

From: Parizo, Erin <Erin.Parizo@vermont.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 10, 2020 at 5:04 PM
Subject: VTrans Project Development Process
To: selectboard11@gmail.com <selectboard11@gmail.com>
Cc: Devlin, Jesse <Jesse.Devlin@vermont.gov>

Sasha, Thanks for catching up this morning! I've tried to provide a bit more background and meeting notes for your reference, as well as more detail about our standard project development process, so hopefully this is clear for your use in your meeting tonight.

1. Scoping

- a. We review locations for potential projects and develop multiple alternatives to address any concerns – safety, mobility, accessibility, assets, etc.
- b. Alternatives are reviewed for impacts (natural, cultural, physical, etc.), cost, benefit, constructability, feasibility and from many other perspectives to narrow down the alternatives.
- c. A preferred alternative is selected (with coordination with appropriate stakeholders) and moved forward as a project to be further investigated and appropriately designed.
 - i. A scoping study (attached) was completed in 2005 by the RPC and an engineering consultant with a preferred alternative very similar to what we're currently proposing. Our kickoff meeting in September 2015 (notes attached) discussed this preferred alternative and that VTrans would move forward with investigating all of the constraints related to that alternative and continue coordination with the Town.
 - ii. VTrans began working through the conceptual design and with internal collaboration meetings realized the number of constraints related to constructability, historic resources, utilities (aerial and underground), traffic management, etc. and began a more thorough review of this alternative and other alternatives (in coordination with our utility section, environmental section, geotechnical section, operations section, and others).
 - iii. Internal review meetings led to VTrans consensus that the two most appropriate solutions were those discussed in a November 2018 meeting with the Town (notes attached). Many alternatives were discussed, with a focus on the two most viable – the island reconstruction with minimal disturbance, or the full intersection construction (Alternative 2B) with a lot of considerations that would require Town consensus.
 - iv. Plainfield Town Selectboard sent the letter to the Secretary requesting that Alternative 2B be moved forward – dated December 2018 (attached).
 - v. VTrans responded to the Selectboard with the attached response in January 2019 reiterating the constraints of Alternative 2B and that we would investigate it further at your request.
 - vi. Meeting held in May 2019 (notes attached) discussing the constraints of Alternative 2B looking for consensus to move forward. Agreed to hold a public meeting to present the concept to the Town and get Selectboard

endorsement.

2. Conceptual Design (~25% design plans)
 - a. With a preferred alternative determined, VTrans moves forward with additional data collection (traffic volumes, historic/natural resources, subsurface investigation, utility information, etc.) to inform a conceptual level set of plans.
 - i. This is roughly where we are now, though without Selectboard endorsement of the preferred alternative we've slowed progress to come to an agreement before continuing to spend federal funding.
 - b. During Conceptual design, the plans are drafted up and additional thought is given to the design of the improvements with respect to the local/state/national standards, but also with respect to the local context and impacts of the design.
 - c. Collaboration meetings are held with necessary stakeholders (Town, RPC, Agency environmental/geotechnical/utilities/operations/maintenance/construction, other State Agencies, etc.) to determine impacts from the project and mitigation measures are decided upon and put into place in future plan sets.
2. Preliminary Design (~60% design plans)
 - a. Preliminary design typically includes the development of a Transportation Management Plan, a Risk Register, and updated plans to incorporate any changes since the Conceptual design, along more detailed engineering design information.
 - B. Utility relocations (if needed) are defined during this phase and new utility locations are determined – this includes aerial and underground utilities, both municipally and privately owned.
 - c. Permitting process is initiated during this phase to apply for and obtain any state or local permits required.
3. Right of Way Process
 - a. Once the plans and impacts of the project are well defined, this is initiated within VTrans and in collaboration with the Town to define, appraise, and acquire all ROW needs for the improvements. This involves detailed coordination between Agency ROW agents and land owners.
4. Final Design (~85% design plans)
 - a. With all ROW agreements in place, the plans move into a final design phase for additional engineering detail and a draft of other contract language and special provisions.
 - b. Developing more detail within the contract language and special provisions includes flexibility for working hour restrictions, seasonal restrictions, and other helpful language that can be modified based on the project requirements and collaboration between the Agency and the Town.
 - i. Some common language includes day/month/hour restrictions if feasible, requirements for the contractor to hold a pre-construction public meeting to ensure the public knows what to expect, requirements for a pre-closure meeting before any roads are closed to be sure all emergency services, residents, school systems, etc. know what to expect during the closure period and other requirements as needed.
6. Contract Plans (100%) and Advertisement
 - a. The plans are advertised, the low bid is reviewed (accepted/rejected) and a contract is awarded.

7. Construction

- a. A pre-construction meeting is held and the contractor begins work within the confines of their contract.

We've been loosely in the Conceptual Design phase under the understanding that we are all willing to do what's necessary to construction the Alternative 2B as presented, but with the latest conversations and on-going discussion on some of the major impacts of the project, we're hoping to have Selectboard endorsement of an alternative before advancing much further. Hopefully this helps, and of course feel free to follow up tomorrow if other questions arise!

Erin Parizo, P.E. | Project Manager
Vermont Agency of Transportation
Highway Safety & Design

Attachments:

2005-06-16 Rte 2-Main St intersection scoping study - DuBois & King

2015-09-02 Rte 2-Main St Intersection Kickoff Meeting Notes

2018-11-13 AOT meeting w Towbin, Strong, Currier, AOT White, AOT Devlin notes

2018-12-10 Plainfield SB Letter to AOT Re Route 2 Intersection

2019-01-08 AOT ltr to Plainfield SB

2019-05-20 AOT meeting w Towbin, Sneyd, Strong, Volz, Hutchinsonm Currier, AOT Parizo, AOT Devlin, AOT Goyette notes