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January 30, 2017 4-year-old killed walking along Airline Drive in Metairie

January 22, 2017 Pedestrian killed, another injured while trying to cross Harvey intersection

January 18, 2017 Pedestrian killed Wednesday morning on Choctaw Drive (Baton Rouge)

January 13, 2017 Pedestrian trying to cross U.S. 190 killed in overnight crash in Covington

December 29, 2016 Greensburg woman booked in Juban Road fatal hit and run (Denham Springs)

December 27, 2016 Lafayette police identify pedestrian killed in Monday crash

December 22, 2016 Slidell pedestrian struck by train, killed Wednesday night

December 9, 2016 Car kills pedestrian crossing Basin Street (New Orleans)

December 8, 2016 Pedestrian struck, killed while crossing street in Treme late (New Orleans)

December 7, 2016 Cyclist, pedestrian struck in two separate incidents Wednesday night (Baton Rouge)
Teamwork!
How has highway safety changed over the years?

• SAFETEA-LU (2005-2009)
  – Creation of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) as core federal-aid program (23 USC 148)
  – Creation of the requirement for the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) as a process for analyzing safety data (23 CFR 924)
  – Safety identified as a separate planning factor for MPOs
  – SRTS established

• MAP-21 (2012-2015)
  – HSIP remains core federal-aid program
  – Performance measure focused
  – Requirement for scheduled updates of the SHSP
  – SRTS no longer funded as standalone federal program

• FAST Act (December 2015 – present)
  – Specifically excludes non-infrastructure projects
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

- Title 23 (Highways) of Code of Federal Regulations 924
- Federal program to **significantly** reduce the occurrence of and potential for fatalities and serious injuries on **all public roads**
- Implemented through State-administered processes
  - Collecting and maintaining safety data
  - Improving safety data
  - Analyzing safety data
  - Conducting engineering studies
  - Establishing priorities
  - Evaluation of the HSIP & SHSP
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

- HSIP Performance Measures
  - Number of fatalities
  - Rate of fatalities
  - Number of serious injuries
  - Rate of serious injuries (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)
  - Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries
Louisiana Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)

- 5 year statewide data driven plan
- Prioritize strategies for reducing fatalities & serious injuries

2011 Emphasis Areas
- Impaired Driving
- Occupant Protection
- Young Drivers (15-24)
- Infrastructure & Operations
  - Roadway Departure
  - Intersection

2017 **UPDATE**
- Distracted Driving EA
- Non-Motorized Users

FHWA Pedestrian & Bicycle Focus Cities
- New Orleans
- Baton Rouge

Non-Motorized: Fatal & Severe

- Bicyclist Fatal & Injury
- Pedestrian Fatal & Injury
- 3% Increase

Yearly Count:
- 2005: 239
- 2006: 186
- 2007: 223
- 2008: 220
- 2009: 228
- 2010: 190
- 2011: 213
- 2012: 250
- 2013: 251
- 2014: 252
- 2015: 274
- 2022: 417
Louisiana Crash Statistics (2011 – 2015)

- **Annual Fatalities**
  - 107 Pedestrians
  - 19 bicyclist

- **Serious Injuries**
  - 149 Pedestrians
  - 34 bicyclists

- **Non-Motorized Fatalities = 15% of all Fatalities**

- **60/40 Split between State & Local Roads**
Safe Routes To Schools Program

SRTS Goal:
“...designed to decrease traffic and pollution and increase the health of children and the community. Safe Routes to Schools promotes walking and biking to school, using education and incentives to show how much fun it can be! “

• 90+ Projects Awarded (2007-2015)
• Total Costs $31.3 Million
Safe Routes To Public Places Program

From the SRTPPP Guidelines:

“The development of the SRTPPP is a result of the recognition that the transportation network is utilized by motorists and non-motorists, such as pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users of all ages and abilities. The SRTPPP aims to address the safety needs of the non-motorists evidenced in fatality and serious injury data.”

• Proposed 2017 HSIP Budget:

Highway Program $ 65 M
LRSP $ 3-5 M
SRTPPP $ 3 M
Total $ 72 M
Workshop Agenda

• Program Guidelines
• Project Selection
  (break)
• Project Application
• Project Implementation
Louisiana’s Safe Routes to Public Places Program
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Funding

- Highway Safety Improvement Funds
  - All Public Roads: State or Locally Owned
- Eligible Project Costs (100% no match req’d)
  - Design Engineering Services (provided by DOTD)
  - Right-of-Way Acquisition
  - Project Construction
  - Construction Contract Administration (CE&I)
• Non-Eligible Project Costs
  – Utility Relocations
  – Right of Way Acquisition Services (locally roads)
  – Project Construction on Private Property
  – Costs above the Federal Funding Commitment
  – Design Engineering Services contracted by local entity
Funding Limitations

- $350,000 per application
  - Applied to Construction & R/W Costs only
  - Design Engineering & Construction Contract Administration not included in funding limitation
- Additional work may be funded by local entity
  - Work on private property required for connectivity
  - Work outside the scope of the project award
Program Eligibility

- Any Public Entity may submit application
- For Locally Owned Roads & Right-of-Ways
  - Project sponsor must be roadway owner
- For State Owned Roads and Right-of-Ways
  - Project sponsor must be entity responsible for maintenance
  - DOTD District Administrator endorsement required
Eligible Public Places*

- Schools (any grade)
- Universities
- Libraries
- Governmental Buildings
- Hospitals

- Transit Facilities
- Public Parks
- Other Public Places
  - Business Centers
  - Shopping Centers

*Scope of project must be associated with reducing crashes along a public road*
Project Types

• Pedestrian Facilities
  – Sidewalks
  – Crosswalks
  – Pedestrian Signals

• Bicycle Facilities
  – Bike lanes
  – Cycle tracks
  – Shared Use Paths

• Road Improvements
  – Traffic Calming
  – Bus Turnouts
  – Signs & Striping
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Selection Process

• Applications Evaluated by SRTPPP Project Selection Committee
• Evaluation Step 1: Safety Impact Assessment
• Evaluation Step 2: Project Feasibility Assessment
Step 1: Project Safety Impact Assessment

- Required to qualify for Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program Funds
- Safety Evaluation Factors (11)
  - Evaluation Score x Factor Weight = Factor Score
- Safety Impact Assessment Total Score = Sum of Factor Scores
- Minimum Grade Required for eligibility (50% of total allowed)
- Project Priority Short List
  - Number of projects determined by available funds
  - Short list does not imply acceptance
Safety Evaluation Factor

1) Identified through a local complete street or safety plan

- Project site is included in pedestrian / bicycle / transit plan for improved safety
  - **High** - Included with a high priority designation
  - **Medium** - Included with medium priority designation
  - **Low** - Not included in any safety plan

(weight factor: medium)
Safet Evaluation Factor

1) Identified through a local/state complete street / safety plan

Table: Top Ten Injury-Reducing Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Primary Road</th>
<th>Intersection Road</th>
<th>Signal</th>
<th>#Crashes</th>
<th>RES Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S. Claiborne Ave (US 90)</td>
<td>Gravier St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paydrick St</td>
<td>Camp St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Iberville St</td>
<td>N. Peters St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canal St</td>
<td>Corin St &amp; Getzen St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S. Peters St</td>
<td>Paydrick St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Esplanade Ave</td>
<td>N. Claiborne Ave (LA 99)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Broad Blvd</td>
<td>I-10 W Champ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S. Carrollton Ave</td>
<td>Ulloa St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Blvd</td>
<td>S. Claiborne Ave (US 90)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Airline Dr (US 61)</td>
<td>Monroe St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Canal St</td>
<td>N/A Peters St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>St. Claude Ave (LA 46)</td>
<td>Frankl In Ave</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Itchen St (LA 439)</td>
<td>Holiday Dr</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Press Dr</td>
<td>Chef Mentour Hwy (US 99)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Willow St</td>
<td>Claiborne St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Louisiana Ave</td>
<td>S. Broadway St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S. Claiborne Ave (US 90)</td>
<td>Leonidas St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>N. Peters St</td>
<td>Camp St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>St. Claude Ave (LA 46)</td>
<td>Elysian Fields Ave (LA 46)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S. Broad St</td>
<td>Camp St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Enhances connectivity to a local pedestrian / bicycle / transit network

- Provides a connection to an existing pedestrian / bicycle / transit network that enhances public safety
  - **High** – New and vital connection
  - **Medium** – Improves connectivity
  - **Low** – Includes only a localized enhancement or update

(weight factor: medium - high)
Safety Evaluation Factor

2) Enhances connectivity to a local pedestrian / bicycle / transit network

Laplace Shared Use Path

Kenner City Park Sidewalks

New shared use path

New Sidewalk

Existing sidewalk ends

Existing

Existing
3) Pedestrian / Bicycle Crashes*

Crashes reported within **one mile** of public place for pedestrians and/or **two miles** for bicycles within last five years of available data

- **High** - High number of reported crashes (typically > 20)
- **Medium** - Moderate number of reported crashes (typically between 5 and 20)
- **Low** - Few reported crashes (typically < 5)

*DOTD developed data (weight factor: high)*
3) Pedestrian / Bicycle Crashes*

Legend
Ped 2010-14 Crashes
Crash Type, Severity
- Pedestrian, A-Fatal
- Pedestrian, B-Severe
- Pedestrian, C-Moderate
- Pedestrian, D-Complaint
- Pedestrian, E-None

H009308 Schools with 1 Mile Buffer

New Orleans: Audubon Charter School
High grade > 20 crashes
4) Pedestrian / Bicycle Crashes Severity

Reported within **one** mile of public place for pedestrian and **two** miles for bicycles within the last five years of available data

- **High**- Includes a fatality or severe injuries account for typically > 10% of crashes
- **Medium**- Includes moderate injuries
- **Low**- No reported crashes

* DOTD developed data
  (weight factor: high)
4) Pedestrian / Bicycle Crashes Severity

Covington Pine View Elem School
Medium – High grade
- No fatalities
- > 10% severe injuries

* See Appendix C for crash analysis example
5) Identified Pedestrian / Bicycle Risks

- Rating should reflect safety risk with local *vehicular traffic* relative to the current condition or lack of proper facility to support *pedestrian / bicycle traffic*
  - Pedestrian safety on the sidewalk due to condition of sidewalk not considered
  - Current ADA compliance not considered
- Clearly identified locations with potential safety risks for pedestrian and/or bicycles walking or operating along, adjacent or across the roadway(s) within the proposed project limits
  - **High** - strong evidence
  - **Medium** - some evidence
  - **Low** - no evidence

(weight factor: medium)
5) Identified Pedestrian / Bicycle Risks

- No sidewalk may rate higher than a sidewalk in need of repair
- Large number of countermeasures at high volume intersections may rate higher than a sidewalk project with minimal number of intersections
6) Pedestrian / Bicycle Demand

- Rating should reflect potential for pedestrians within one mile and/or bicycles within two miles of the public place (current or projected usage):
  - Application demonstrates through statistical data, user surveys, community outreach or other data analysis that a high potential for pedestrian and/or bicycle traffic will exist with implemented safety improvements. (typically >100 or 40% of public place users)
    - **High** - high potential (typically >100 or 40% of public place users)
    - **Medium** - moderate potential (typically >50 or 20% of public place users)
    - **Low** - data does not support a claim that potential pedestrian and/or biker traffic will exist with implemented safety improvements.
- Backup data required in application (weight factor: medium)
  - Guesses don’t count
7) Systemic Analysis of Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes*

- Rating should reflects number of systemic analysis risk conditions (intersection, undivided street, no traffic light, no shoulder):
  - **High** - Includes a high number of specific locations with high risk systemic analysis conditions
  - **Medium** - Includes a moderate number of specific locations with high risk systemic analysis conditions
  - **Low** - Includes no specific locations with high risk systemic analysis conditions

* Based on DOTD’s systemic crash analysis (weight factor: medium)
Safety Evaluation Factor

7) Systemic Analysis of Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes*
8) Roadway Characteristics

• Rating should reflect a combination of potential pedestrians/bicycle safety risks with vehicular traffic relative to the scope of the project
  
  – **High** – Numerous higher risk roadway characteristics. ADT> 5000, Speed >40mph, conflict points typically >10, no shoulders, two-way traffic, # of lanes, etc.
  
  – **Medium** – Moderate number of higher risk roadway characteristic. ADT> 500, Speed <30 mph, conflict points typically<5, lack of shoulders, two-way traffic, etc.
  
  – **Low** – Minimal or no higher risk roadway characteristics

(weight factor: medium)
8) Roadway Characteristics

LA 308 Raceland

Williams Blvd Kenner
9) Other supporting risk data analysis

- Rating should be based on outcome and quality of additional supporting data not identified or addressed in previous evaluation factors (i.e. high number of speeding tickets, high number of disabled users, etc.):
  - **High** - Application includes additional high quality site specific data and data analysis
  - **Medium** - Application includes additional site specific data
  - **Low** - No additional supporting data and/or data analysis provided

(weight factor: medium)
Safety Evaluation Factor

9) Other supporting risk data analysis

Speeding tickets

Visual or Hearing Impaired

Elderly
10) Safety Effectiveness

• Proven safety improvements* that clearly address the potential safety risks for pedestrian / bicycle conflict with vehicular traffic walking or operating along, adjacent or across the roadway(s)

• Rating Examples:
  – New sidewalk on road with no shoulders may rate higher than a sidewalk in need of repair
  – Pedestrian controls at high volume intersection(s) may rate higher than sidewalk(s) with low ADT
  – Traffic calming measures on street with history of speeding may rate higher than just adding crosswalks

(weight factor: high)
10) Safety Effectiveness

*See Appendix B for informational links for proven safety improvements
11) Implementing FHWA Proven Countermeasures:

- **High** - Includes use of both countermeasures at multiple locations.
- **Medium** - Includes use of one countermeasure at multiple locations.
- **Low** - Does not include use of either countermeasure.

(weight factor: med – high)
Priority Project Short List

- Evaluation factor grade is multiplied by the evaluation factor weight and then summed to achieve a total application score.
- Priority Ranking based on total application scores highest to lowest.
- Minimum score (50% of maximum allowable score) required for funding eligibility (eligibility does not place project on short list)
- Project Short List based on Priority Ranking compared to annual available funds
- Projects provided on the Short List do not represent or imply approval for funding or implementation
- The short list will contain projects that will not be funded (unfunded projects may be resubmitted in subsequent advertisements)
- Projects on the short list will move to Step 2: Feasibility Assessment
Step 2: Project Feasibility Assessment

- Assessment of non-safety related factors (5)
  - Non-safety related costs
  - Project support
  - Sustainability

- Project feasibility report prepared by DOTD’s consultant
  - Meeting with LPA
  - Site Visit
  - Cost estimate

- Final Selection based on combined Safety Assessment Factors and Project Feasibility Factors
12) Stakeholder Support

- **High** - Includes high priority designation for site specific improvements from MPO long range plan, DOTD District PSI list, or other political subdivision long range transportation plan, along with documented support from Regional Safety Coalition, political subdivisions, local agencies and public associations.

- **Medium** - Application includes documented correspondence from MPO, DOTD District, Regional Safety Coalition, along with political subdivisions, local agencies and public associations.

- **Low** - Application provides minimal documented support from outside entities or potential end users.

(weight factor: medium)
13) Financial Support:

- Rating based on percentage of funds provided by sponsor for eligible costs for total project costs to include engineering, construction, right-of-way, etc:
  - **High** – Sponsor provides substantial financial support (typically >20%)
  - **Medium** - Sponsor provides some financial support (typically >10%)
  - **Low** – 100% of project eligible costs provided by Federal Funds

(weight factor: low)
14) Right of Way Needs:

- Rating based on potential need for R/W and estimated R/W costs applied to the project funds when R/W is required:
  - **High** - Project does not need additional right of way
  - **Medium** - Additional right of way typically costs < 10% of total project costs
  - **Low** - Additional right of way typically costs > 20% of total project costs

(Weight factor: low)
15) Drainage Issues:

- **High** - Drainage typically costs < 5% of total project costs
- **Medium** – Drainage typically costs >5% and < 25% of total project costs
- **Low** - Drainage typically costs > 25% of total project costs

(Weight factor: medium)
16) Maintenance / Operations Action Plan:

- **High** - Application includes documented Maintenance and Operation Plan to include estimate of the annual costs of maintenance and operation with identified source of revenue to support plan. Application includes resolution to accept and maintain improvements provided by project.

- **Medium** - Application includes documented acceptance of maintenance without providing annual costs or source of funds for maintenance.

- **Low** - Application does not address maintenance needs.

(weight factor: low)
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SRTPP Application

- Solicited annually
- Formatted to provide necessary information for safety and feasibility assessments
- Local Entities may submit multiple applications
  - Multiple applications must be locally prioritized
  - Large cost projects may be submitted in multiple phased applications
  - Approval of initial phase does not guarantee approval of subsequent phases
- Project scopes, construction items and estimated costs should be accurately developed
- Submit complete but concise applications
- Remember that this is a competitive process
Sponsor Information

- Provide official name, mailing address, and identification numbers of government entity submitting application.
- Provide name and contact information of Responsible Charge Person.
- Provide entity consultant name and contact information (if applicable).
- Complete LPA Responsible Charge Form
Public Place(s) Information / Project Identification

• Provide Public Place facility information and contact
• Provide name of project.
• Provide project limits and location
SRTPP Application Format

Problem Identification

- Describe existing condition and potential safety risks to walking/bicycling to public facility(s) identified in the application.
- Provide pictures of existing conditions.
- Describe current pedestrian or cyclist activity.
- Provide statistical data through pedestrian / bicycle counts, population data, user surveys, community outreach or other data that supports a high potential for pedestrian and/or bicycle user demand with implemented safety improvements. Specific data needs to represent user demand to the public facility within one mile for pedestrians and two miles for bicyclists.
Problem Identification (cont’d)

- Provide any additional data and/or data analysis that support a need for the proposed improvements such as traffic infractions, parking tickets, etc.
- Provide roadway characteristics of the existing road facility such as ADT, speed, intersections that pose a safety risk to pedestrians and/or bicyclists.
Project Scope and Details of Proposed Improvement

- Describe work necessary for the project.
- Identify the safety improvements proposed to mitigate high risk road features to pedestrians and/or bicyclists.
- Provide supporting data for projecting the benefits of the safety improvements such as potential risk reductions, increase facility use, etc.
- Provide maps, plans and photographs as applicable to identify safety improvement locations and boundaries.
- Provide any other supporting risk data analysis
SRTPP Application Format

Local Safety Plan and Network Connectivity

• Provide adopted local plan (if applicable) indicating priority of proposed project and safety improvements.
• Provide how the proposed project will enhance or improve connectivity to a pedestrian / bicycle / transit network. (if applicable)
SRTPPP Application Format

Project Support

• Provide endorsement and support letters from other public agencies and community associations that indicated the need and priority of the project

• Provide resolution accepting future maintenance responsibility and funding
SRTPP Application Format

General Information and Pre-construction Engineering Option

- Select option for responsible party for preconstruction engineering
- Provide consultant name and contact information (if applicable)
- Provide projected need for utility relocations and additional right-of-way
SRTPP Application Format

**Project Cost (accurate & comprehensive)**

- Provide a detailed cost estimate
- List items with description, estimated quantities, unit prices, and total amount
- Include items for mobilization, signs, and barricades, construction layout, etc.
- Indicate those items being paid for with local funds (if any)
SRTPP Application

• Application Deadline
  – March 31, 2017

• Application Submittal
  – LADOTD
    Attn: Mark Morvant, Rm 204CC
    PO Box 94245
    Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9245

• Application Link
  http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside_LaDOTD/Divisions/Multimodal/Highway_Safety/SRTPPP/Pages/default.aspx
Informational Links:

• DOTD website:  
  http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside_LaDOTD/Divisions/Administration/LPA/Pages/default.aspx

• Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System:  
  http://www.pedbikesafe.org/

• Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center:  
  http://www.pedbikeinfo.com/

• FHWA memorandum:  
  https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_flexibility.cfm
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Project Implementation

• Design Engineering
  – DOTD held Retainer Contracts
  – Entity elects to hold contract

• Construction
  – DOTD awards and holds contract

• Construction Engineering, Inspection & Testing
  – DOTD held Retainer Contracts
  – DOTD District Personnel
DOTD Responsibilities

- Initiate Entity State Agreements
- Obtain Environmental Clearance
- Develop Construction Proposal and Plans
- Provide R/W Services and Acquisition as applicable
- Bid Project
- Contract with Construction Contractor
- Provide Construction Engineering and Inspection
Project Implementation

Entity Responsibilities

- Process Entity State Agreements
- Provide LPA Responsible Charge
- Develop Construction Proposal and Plans (optional)
- Provide R/W Acquisition Services as applicable
- Provide for Utility Relocations as applicable
- Obtain necessary permits
- Provide Site Access to Contractor
- Provide funds for non eligible costs as applicable
SRTS Historical Application Issues

• Underestimated Costs
  – Missing items
  – Wrong item numbers
  – Historically higher bid costs (small projects)

• Drainage overruns

• Right of Way constraints

• ADA compliance

• Entity Selected Engineering Consultant
Cost Estimates

• Project Common Items (SRTPPP website)
  – Item Number
  – Description
  – Units

• Unit Costs
  – SRTS projects – 2017 bid result
  – DOTD 2017 weighted bid average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th># of SRTS bids</th>
<th>SRTS Low Bid</th>
<th>SRTS High Bid</th>
<th>SRTS Bid average</th>
<th>DOTD weighted bid ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201-01-00100</td>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>7,875.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-02000</td>
<td>Removal of Asphalt Drives</td>
<td>SQYD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>16.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-06010</td>
<td>Removal of Concrete Drives</td>
<td>SQYD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-06140</td>
<td>Removal of Curb (Concrete)</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-12000</td>
<td>Removal of Fence</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-32120</td>
<td>Removal of Pipe (Side Drain) 15&quot;</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-32120</td>
<td>Removal of Pipe (Side Drain) 18&quot;</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-32140</td>
<td>Removal of Pipe (Storm Drain) 18&quot;</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-32160</td>
<td>Removal of Pipe (Yard Drain)</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-32180</td>
<td>Removal of Pipe Headwalls</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,100.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,302.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-38000</td>
<td>Relocation of Sign</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>187.50</td>
<td>192.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-02-39020</td>
<td>Relocation of Sign Pole</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>187.50</td>
<td>302.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203-03-00100</td>
<td>Excavation and Embankment</td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-02-00100</td>
<td>Temporary Hay or Straw Bales</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>18.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-09-00100</td>
<td>Temporary Silt Fencing</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-01-00100</td>
<td>Traffic Maintenance Aggregate</td>
<td>CYGD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>36.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-02-00100</td>
<td>Portland Cement Concrete Pavement</td>
<td>SQYD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-01-02040</td>
<td>Cross Drain Pipe (30&quot; RCP/PP or 36&quot; CMP)</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>158.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-03-01000</td>
<td>Storm Drain Pipe (15&quot; RCP/PP)</td>
<td>LNFT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>64.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 Application Timeline

• Application Submittal Deadline
  – March 31, 2017

• Projected Short List Announcement
  – May 2017

• Projected Project Selection Announcement
  – August 2017
Project Implementation

Timeline (best case scenario: 2 - 3 years)

– Entity State Agreements: 2 months
– Budgeting & Federal Authorization: 1 month
– Design task order: 1 month
– Design Engineering & Plan Development: 12-24 months
  • R/W
  • Utilities
– Project Advertisement & Bidding: 3 months
– Construction Contract Award: 3 months
– Construction: 3-6 months
Potential project delays (worst case scenario: ??$$!!)

- Entity State Agreements: delay in signature process & entity resolution
- Budgeting & Federal Authorization: SRTPP annual budget authority & MPO STIP revisions
- Design task order: DOTD consultant workload or entity consultant
- Design Engineering & Plan Development
  - Complexity (drainage issues, permits, communication, etc.)
  - Right-of-way acquisition
  - Utility relocation
  - Plan reviews
- Project Advertisement & Bidding: bid overruns
Questions?

Louisiana’s Safe Routes to Public Places Program

Contacts

Program Manager
April Renard, P.E.
(225)379-1919
april.renard@la.gov

Project Manager
Mark Morvant, P.E.
(225)379-1205
mark.morvant@la.gov

Project Manager
Mike Ricca, P.E.
(225)242-4582
mike.ricca@la.gov