STAGE 0 Preliminary Scope and Budget Checklist

MPO Area: Baton Rouge

| A. | Project Backgro | ound | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------------|--|---------------------|
| District | 62 | | | Parish | Livingston | |
| Route | LA 447 | | | | | |
| Project | Category (Safety, | Capacit | ty, etc.): | Safety | | |
| Date St | udy Completed: | | 1-8-14 | | | |
| Describ | e the existing faci | lity: | | | | |
| Function | nal classification: | | UA2 | | Number and width of lanes: | 5 and 2, 12' |
| Shoulde | er width and type: | | 2' | | Mode: | |
| | | | | | Posted Speed: 45MPH | |
| | • • • • | | | · • | nce should be considered for all 447 in the 5-lane section | - |
| Describ | e the adjacent land | d use: | | Commer | cial/residential | |
| Who is | the sponsor of the | study? |] | LADOTD | | |
| List stud | dy team members: | | Jeff Brow | vn | | |
| | | | | | vstem (new alignment, new facil ity? <u>N</u> | |
| Are the | re recent, current o | or near f | future plan | ning studies or p | rojects in the vicinity? | Y |
| If yes, p | please describe the | relation | nship of th | is project to thos | e studies/projects. | Traffic Study |
| Provide alternati | | y of the | se plannin | g study activities | S: Study Traffic to | determine different |

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.

The purpose/need of this project is to determine the best mobility and safety alternate for LA 447 Corridor in Livingston Parish.

C. Agency Coordination

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

Local Government

What transportation agencies were included in the agency coordination effort?

LADOTD

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

C. Agency Coordination (Continued)

What steps will need to be taken with each agency during NEPA scoping? Be in contact with FHWA

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).

Two Stakeholder Meeting and One Public Information Meeting

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).

No Build, R-Cut corridor, and Roundabout corridor, and three-lane section

Will design exceptions be required? <u>N</u>

What impact would this project have on freight movements? <u>None</u>

Does this project cross or is it near a railroad crossing? Y

| Was the DOTD's "Complete | Streets" policy | taken into cons | sideration? | Y |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|---|
| - | 1 0 | | | _ |

If so, describe how. Include a brief explanation of why the policy was determined to be feasible or not feasible. <u>Nearby crosswalks and businesses</u>

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

Was the DOTD's "Access Management" policy taken into consideration? If so, describe how. <u>Y</u>, <u>improve safety by possibly adding median and restricting turning movements</u>

Were any safety analyses performed? If so describe results. <u>Listed the crashes along the corridor for a three year period</u>

Are there any abnormal crash locations or overrepresented crashes within the project limits?

What future traffic analyses are anticipated? _____ Reanalyze the current traffic study if needed at a later date.

Stage 0 Preliminary Scope and Budget Checklist

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

| Will fiber optics be required? If so, are there existing lines to tie into? | Ν | |
|---|---|--|
| Are there any future ITS/traffic considerations? | | |

Is a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) required?

- Is this project considered significant as defined in EDSM No. VI.1.1.4? <u>No</u>
- If yes, describe the mobility and safety analysis and assessment that was conducted as required in the development of a TMP.
- 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?

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

Were alternative construction methods considered to mitigate work zone impacts? Y

| Describe screening criteria used to compare alte | rnatives and from what agency the criteria were defined. |
|--|--|
| Safety, Travel times, and Public Meeting | 1g |

Give an explanation for any alternative that was eliminated based on the screening criteria.

Which alternatives should be brought forward into NEPA and why?

| 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.

N/A

F. Planning Assumptions and Analytical Methods

What is the forecast year used in the study? _____2034

What method was used for forecasting traffic volumes? <u>MPO growth rate</u>

Are the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with the long range transportation plan?

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?

G. Potential Environmental Impacts

See the attached Stage 0 Environmental Checklist

H. Cost Estimate

Provide a cost estimate for each feasible alternative:

| Phase | Total Estimated Cost | Funding Source (STP>200K, STP<200K, CMAQ, DEMO, DOTD Priority Program) | Match Provided By (City, Parish, State, Other) | TIP Fiscal Year |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| Environmental (document, mitigation, etc.) | \$600K | STP>200K | | |
| Engineering Design | * | | | |
| R/W Acquisition (C of A if applicable) | \$12.1 million | N/A | | |
| Utility Relocations | \$3.75 million | N/A | | |
| Construction | \$64 million | N/A | | |
| Construction Engineering & Inspection Services | * | | | |
| TOTAL COST | \$95 million** | | | |

*Will be done in house ** Includes additional cost

ATTACH ANY ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION

Disposition (circle one): (1) Advance to Stage 1

(2) Hold for Reconsideration (3) Shelve