# $\mathbf{D}_{ata}$ $\mathbf{N}_{eeds}$ $\mathbf{A}_{nalysis}$



# Scoping Study



Sub Station Road (CR 1116) Christian County Replace Bridge over CSX RR

Item No. 2-1085.00

Prepared by KYTC

April 2013





	I. PRELIMINA	RY PROJECT IN	IFORMATI	ON	
County:	Christian	Item No.:		02-1085.00	
Route Number(s):	CR 1116	Road Name:		Sub Station Road	
Program No.:	8757501D	UPN: FD:		52 024 1116 000-001	
Federal Project No.:	BRZ 0203 (311)	Type of Work:		Bridge Replacement	
2012 Highway P	Plan Project Description:	_			
	SUB STATION RD (CR 111		0.04 MILE	E OF US 41 (SR 34.4)	
024C00034N					
ВМР	0.019	EMP:	0.059	Project Length: 0.04 MI.	
Functional Class.:	Urban Z Rural	Sta	ate Class.:	Primary Secondary	
	Local <b>~</b>	Ro	ute is on:	□ NHS □ NN □ Ext Wt	
MPO Area: Not Applicat	Tru	uck Class.:	<b>▼</b>		
In TIP: Yes	No	% -	Trucks:	Unknown	
ADT (current):	<u>102</u> (2006)	Te	rrain:	Rolling	
Access Control:	None Permit	Fully Controlled	Partial	Spacing: ▼	
Median Type:	✓ Undivided Div	ided (Type):			
Existing Bike Accomm	nodations: Shared Lane		Ped:	Sidewalk	
Posted Speed:	35 mph 45 mph	☐ 55 m	nph	Other (Specify):	
KYTC Guidelines Preli	minarily Based on :	15 MP	PH Proposed	l Design Speed	
		COMMON GE	OMETRIC		
Roadway Data:	EXISTING	PRACTIO			
No. of Lanes	1	AASHTO's "G		Existing Rdwy. Plans available?	
Lane Width	14 ft	Design Guidelines for very		Yes Vo	
Shoulder Width	Unknown	low-volume lo	ocal roads	Year of Plans:	
Max. Superelevation**	Unknown	(ADT ≤ 400)'	" states a	Traffic Forecast Requested	
Minimum Radius**	Unknown	replacement br	idge can be	Date Requested:	
Maximum Grade	Unknown	constructed wit	th the same	Mapping/Survey Requested	
Minimum Sight Dist.	Unknown	width as the exi	sting bridge	Date Requested:	
Sidewalk Width(urban)	N/A	with no site	-specific	Type: ▼	
Clear-zone***		safety pro	oblem		
Project Notes/Design Ex					
*Based on proposed Design Speed,	**AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric De	esign of Highways and Str	eets, ***AASHTC	o's Roadside Design Guide	
Bridge No.*:	<u>024C00034N</u>				
Sufficiency Rating	34.4			Existing Geotech data available?	
Total Length	80.1 ft			∐ Yes ☑ No	
Width, curb to curb	12.1 ft				
Span Lengths	3 spans, Max span 30.8 ft			Bypass Detour Length(s): 3.7 mi	
Year Built	1935				
Posted Weight Limit	Posted, 14 tons			*16 41 4 1	
Structurally Deficient?	Yes		*If more than two brid		
Functionally Obsolete?	No			the project, include additional sheets.	
Existing Bridge Type	Steel Girder, Wood Deck				

Item No. 2-1085.00 Christian County

	I PURPUSE	AND NEED				
A. Legislation						
This project is in the approved 2012 Highway Plan.	Funding	Phase	Year	Amount		
	BRZ	D	2013	\$175,000		
	BRZ	R	2015	\$150,000		
	BRZ	U	2015	\$120,000		
	BRZ	С	2017	\$500,000		
B. Project Status						
Design funds for this project were authorized in Feb	ruary 2013. Tl	nere are no ot	her projects nea	ar the project site in		
the current Highway Plan or on the Unscheduled Ne	=		nei projects net	ir the project site ii		
C. System Linkage						
This county road provides access to a power sub state	tion and a con	nection from	JS 41 to Old Ma	idisonville Road.		
inis county roug provides access to a power sub-sta-	cion and a con		00 11 10 014 1110	alsonvine noda.		
D. Modal Interrelationships						
The bridge spans over the CSX RR double tracks.						
E Social Domands & Economic Davidonment						
E. Social Demanus & Economic Development						
•						
•						
•						
N/A.						
N/A. F. Transportation Demand						
N/A.  F. Transportation Demand  The only traffic data for this road was reported on the						
N/A.  F. Transportation Demand  The only traffic data for this road was reported on the						
N/A.  F. Transportation Demand  The only traffic data for this road was reported on the considerable amount of traffic was observed. A new						
F. Transportation Demand The only traffic data for this road was reported on the considerable amount of traffic was observed. A new						
N/A.  F. Transportation Demand  The only traffic data for this road was reported on the considerable amount of traffic was observed. A new						
F. Transportation Demand The only traffic data for this road was reported on the considerable amount of traffic was observed. A new						
F. Transportation Demand  The only traffic data for this road was reported on the considerable amount of traffic was observed. A new along the route.						

II. PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED (cont.)
G. Capacity
There currently are no capacity problems on this route and none are expected in the future.
There currently are no capacity problems on this route and none are expected in the ratare.
<ul><li>H. Safety</li><li>According to the KY State Police database, no collisions were reported on or near the bridge in the last three years.</li></ul>
The bridge is structurally deficient which could impact the safety of motorists is not addressed.
The bridge is structurally denoted which could impact the callet, or motion is not add.
I. Roadway Deficiencies
In order to get the clearance needed over the RR, the one-lane bridge arches over the RR with the crest of the vertical
curve near the midpoint of the bridge. Sight distance is limited for the two-way traffic on the one-lane bridge.
Additionally the bridge is classified as structurally deficient.
Draft Purpose and Need Statement:
Need: The bridge over the CSX RR is structurally deficient. There is poor sight distance for two-way traffic due to the
vertical curve that crests near the middle of the one-lane hridge

Purpose: The purpose of this project is to address the structural deficiencies and limited sight distance in order to

provide a safe connection between US 41 and the power sub station and Old Madisonville Road.

3 4/8/2013

Item No. 2-1085.00 Christian County

III. PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW				
A. Air Quality  Project is in:   Attainment area Nonattainment or Maintenance Area PM 2.5 County				
Project is in:  ✓ Attainment area				
Attainment is for 8-hour Ozone (2008 NAQS)				
Attailment is for 6-hour Ozone (2000 NAQ)				
B. Archeology/Historic Resources				
Archaeological issues possible in surrounding fields. Dependent upon disturbance of areas around approach and bridge. No know Historic Resources at this stage of project				
C. Threatened and Endangered Species				
No Effect unless large trees on South are removed. Will have to pay mitigation fees contingent upon time of year they are removed (Indiana Bat requirements). DEA Biologist examined site				
D. Hazardous Materials  ☐ Potentially Contaminated Sites are present  ☐ Potential Bridge or Structure Demolition				
Structure is treated wood with metal trusses, supports. No know asbestos at this time.				
E. Permitting  Check all that may apply: Waters of the US MS4 area Floodplain Impacts Navigable Waters of the US Impacts  Are 401/404 Permits likely to be required? Yes No Impacts to: Wetlands Stream/Lake/Pond  ACE NW ACE NF DOW IWOC Special Use Waters				
USACE Letter of Notification may be needed. DEA Permits Expert needs to examine final plans				
F. Noise  Are existing or planned noise sensitive receptors adjacent to the proposed project?   ✓ Yes   No  Is this considered a "Type I Project" according to the   KYTC Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy?   Yes  ✓ No				
One house is adjacent and will be affected by construction noise. New bridge will not increase noise. Analysis is not expected at this time				
G. Socioeconomic  Check all that may apply: ☐ Low Income/Minority Populations affected ☐ Relocations ☑ Local Land Use Plan available  Bridge replacement that increases safety is desired in the Christian Co / Hopkinsville Land Use Plan				
H. Section 4(f) or 6(f) Resources  The following are present on the project: Section 4(f) Resources Section 6(f) Resources				
Resources do not appear to be present at this stage of project				
Anticipated Environmental Document:  CE Level 1				

### **IV. PROJECT SCOPING**

### A. Alternative 1: No Build

The bridge will continue to deteriorate and eventually need replacement.

### B. Alternative 2: Replace Bridge

Construct new 60' single span bridge to replace existing bridge on same alignment.

Current Estimate				
<u>Phase</u>	<u>Estimate</u>			
Planning				
Design	\$350,000			
R/W	\$75,000			
Utilites	\$200,000			
Const	\$321,000			
Total	\$946,000			

The cost estimate is based on replacing the existing 3-span, single lane structure (total length = 80') to a single span bridge with a total length of 60' in the same location with no alignment shift. The proposed bridge includes 2 - 12' lanes (24 feet curb to curb). The proposed approach length on the east side extends to the entrance of the substation. The current approach width needs to be widened to accommodate the widening of the bridge. There may be differential elevation for embankment due to the vertical alignment (steep grade) and clearance needed for CSX railroad. Temporary easements for construction would most likely need to be acquired around the bridge for removal of the existing structure and other construction activities as well as allowing room for materials. Overhead utilities will have to be relocated. RR approval will be required for this project.

### C. Alternative 3: Replace Bridge

Construct new 3 span bridge (Total Length = 80') to replace existing bridge on same alignment.

•						
	Current Estimate					
	<u>Phase</u>	<u>Estimate</u>				
	Planning					
	Design	\$350,000				
	R/W	\$75,000				
	Utilites	\$200,000				
	Const	\$448,000				
	Total	\$1,073,000				

The cost estimate is based on replacing the existing 3-span, single lane structure (total length = 80') to a 3-span bridge with the same total length of 80' in the same location with no alignment shift. New constructed piers are considered. The proposed bridge includes a widening of 2 - 12' lanes (24 feet curb to curb). The proposed approach length on the east side extends to the entrance of the substation. The current approach width needs to be widened to accommodate the widening of the bridge. There may be differential elevation for embankment due to the vertical alignment (steep grade) and clearance needed for CSX railroad. Temporary easements for construction would most likely need to be acquired around the bridge for removal of the existing structure and other construction activities as well as allowing room for materials. Overhead utilities will have to be relocated. RR approval will be required for this project.

# IV. PROJECT SCOPING (cont.)



## V. Summary

Taking into consideration the utility and right of way impacts and RR involvement, it may be more desirable to replace the bridge in place. The detour is approximately 4 miles. Consideration should be given to the sight distance issues created by the vertical crest that will be on the bridge and the clearance needed for the railroad. It is recommended to use Alternative 2 based on cost and having appropriate RR clearances while meeting the Purpose and Need.



# VI. Tables and Exhibits







