

То:	Jason Charest	From:	Justin LaPerle
	Chittenden County RPC		Stantec Consulting Services
File:	Assessment of Existing Conditions	Date:	June 8, 2023

### **Reference: Existing Conditions Report**

#### **Executive Summary**

In the interest of the CCRPC and the Town of Richmond this assessment investigates the 11 identified pinch points where a 5-foot shoulder cannot be met with the existing Richmond-Bolton paving project going through this section of US-2. This high-level feasibility report will assess the pinch points by identifying the cause of the pinch point and providing an order of magnitude cost estimate. Information from the ongoing Richmond-Bolton paving project will be used and assumptions about ROW, Utilities, and permitting will be made on a site-to-site basis.

Locations will be identified using the stations from the existing Richmond-Bolton paving project and will be included in Appendix A.

#### Site Location:

The corridor of interest is approximately 1.5 miles along US Route 2 which runs East/West in the arial map below. US Route 2 generally parallels Interstate 89 around Richmond. Plans detailing the pinch points can be found in Appendix A.



Design with community in mind lj u:\179450619\transportation\report\assessment of existing conditions.docx June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 2 of 10

Reference: Existing Conditions Report

Location 1: STA 79+20 – 81+00, LT.

Proposed Shoulder Width: LT – 3'6"

The existing retaining wall adjacent to the westbound lane is encroaching on the shoulder. Proposed solutions for the wall include relocating the wall within the state Right-of-Way (ROW), removing the wall, and adequately sloping the slope in a manner that it remains stable, or removing the vegetation that you can see in Figure 2 between the Edge of Pavement (EOP) and the start of the wall.

Г

Assumptions:

- > Limits of construction activity will remain within the existing ROW.
- > Assume Categorical Exclusion (NEPA) is applicable for all work.
- > No Utility, or Historical/Archeological Impacts.
- > Roadway impacts will be negligible.



Figure 2 (Location 1):Retaining Wall facing East.

Location 1	Relocate Wall	Remove & Regrade
Parametric Solution	\$90,000	\$50,000
Utility Coordination	\$25,000	\$25,000
Geotechnical Analysis	\$25,000	\$5,000
Preliminary Engineering	\$75,000	\$50,000
Contingency (50%)	\$107,500	\$65,000
Approximate Total	\$322,500	\$195,000

Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate:

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 3 of 10

#### Reference: Existing Conditions Report

Location 2 & 3: Covered in STP CULV (58) Richmond. Figure 3 (below) shows the projected timeline showed on VTrans website.

![](_page_2_Picture_3.jpeg)

Figure 3: Schedule for STP CULV (58) Richmond

Locations 4 & 5: STA 100+33 – 102+58, LT

STA 101+46 - 102+03, RT

Proposed Shoulder Widths: LT – 4'

RT – 1'10"

The existing Bridge (#28) is showing signs of deterioration with the eastbound shoulder the narrowest of the whole stretch. Proposed solutions would include a full replacement or extending the Outlet (Eastbound) side of the culvert. With the extension, realignment of US-2 could accommodate 5ft shoulders on both sides of the roadway.

Assumptions:

- Limits of construction activity will remain within the existing ROW.
- > Assume Categorical Exclusion (NEPA) is applicable for all work.
- > No Utility, or Historical/Archeological Impacts.

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 4 of 10

#### Reference: Existing Conditions Report

![](_page_3_Picture_2.jpeg)

Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate:

Location 4/5	Full Replacement	Extension
Parametric Solution	\$290,000	\$100,000
Utility Coordination	\$50,000	\$25,000
Geotechnical Analysis	\$50,000	\$50,000
Preliminary Engineering	\$150,000	\$100,000
Contingency (50%)	\$270,000	\$137,500
Approximate Total	\$810,000	\$412,500

Figure 4 (Location 4/5): Eastbound (Outlet) side of Culvert

Locations 6 & 7: STA 106+18 – 107+08, LT.

STA 105+95 - 107+05, RT.

Proposed Shoulder Widths: LT – 2'4"

RT – 3'6"

The existing 2' x 3' Box Culvert (PID 64504) is too short to provide enough roadway width for the desired shoulders. Keeping VTrans Maintenance personnel in mind, the best solution for this location is to replace the existing box culvert with a Pipe. Hydraulic Analysis would provide a recommended pipe size.

Assumptions:

- > Limits of construction activity will remain within the existing ROW.
- > Assume Categorical Exclusion (NEPA) is applicable for all work.
- > No Utility, or Historical/Archeological Impacts.

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 5 of 10

Reference: Existing Conditions Report

![](_page_4_Picture_2.jpeg)

Figure 5: Inlet Side of Box Culvert

Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate:

Location 6 &7	Full Replacement
Parametric Solution	\$325,000
Utility Coordination	\$50,000
Geotechnical Analysis	\$50,000
Preliminary Engineering	\$150,000
Contingency (50%)	\$287,500
Approximate Total	\$862,500

Location 8: STA 115+25 - 117+50, RT.

Proposed Shoulder Widths: RT - 3'6"

With the steep fill slope behind the existing guardrail, the most appropriate and most cost-effective solution would be sheet piling. Being only 1'6" short of 5' removing the offset blocks from the existing guardrail would allow for an additional 6". In addition to the results of the paving project going through the corridor, if lane widths change at all the results could be very close to 5' on the Eastbound Lane after remove of offset blocks.

Assumptions:

- > Limits of construction activity will remain within the existing ROW.
- > Assume Categorical Exclusion (NEPA) is applicable for all work.

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 6 of 10

Reference: Existing Conditions Report

- > No Utility, or Historical/Archeological Impacts.
- > Roadway impacts will be negligible.
- > Required embedment for sheet pile would be met.

![](_page_5_Picture_5.jpeg)

Figure 6: Embankment on US-2 facing West.

Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate:

Location 8	Sheet Piling	Offset Blocks
Parametric Solution	\$675,000	\$2,250
Utility Coordination	\$75,000	\$5,000
Geotechnical Analysis	\$50,000	\$0
Preliminary Engineering	\$100,000	\$5,000
Contingency (50%)	\$450,000	\$6,125
Approximate Total	\$1,350,000	\$18,375

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 7 of 10

Reference: Existing Conditions Report

Location 9: STA 120+00 - 121+03, RT.

Proposed Shoulder Widths: RT - 3'7"

A combination of steep slope and proximity to the railroad limit the options to increase the shoulder along US-2. Sheet Piling is the solution that would work best in this instance. The small footprint of the sheet piles could potentially stay out of the Railroad clear zone while providing extra width to the shoulder.

Assumptions:

- > Limits of construction activity will remain within the existing ROW.
- > Assume Categorical Exclusion (NEPA) is applicable for all work.
- > No Utility, or Historical/Archeological Impacts.
- > Roadway impacts will be negligible.
- > Required embedment for sheet pile would be met.

![](_page_6_Picture_11.jpeg)

Figure 7: Embankment facing Eastbound along US-2

Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate:

Location 9	Sheet Piling
Parametric Solution	\$309,000
Utility Coordination	\$50,000
Geotechnical Analysis	\$50,000
Preliminary Engineering	\$100,000
Contingency (50%)	\$204,500
Approximate Total	\$613,500

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 8 of 10

Reference: Existing Conditions Report

Locations 10 & 11: STA 130+94 – 133+75, LT. STA 129+99 – 133+75, RT. Proposed Shoulder Widths: LT – 1'5"-3'7" RT – 3'0"-4'2"

The roadway cut is narrow leaving tight shoulders on either side of US-2 coming up into the Village of Richmond. As you crest the hill heading Eastbound you are welcomed with infrastructure on both sides, including sidewalk on both sides when you reach the top of the hill. Retaining walls or sheet piling would provide adequate width to accommodate 5ft shoulders on either side. There's a cross culvert located at STA 130+30 that will need an appropriate headwall to facilitate the wider shoulder as well.

Assumptions:

- > Limits of construction activity will remain within the existing ROW.
- > Assume Categorical Exclusion (NEPA) is applicable for all work.
- > No Utility, or Historical/Archeological Impacts.
- > Roadway impacts will be negligible.
- > Required embedment for sheet pile would be met.

![](_page_7_Picture_10.jpeg)

Figure 8: Embankments along US-2 heading into Richmond Village

Location 10 & 11	Sheet Piling	Retaining Wall
Parametric Solution	\$1,968,000	\$656,000
Utility Coordination	\$75,000	\$75,000
Geotechnical Analysis	\$100,000	\$100,000
Preliminary Engineering	\$200,000	\$200,000
Contingency (50%)	\$1,171,500	\$515,500
Approximate Total	\$3,514,500	\$1,546,500

## Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 9 of 10

Reference: Existing Conditions Report

Appendix A:

Pinch Points PDF (12 Pages)

Stantec Consulting Services Inc.

Justin LaPerle, EIT Civil Engineer

Phone: 802 497 6434 Fax: 802 864 0165 Justin.LaPerle@stantec.com

Attachment: Attachment

c. C.C.

June 8, 2023 CCRPC Page 10 of 10

Reference: Existing Conditions Report

# Appendix A:

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_3.jpeg)

	CIHO JANTA JAN
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
NRCH —	——————————————————————————————————————
	$\frac{2}{2HV} = 6 - \frac{1}{42HV} - \frac{1}{2K} - \frac{1}{2K} + $
<u></u>	STA. S
	MAT
	PROJECT NAME: RICHMOND US-2 PINCH PUINTS PROJECT NUMBER: 179250619

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_0.jpeg)

	VI STATE PLANE GRID
<ul> <li>○</li> <li>PLUGGED</li> <li>F-22</li> <li>O</li> <lio< li=""> <lio< li=""> <li>O</li> <li>O</li> <li></li></lio<></lio<></ul>	PAVED DRIVE UD-2 MONITORING CURVE #18
	PROJECT NAME: RICHMOND US-2 PINCH POINTS PROJECT NUMBER: 179450619
ntec	FILE NAME: Richmond US-2 Pinch Points.dgrPLOT DATE: 4/20/2023PROJECT LEADER: M.FOWLERDESIGNED BY:J.LAPERLECHECKED BY:M.FOWLERPLAN SHEET 7OFI2

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_3.jpeg)

# 

LON		
	— 1 <i>3</i> Л —	
GI.5"DIAMETER_30"AGS		UD-3
G		

Z ON STATE PLANE GRID \_\_\_\_\_ LON \_\_\_\_ (\$) R 114+00 RICHMOND US-2 PINCH POINTS PROJECT NAME: project number: 179450619 FILE NAME: Richmond US-2 Pinch Points.dgrPLOT DATE: 4/20/2023

FILE NAME: Richmond US-2 Pinch Points.dgrPLOT DATE: 4/20/2023PROJECT LEADER: M.FOWLERDRAWN BY: J.LAPERLEDESIGNED BY: J.LAPERLECHECKED BY: M.FOWLERPLAN SHEET 8SHEET 8 OF 12

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

PROJECT LEADER: M.FOWLER DRAWN BY: J.LAPERLE DESIGNED BY: J.LAPERLE CHECKED BY: M. FOWLER PLAN SHEET 9 SHEET 9 OF 12

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

BOXC 3'X3'

MONITORING MONITORING DRIVE MONITORING AER E&T	$\frac{10}{6}$	10 	Π	— 10N —
RICHMOND	' - 0''	6 	WESTBOUND	CURVE
S ROUTE 2 R 122+00	í í · - 0''	R 123+00	EASTBOUND	R 12
<u>G</u> UGU UGU		-FO	- <u>6</u> UGU — –	

![](_page_19_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_6.jpeg)

project name: RICHMOND US-2 PINCH POINTS
project number: 179450619
FILE NAME: Richmond US-2 Pinch Points.dgnPLOT DATE: 4/20/2023 PROJECT LEADER: M.FOWLER DRAWN BY: J.LAPERLE DESIGNED BY: J.LAPERLE CHECKED BY: M.FOWLER PLAN SHEET 10 OF 12

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

		₹
		Class Har I
RCH	ARCH ARCH	-
ÊL /E,	. 1	
		0
— ¥BCH	<u>- UT - T UT - TU - TU - TU - TU - TU - </u>	135+0
	WESTBOUND	TA. R
4+00		
<u></u>		MATCHL
```````````````````````````````````````		
, 		
	PROJECT NAME: RICHMOND PROJECT NUMBER: 179450619	US-2 PINCH POINTS
antec	FILE NAME: Richmond US-2 Pinch Po PROJECT LEADER: M.FOWLER DESIGNED BY: J.LAPERLE PLAN SHEFT 12	Dints.dgrPLOT DATE: 4/20/2023 DRAWN BY: J.LAPERLE CHECKED BY: M.FOWLER SHEFT 12 OF 12
		+