

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: September 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 Flourney 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 B: Stage 0 Checklists.

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 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 was conducted on August 2, 2012 to discuss the findings of the study. Further information on the public meetings is provided in Appendix E: Public Meeting Information.

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 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 D (Chapter 3- Projected Conditions): Traffic Study.

G. Potential Environmental Impacts

See Appendix B: Stage 0 Checklists.

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)	\$5,286,400
Environmental Assessment (EA)	\$400,000
Right-Of-Way & Control of Access Acquisition ^(A)	\$6,835,000
Utility Relocation	\$9,000,000
Construction	\$66,080,000
<i>Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)</i>	\$8,080,000
<i>Mainline (Bridge Structure)</i>	\$8,000,000
<i>LA 523 Diamond Interchange Extension^(B)</i>	\$10,000,000
<i>Trumpet Interchange at LA 1</i>	\$40,000,000
Subtotal	\$87,601,400
Contingency (15%)	\$13,140,210
Total	\$100,741,610

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

- ^(A) Replace this line item with a cost of \$6,760,000;
- ^(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)	\$8,377,440
Environmental Assessment (EA)	\$400,000
Right-Of-Way & Control of Access Acquisition ^(A)	\$9,020,000
Utility Relocation	\$13,000,000
Construction	\$104,718,000
<i>Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)</i>	\$16,718,000
<i>Mainline (Bridge Structure)</i>	\$12,000,000
<i>LA 523 Diamond Interchange Extension^(B)</i>	\$10,000,000
<i>Leonard Road Diamond Interchange</i>	\$13,000,000
<i>Semi-Directional Interchange at I-69</i>	\$53,000,000
Subtotal	\$135,515,440
Contingency (15%)	\$20,327,316
Total	\$155,842,756

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

- ^(A) Replace this line item with a cost of \$8,945,000;
- ^(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)	\$8,769,440
Environmental Assessment (EA)	\$400,000
Right-Of-Way & Control of Access Acquisition ^(A)	\$9,090,000
Utility Relocation	\$17,000,000
Construction	\$109,618,000
<i>Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)</i>	\$14,618,000
<i>Mainline (Bridge Structure)</i>	\$12,000,000
<i>LA 523 Diamond Interchange Extension^(B)</i>	\$10,000,000
<i>Leonard Road Diamond Interchange</i>	\$13,000,000
<i>Semi-Directional Interchange at I-69</i>	\$60,000,000
Subtotal	\$144,877,440
Contingency (15%)	\$21,731,616
Total	\$166,609,056

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

- ^(A) Replace this line item with a cost of \$9,015,000;
- ^(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
<i>Mainline (At-Grade Roadway)</i>	\$7,577,000
<i>Mainline (Bridge Structure)</i>	\$49,555,000
<i>Trumpet Interchange at LA 1</i>	\$40,000,000
Subtotal	\$121,430,560
Contingency (15%)	\$18,214,584
Total	\$139,645,144

Stage 0 Environmental Checklist

C.S. 100+00 to 487+00 Parish Caddo Parish
Route LA 3132 Inner Loop Extension Begin Log mile 0.00 End Log mile 7.50

ADJACENT LAND USE: low and high-density residential, commercial, water, industrial, and agricultural

Any property owned by a Native American Tribe?

(Y or N or **Unknown**) If so, which Tribe? _____

Any property enrolled into the Wetland Reserve Program?

(Y or **N** or Unknown) If so, give the location _____

Community Elements: Is the project impacting or adjacent to any:

(Y or **N**) Cemeteries _____

(**Y** or N) Churches One church, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic Church, is located adjacent to the start of the mainline for Alternative C.

(Y or **N**) Schools _____

(**Y** or N) Public Facilities (i.e., fire station, library, etc.) One fire station, Caddo Parish District 5 Fire Department, is located adjacent to the Leonard Road interchange of Alternatives B1 and B2.

(Y or **N**) Community water well/supply _____

Section 4(f) issue: Is the project impacting or adjacent to any:

(Y or **N**) Public recreation areas _____

(Y or **N**) Public parks _____

(Y or **N**) Wildlife Refuges _____

(**Y** or N) Historic Sites No historic standing structures were located; however, six archaeological sites appear to be located within the required ROW for the project's alternatives.

Is the project impacting, or adjacent to, a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places? (Y or **N) Is the project within a historic district or a national landmark district? (Y or **N**)**

If the answer is yes to question, list names and locations below:

Do you know of any threatened or endangered species in the area? (Y or **N)** If so, which species?

Does the project impact a stream protected by the Louisiana Scenic Rivers Act? (Y or **N)**

If yes, name the stream. _____

Are there any Significant Trees as defined by EDSM I.1.1.21 within proposed ROW?(Y or **N)** If so, where? Significant trees were not observed during the site visit; however, there is a possibility they exist in some areas not readily observable from public access points.

What year was the existing bridge built? The proposed LA 3132 extension is on new alignment; therefore, there are no existing bridges as part of this project. There is one bridge on LA 523 that crosses over Sand Beach Bayou, near Station 151+00.00. Alternative C will be elevated over this structure.

Are any waterways impacted by the project considered navigable? (Y** or N)** If unknown, state so, list the waterways: Bayou Pierre, Mile Bayou, Sand Beach Bayou, Kelley Bayou, and Chico Bayou are located along the proposed project areas and may be affected, navigability is unknown.

Hazardous Material: Have you checked the following DEQ and EPA databases for potential problems?

(**Y** or N) Leaking Underground Storage Tanks _____

(**Y** or N) CERCLIS _____

(**Y** or N) ERNS _____

(**Y** or N) Enforcement and Compliance History _____

If found site, give the name and location: _____

Stage 0 Environmental Checklist

Underground Storage Tanks (UST): Are there any Gasoline Stations or other facilities that may have UST on or adjacent to the project? (Y or N) If so, give the name and location: The Relay Station Port, located at 10281 LA 1 South, is adjacent to the proposed entrance ramp for LA 1 northbound traffic (Alternatives A and C).

Any chemical plants, refineries or landfills adjacent to the project? (Y or N) **Any large manufacturing facilities adjacent to the project?** (Y or N) **Dry Cleaners?** (Y or N) If yes to any, give names and locations: _____

Oil/Gas wells: Have you checked DNR database for registered oil and gas wells? (Y or N) List the type and location of wells being impacted by the project. There is one oil and gas well, Well Serial No. 238921, within 50 feet of Alternative A. Seven wells are within 50 feet of Alternative B1 (Well Serial Nos. 238806, 234370, 237358, 232084, 233484, 16371, and 227999). Six wells are within 50 feet of Alternative B2 (Well Serial Nos. 238806, 234370, 237358, 973230, 149778, and 227999). Two oil and gas wells, Well Serial Nos. 145358 and 238921, are within 50 feet of Alternative C.

Are there any possible residential or commercial relocations/displacements? (Y or N)
How many? Based on current data Alternative A would potentially affect two residential structures. Alternative B1 would potentially affect nine residential and two commercial structures. Alternative B2 would potentially affect two residential and two commercial structures. Alternative C would potentially affect two residential structures. The final number depends on which of the alternative routes would be selected and how much redevelopment occurs prior to Stage 1.

Do you know of any sensitive community issues related to the project? (Y or N)

If so, explain _____

Is the project area population minority or low income? (Y or N) _____

What type of detour/closures could be used on the job? The majority of this work will occur within new alignment and will not require traffic detours. The only areas that may require detours are along the proposed interchanges with existing LA 3132, LA 523, Leonard Road, Robson Road, LA 1, and the future I-69, if constructed prior to this project. All efforts will be made to keep the existing roads open during construction of the interchanges.

Did you notice anything of concern during your site/windshield survey of the area? If so, explain below.

Providence/Monica Herrera

Point of Contact

225.766.7400

Phone Number

July 9, 2012

Date

Stage 0 Environmental Checklist

Threatened & Endangered Species Information

<http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/experience/threatened/speciesfactsheets/>
<http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/experience/threatened/threatenedandendangeredtable/>
<http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/experience/threatened/>

LA Wildlife Refuge Information

<http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/experience/wmas/refuges/>

Louisiana Scenic Rivers Act (R.S. 56:1840-1856)

Louisiana Natural and Scenic Rivers (R.S. 56:1847)

<http://www.legis.state.la.us/lss/lss.asp?doc=104995>

Louisiana Historic and Scenic Rivers (R.S. 56:1856)

<http://www.legis.state.la.us/lss/lss.asp?doc=105004>

<http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/experience/scenicrivers/>

Significant Tree Policy (EDSM I.1.1.21)

EDSMs can be found on DOTD's intranet site: <http://ladotnet/>

(Live Oak, Red Oak, White Oak, Magnolia or Cypress, aesthetically important, 18" or greater in diameter at breast height and has form that separates it from surrounding or that which may be considered historic.)

LA Historic Sites and Districts

<http://www.crt.state.la.us/hp/nhl/default.htm>

Hazardous Waste Site Information

<http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/tabid/71/Default.aspx>

<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/cursites/index.htm>

<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/la.htm>

http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/Portals/0/permits/ust_facility_owner.pdf

http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/Portals/0/remediation/form_5222_r01.xls

http://www.nrc.uscg.mil/wdbcgi/wdbcgi.exe/WWWUSER/WEBDB.foia_query.show_parms

<http://www.epa.gov/echo/>

DNR Oil & Gas Well Information

http://sonris-www.dnr.state.la.us/www_root/sonris_portal_1.htm

Environmental Justice (minority & low income)

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/ej2000.htm>

Demographics

<http://www.louisiana.gov/wps/wcm/connect/Louisiana.gov/About+Louisiana/Demographics%3A+Census+Info/Census+2000+Information/>

<http://www.census.gov/>

Water Wells

<http://www.dotd.state.la.us/intermodal/wells/home.asp>

FHWA's Environmental Website (Just a good reference for understanding NEPA)

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/index.htm>

Additional Databases Checked

See Appendices of the Environmental Inventory for the EDR Report

Other Comments:

Stage 0 Environmental Checklist

General Explanation:

To adequately consider projects in Stage 0, some consideration must be given to the human and natural environment which will be impacted by the project. The Environmental Checklist was designed knowing that some environmental issues may surface later in the process. This checklist was designed to obtain basic information, which is readily accessible by reviewing public databases and by visiting the site. It is recognized that some information may be more accessible than other information. Some items on the checklist may be more important than others depending on the type of project. It is recommended that the individual completing the checklist do their best to answer the questions accurately. Feel free to comment or write any explanatory comments at the end of the checklist.

The Databases:

To assist in gathering public information, the previous sheet includes web addresses for some of the databases that need to be consulted to complete the checklist. As of October 2006, these addresses were accurate.

Note that you will not have access to the location of any threatened or endangered (T&E) species. The web address list only the threatened or endangered species in Louisiana. It will generally describe their habitat and other information. If you know of any species in the project area, please state so, but you will not be able to confirm it yourself. If you feel this may be an issue, please contact the Environmental Section. We have biologist on staff who can confirm the presence of a species.

Why is this information important?

Land Use? Indicator of biological issues such as T&E species or wetlands.

Ownership? Tells us whether coordination with tribal nations will be required.

WRP properties? Farmland that is converted back into wetlands. The Federal government has a permanent easement which cannot be expropriated by the State. Program is operated through the Natural Resources Conservation Service (formerly the Soil Conservation Service).

Community Elements? DOTD would like to limit adverse impacts to communities. Also, public facilities may be costly to relocate.

Section 4(f) issues? USDOT agencies are required by law to avoid certain properties, unless a prudent or feasible alternative is not available.

Historic Properties? Tells us if we have a Section 106 issue on the project. (Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act) See <http://www.achp.gov/work106.html> for more details.

Scenic Streams? Scenic streams require a permit and may require restricted construction activities.

Significant Trees? Need coordination and can be important to community.

Age of Bridge? Section 106 may apply. Bridges over 50 years old are evaluated to determine if they are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Navigability? If navigable, will require an assessment of present and future navigation needs and US Coast Guard permit.

Hazardous Material? Don't want to purchase property if contaminated. Also, a safety issue for construction workers if right-of-way is contaminated.

Oil and Gas Wells? Expensive if project hits a well.

Relocations? Important to community. Real Estate costs can be substantial depending on location of project. Can result in organized opposition to a project.

Sensitive Issues? Identification of sensitive issues early greatly assists project team in designing public involvement plan.

Minority/Low Income Populations? Executive Order requires Federal Agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority or low income populations. (often referred to as Environmental Justice)

Detours? The detour route may have as many or more impacts. Should be looked at with project. May be unacceptable to the public.