interchange Extension[(B)]	*$15,000,000*
Leonard Road Diamond Interchange	*$30,000,000*
Semi-Directional Interchange at I-69	*$90,000,000*
Subtotal	**$206,205,520**
Contingency (15%)	**$30,930,828**
Total	**$237,136,348**

[1]When considering a Single Point Urban Interchange at LA 523 for this Alternative:

[(A)] Replace this line item with a cost of $8,840,000;

[(B)] Replace this line item with a cost of $20,000,000.

Preliminary Conceptual Cost Estimate	
Alternative B2[1]	
Cost Category	**Estimated Cost**
Engineering Design (8% of Construction)	$16,253,520
Environmental Assessment (EA)	$400,000
Right-Of-Way & Control of Access Acquisition[(A)]	$8,985,000
Utility Relocation	$17,000,000
Construction	$203,169,000
Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)	*$14,618,000*
Mainline (Bridge Structure)	*$18,551,000*
LA 523 Diamond Interchange Extension[(B)]	*$15,000,000*
Leonard Road Diamond Interchange	*$30,000,000*
Semi-Directional Interchange at I-69	*$125,000,000*
Subtotal	**$245,807,520**
Contingency (15%)	**$36,871,128**
Total	**$282,678,648**

[1]When considering a Single Point Urban Interchange at LA 523 for this Alternative:

[(A)] Replace this line item with a cost of $8,910,000;

[(B)] Replace this line item with a cost of $20,000,000.

Preliminary Conceptual Cost Estimate	
Alternative C	
Cost Category	**Estimated Cost**
Engineering Design (8% of Construction)	$7,770,560
Environmental Assessment (EA)	$400,000
Right-Of-Way & Control of Access Acquisition	$7,128,000
Utility Relocation	$9,000,000
Construction	$97,132,000
Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)	*$7,577,000*
Mainline (Bridge Structure)	*$49,555,000*
Trumpet Interchange at LA 1	*$40,000,000*
Subtotal	**$121,430,560**
Contingency (15%)	**$18,214,584**
Total	**$139,645,144**