

STATE OF TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CONSTRUCTION DIVISION

SUITE 700, JAMES K. POLK BUILDING 505 DEADERICK STREET NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243-1402 (615) 741-2414

JOHN C. SCHROER
COMMISSIONER

BILL HASLAM GOVERNOR

July 26, 2016

MEMORANDUM

PROJECT:	PIN 101887.00
	Marshall County SR-50 from SR-106 (US-431; Franklin Pike) to SR-11 (US-31; Verona Avenue) in Lewisburg PIN 101887.00
SUBJECT:	CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW MEETING SUMMARY
DATE:	July 11 & 12, 2016
NOTES BY:	Lori Lange, P.E. TDOT Construction Division

A Constructability Review meeting was held on July 11th and 12th, 2016 with Construction Industry Representatives, the Consultant Design Team, TDOT Headquarter Divisions, and TDOT Region 3 Operations and Project Development staff. The scope of the review was to integrate construction expertise early into the project development process for the SR-50 reconstruction project.

The bridge design, retaining wall conceptual plans, construction plans, and traffic control phasing were specifically reviewed as part of the meeting. Quantities were not discussed in depth as part of this review, but were thoroughly reviewed at the Construction Field Review.

AGENDA:

- 1. Introductions
- 2. Purpose: Existing Conditions
- 3. Project Overview: Roadway, Right-Of-Way/Utilities, Structures, Railroad, Traffic Control, Construction/Maintenance
- 4. Work Session

ACTION ITEMS:

Marshall County SR-50 from SR-106 (US-431; Franklin Pike) to SR-11 (US-31; Verona Avenue) in Lewisburg July 25, 2016

- 1. Railroad Coordination
- 2. Quantities
- 3. Geotechnical
- 4. Retaining Walls

SUMMARY:

Coordination with the railroad for construction of the bridge and retaining walls were considered the greatest risk for the project. It was preferred that Retaining Walls 1 and 2 be designed prior to letting; however, that would affect the anticipated letting date. There are estimated 25 trains per day at this location.

The project commitments regarding tree cutting should be clarified. Tree cutting for both phases may be needed to meet the restriction dates. Any time restrictions on stream sweeps should be clearly identified in the plans.

The utility quantities should be reviewed specifically for bore and jack items, and temporary connections and adjusted accordingly based on phasing. On-call utility inspection may benefit the project.

Project Development should review the plans to determine if temporary signals are needed. The signal design should be verified to meet City equipment standards. The traffic control plans should maintain left turn lanes for the project where those lanes currently exist. Ingress and egress to Wal-Mart and the hospital facility should be specifically reviewed. Maintaining three lanes of traffic should be considered north of the bridge, this would require temporary paving. A well is shown on the plans; however, the method for abandonment is not detailed.

The proposed undercut shown in the geotechnical report is currently under review. If it is determined undercut is required the utility rainbow drawings may require revisions. The width of full-depth paving should be shown in the typical sections ensuring additional quantities are not required due to paver widths. The proposed paving section should be reviewed for use of AS mix throughout the limits. A saw cut item should be set-up on the project. Additional items should be set-up for driveway maintenance. Bore and jack items should be considered to aid in traffic control phasing. A shoring item should be added for work at the bridge.

Project Development will review Retaining Wall #4 and make a recommendation regarding location based on sinkhole findings and constructability. Sight distance at Retaining Wall #3 and the Wal-Mart entrance should be reviewed. The bridge Structural Drawings along with Retaining Wall #1, 2, and 3 conceptual and geotechnical recommendations should be checked between functional areas. Structures and Geotechnical will update the details accordingly (i.e. removal of detail for Wall #1, and 2). The retaining wall at the bridge location will be on piles. The proposed arch bridge will be reviewed to determine if a pre-cast box would be suitable for this location.