

STAGE 3 CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEWS ARE INTENDED TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SET OF PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS AND BID DOCUMENTS. THE PLANS SHOULD BE CLEAR FOR THE CONTRACTOR TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE BIDS AND UNDERSTAND INDOT'S REQUIREMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION.

THE BASIC OBJECTIVE OF THE CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW IS TO SEEK OUT OVERLOOKED PROBLEMS THAT INCREASE COSTS, IMPAIR THE SCHEDULE, AND DECREASE QUALITY AND SAFETY MARGINS.

THE STAGE 3 REVIEW IS CONDUCTED JOINTLY BY THE PROJECT MANAGER AND THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER TO ACHIEVE THE BEST BID PACKAGE.

STAGE 3 REVIEW OCCURS AT THE FINAL PLAN PACKAGE. THE INTENT OF THE STAGE 3 PLANS IS TO HAVE THE PLANS, SPECIAL PROVISIONS AND COST ESTIMATES IN FINAL FORM.

- **FINAL FIELD CHECK AND CONSTRUCTABILITY/UTILITY CONFERENCE COMMENTS HAVE BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR.**
- **RIGHT OF WAY IS COMPLETE OR ACCOUNTED FOR.**
- **UTILITIES PERMITS AND NTP HAVE BEEN ISSUED OR ACCOUNTED FOR.**
- **IF REQUIRED, RAILROAD PERMITS AND NTP HAVE BEEN ISSUED.**
- **FINAL CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE AND FINAL SPECIAL PROVISIONS (INCLUDING ALL WATER WAY PERMITS) ARE COMPLETE.**
- **COMPARE THE COST ESTIMATE WITH THE QUANTITY CALCULATIONS, QUANTITY TABLES IN THE PLAN SET, AND LOOK FOR ANY MISSING PAY ITEMS.**

ITEMS TO REVIEW AT STAGE 3

- **CHECK FOR CONFLICTS BETWEEN ITEMS AND PLANS AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THEY SHOULD BE CONSISTENT THROUGHOUT.**
- **CHECK FOR ANY SPECIFICATION UPDATES THAT MIGHT IMPACT THE ITEM NEEDED.**
- **THE ITEMS USED NEED TO MATCH THE SPECIFICATION ITEMS.**
- **WATCH FOR SPECIALTY ITEMS THAT HAVE SUPPLEMENTAL DESCRIPTIONS.**

STAGE 3 CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW CONT'D

STAGE 3 DOCUMENTS

- **STAGE 3 PLANS**
- **FINAL FIELD CHECK MEETING MINUTES**
- **CONSTRUCTABILITY/UTILITY REVIEW MINUTES**
- **SPECIAL PROVISIONS**
- **PERMITS (ENVIRONMENTAL, RAILROAD, & UTILITY)**
- **FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT**
- **RULE 5 EROSION CONTROL SUBMISSION**
- **GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT**
- **PAVEMENT DESIGN APPROVAL**
- **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INVESTIGATION REPORT**
- **QUANTITY CALCULATIONS**
- **COST ESTIMATE**
- **TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN**
- **COMMITMENT REPORT**

COMMONLY MISSED ITEMS TO CHECK

- **PAVEMENT REMOVAL**
- **RPM REMOVAL**
- **REMOVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL**
- **LINE REMOVAL FOR PHASING**
- **PAVEMENT MESSAGE MARKING REMOVAL**
- **PIPE REMOVAL. EITHER INCLUDE AN ITEM FOR THIS AND QUANTIFY IT WITH A TABLE OR INCLUDE IT IN CLEARING OR RIGHT OF WAY.**
- **CZ UNITS FOR BARRIER WALL**
- **MOB/DEMOB FOR SEEDING**
- **MISSED PAVEMENT MARKING ITEMS**
- **ROAD CLOSURE SIGN ASSEMBLIES**

STAGE 3 CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW CONT'D

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- **A “CLEARING OF R/W” DESCRIPTION HELPS.**
- **“HMA FOR APPROACHES” CONFLICTS BETWEEN SPECS, PLANS AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS.**
- **SOMETIME IT IS BETTER TO NOT HAVE AN ITEM RATHER THAN TO DO A “JUST IN CASE” ITEM THAT IS UNDISTRIBUTED.**
- **LOW QUANTITY ITEMS CAN HURT US, ESPECIALLY IF THERE IS A “QUANTITY BASIS”.**
- **USAGE OF MESSAGE BOARDS IS NOT “PER DAY”. IT SHOULD BE “EACH”.**
- **THE DIRECTION SIGN ON THE DETOUR ROUTE MARKER ASSEMBLIES ARE LEFT OUT OF THE PLANS.**
- **BARRICADE QUANTITIES ARE TOO LOW.**
- **PREFORMED LOOPS RARELY WORK INTO THE PHASING.**
- **ASPHALT PAVEMENT VS. CONCRETE: IS THERE ENOUGH ROOM FOR CONSTRUCTION STAGING FOR CONCRETE PAVEMENT.**



**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LEVEL 2**

**PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 3
STAGE 3 PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PLAN REVIEW SUBMISSION
PROJECT MANAGER/CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/MAINTENANCE MANAGER**

PRIMARY DES No. _____ **CONTRACT No.** _____

ROUTE _____ **DISTRICT** _____

WORK TYPE _____ **RFC DATE** _____

PROJECT LOCATION _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION _____

COUNTY/CITY/TOWN _____ **DESIGNER** _____

PROJECT MANAGER _____

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER _____ **DATE** _____

EVALUATION OF PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY QUALITY

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
CONSTRUCTABILITY						
A. PLANS – ROAD						
*	1. ARE CONFLICTS BETWEEN PLANS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS?					
*	2. ARE CONTROL POINTS INCLUDED AND MATCH THE WORK TO EXISTING CONDITIONS?					
*	3. CAN EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERNS BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION?					
*	4. DO DRIVEWAY/TURNOUT GRADES MEET ALLOWABLE STANDARDS?					
*	5. ARE SPECIAL STRUCTURES REQUIRED BECAUSE OF PIPE SIZE OR NUMBER OF PIPES?					
*	6. ARE PAVING LIMITS SHOWN?					
*	7. IS MILLING REQUIRED?					
*	8. CAN EXISTING ROADWAY MATERIALS BE SALVAGED FOR OTHER USE?					
*	9. HAS GEOTECH TAKEN CORES OF THE EXISTING PAVEMENT AND SHOULDER TO VERIFY THE STRUCTURE OF THE EXISTING ROADWAY? WHERE WERE CORES TAKEN?					
*	10. WHAT ARE THE LOCATIONS OF GEOTECH INVESTIGATIONS? WHEN WERE THEY TAKEN?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	11. IS THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING COMPLETED AS NECESSARY?					
*	12. IS THERE SUFFICIENT ROOM FOR CONCRETE PAVEMENT CONSTRUCTION PHASING?					
*	13. CHECK FOR CONFLICTS WITH EXISTING/PROPOSED DRAINAGE.					
*	14. IS EXISTING DRAINAGE AFFECTED BY THE TEMPORARY PAVEMENT?					
B. PAY ITEMS & COST ESTIMATE						
*	1. ARE PAY ITEMS APPROPRIATE?					
*	2. ARE PAY ITEMS CONSISTENT WITH SPECIFICATIONS?					
*	3. DOES THE ESTIMATE INCLUDE A PAY ITEM FOR ALL WORK INCLUDED IN THE PLANS? DO PAY ITEMS REFLECT SCOPE OF WORK?					
*	4. ARE COST ESTIMATES AND UNIT PRICES APPROPRIATE FOR TYPE OF PROJECT?					
*	5. HAS STAGE 3 COST ESTIMATE BEEN CHECKED?					
*	6. WERE ALL TEMPORARY ITEMS FOR MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC INCLUDED?					
*	7. PAVEMENT REMOVAL ITEM? IS ASPHALT PAVEMENT REMOVAL INCLUDED IN THE COMMON EXCAVATIONS? IS TEMPORARY PAVEMENT?					
*	8. RPM REMOVAL ITEM?					
*	9. REMOVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL ITEM?					
*	10. LINE REMOVAL FOR PHASING ITEM?					
*	11. PIPE REMOVAL ITEM?					
*	12. CZ UNITS FOR BARRIER WALL ITEM?					
*	13. MOB/DEMOB FOR SEEDING ITEM?					
C. QUANTITIES						
*	1. ARE QUANTITIES RELIABLE AND VERIFIABLE?					
*	2. ARE QUANTITY ESTIMATES DEVELOPED TO APPROPRIATE LEVEL FOR THIS REVIEW?					
D. SPECIAL PROVISIONS						
*	1. DO SPECIAL PROVISIONS INCLUDE MEASUREMENT AND BASIS OF PAYMENT?					
*	2. ARE ANY SPECIAL PROVISIONS OMITTED?					
*	3. ARE THERE ANY APPARENT CONFLICTS BETWEEN PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS OR SPECIAL PROVISIONS?					
*	4. ARE ALL REQUIRED PERMITS DETAILED IN SPECIAL PROVISIONS?					
*	5. ARE REQUIRED LANES AND CLOSURE PERIODS CLEARLY IDENTIFIED?					
*	6. IS SPECIAL COORDINATION REQUIRED, RR, PERMITS, REGULATORY?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	7. ARE THE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTION PERIOD IMPACTS IDENTIFIED?					
*	8. ARE UNIQUE SPECIAL PROVISIONS DEVELOPED AS NEEDED?					
E. UTILITIES AND RAILROAD						
*	1. ARE UTILITY CONFLICTS IDENTIFIED?					
*	2. ARE ALL KNOWN UTILITIES INDICATED ON PLANS?					
*	3. CHECK DRIVEWAYS/SIDEWALKS FOR CONFLICTS WITH UTILITIES.					
*	4. CAN REASONABLE CHANGES BE MADE TO AVOID UTILITY CONFLICTS?					
*	5. ARE UTILITIES TO BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION? IF SO, ARE PROVISIONS IN PLACE?					
*	6. ARE POLE RELOCATIONS IN CONFLICT WITH PROPOSED SIDEWALKS?					
*	7. IS RAILROAD COORDINATION IN PROGRESS AS REQUIRED?					
*	8. DO THE STRUCTURES FIT IN THE R/W?					
F. ENVIRONMENTAL						
*	1. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTIONS PERIOD IMPACTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED?					
*	2. HAVE ALL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS BEEN MET? RULE 5?					
*	3. ARE DUST AND NOISE CONTROL MEASURES IDENTIFIED?					
*	4. IF THE WORK IS LOCATED ADJACENT TO A RESIDENTIAL AREA OR OCCUPIED BUILDING, PROVISIONS MAY BE REQUIRED TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACT OF NOISE PRODUCING ACTIVITIES, SUCH AS RESTRICTED WORK HOURS OR TEMPORARY NOISE BARRIERS.					
*	5. ARE REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS IDENTIFIED & APPLICATIONS DRAFTED? HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INVESTIGATIVE REPORT?					
*	6. ANY ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVE COMMITMENT INSTEAD OF PERMITS?					
*	7. HAVE THE MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS BEEN IDENTIFIED & PLANS DEVELOPED?					
*	8. IF PRESENT, ARE HISTORICAL STRUCTURES IDENTIFIED ON PLANS WITH CLEAR INSTRUCTION ON LIMITATIONS AND HANDLING?					
G. RIGHT OF WAY						
*	1. SUFFICIENT R/W AVAILABLE FOR ALL OPERATIONS?					
*	2. IS TEMPORARY R/W FOR CONSTRUCTION ACCESS IDENTIFIED?					
*	3. IS THERE SUFFICIENT R/W TO RELOCATE ALL UTILITIES?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	4. HAS THE REQUIRED R/W BEEN IDENTIFIED AND SUFFICIENT FOR THE PROJECT AND ALL NECESSARY CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS?					
*	5. ACCESS TO WORK AREAS?					
H. CONSTRUCTION PHASING						
*	1. ARE WORK ZONE WIDTHS ADEQUATE FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NEEDS?					
*	2. ARE THERE GRADE CHANGES BETWEEN PHASES THAT WON'T ALLOW ACCESS TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES?					
*	3. IS THERE ENOUGH HORIZONTAL CLEARANCE FOR BARRIERS, SHORING, AND CONSTRUCTION ACCESS?					
*	4. ARE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION PHASES APPROPRIATE AND CONSTRUCTIBLE?					
*	5. HAVE UNIQUE SPECIAL REVISIONS REQUIRED BY THE CONSTRUCTION PHASING BEEN DRAFTED?					
*	6. ARE THERE AREAS WITH RESTRICTED ACCESS?					
*	7. ARE TRAVEL LANES ADEQUATE? WIDTH? NUMBER? WIDE LOADS?					
*	8. DOES STAGING CAUSE SPECIAL CONDITIONS (I.E. STRUCTURAL ADEQUACY/STABILITY)? IF SHOULDERS ARE REQUIRED TO CARRY TRAFFIC DURING STAGE CONSTRUCTION, ARE THEY STRUCTRALLY ADEQUATE OR SHOULD RECONSTRUCTION BE REQUIRED?					
*	9. PROPOSED ADJACENT CONTRACTS, RESTRICTIONS, CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED AND ACCOUNTED FOR?					
*	10. WILL TRAFFIC SIGNAL PREFORMED LOOPS WORK WITH PHASING?					
*	11. DOES PROPOSED DRAINAGE FUNCTION DURING CONSTRUCTION PHASES?					
I. TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLANS						
*	1. EMERGENCY VEHICLE TRAVEL THROUGH CLOSURE AREAS?					
*	2. "DROP OFFS" DUE TO CONSTRUCTION PHASING ADDRESSED TO SAFELY MAINTAIN TRAFFIC LANES.					
*	3. ARE PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, ADA NEEDS CONSIDERED?					
*	4. ARE EXITS AND ENTRANCES TO WORK ZONES ADEQUATE AND SAFE?					
*	5. IS DETOUR NECESSARY FOR AVERTING DELAYS/CONGESTION?					
*	6. IS THERE ADEQUATE VERTICAL CLEARANCE IN ALL PHASES OF THE MOT?					
*	7. ARE APPROACH AND DRIVEWAY GRADE APPROPRIATE AND HAS CONSTRUCTION PHASING AND PROPERTY OWNER ACCESS BEEN CONSIDERED?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	8. ADEQUATE TURN LANES PROVIDED TO AVOID TRAFFIC BACKUPS?					
*	9. DOES THE TMP ADEQUATELY ADDRESS SITE CONDITIONS AND TRAFFIC VOLUMES?					
*	10. DOES THE MOT PLAN ADDRESS ADEQUATE WORK AREA FOR CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS?					
*	11. ARE CONFLICTS WITH OTHER WORK IN AREA OF PROJECT BEING ADDRESSED?					
*	12. DOES SIGNING MEET TRAFFIC NEEDS IN EACH PHASE?					
*	13. ARE WORK ZONES LARGE ENOUGH FOR EQUIPMENT ACCESS?					
J. SCHEDULE & SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS						
*	1. IS LETTING SCHEDULE APPROPRIATE FOR DESIRED COMPLETION DATE?					
*	2. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS OTHER WORK IN AREA OR RELATED CONTRACTS IN PROJECT?					
*	3. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTION PERIODS?					
*	4. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS LOCAL EVENTS, HOLIDAYS, ETC.?					
*	5. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS UTILITY RELOCATION TIMELINE?					
K. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS?						
*	1. ARE UNIQUE SPECIAL PROVISIONS DEVELOPED AS NEEDED?					
*	2. ARE APPROACH AND DRIVEWAY GRADES APPROPRIATE AND HAS CONSTRUCTION PHASING AND PROPERTY OWNER ACCESS BEEN CONSIDERED?					
*	3. ANY SUBDIVISIONS OR COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL AREAS NOT INDICATED? CONFLICTS WITH ADJACENT PROJECTS, IF ANY?					
NOTE No.	REVIEWER COMMENTS					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

NOTE
No.

REVIEWER COMMENTS

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NECESSARY)

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, **N** - No, **NA** - Not Applicable, **Note** - See note number, **Flag** - Item requires priority attention



**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LEVEL 3**

**PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 3
STAGE 3 PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PLAN REVIEW SUBMISSION
PROJECT MANAGER/CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/MAINTENANCE MANAGER**

PRIMARY DES No. _____ **CONTRACT No.** _____

ROUTE _____ **DISTRICT** _____

WORK TYPE _____ **RFC DATE** _____

PROJECT LOCATION _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION _____

COUNTY/CITY/TOWN _____ **DESIGNER** _____

PROJECT MANAGER _____

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER _____ **DATE** _____

EVALUATION OF PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY QUALITY

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
CONSTRUCTABILITY						
A. PLANS – ROAD						
*	1. ARE CONFLICTS BETWEEN PLANS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS?					
*	2. ARE CONTROL POINTS INCLUDED AND MATCH THE WORK TO EXISTING CONDITIONS?					
*	3. CAN EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERNS BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION?					
*	4. DO DRIVEWAY/TURNOUT GRADES MEET ALLOWABLE STANDARDS?					
*	5. ARE SPECIAL STRUCTURES REQUIRED BECAUSE OF PIPE SIZE OR NUMBER OF PIPES?					
*	6. ARE PAVING LIMITS SHOWN?					
*	7. IS MILLING REQUIRED?					
*	8. CAN EXISTING ROADWAY MATERIALS BE SALVAGED FOR OTHER USE?					
*	9. HAS GEOTECH TAKEN CORES OF THE EXISTING PAVEMENT AND SHOULDER TO VERIFY THE STRUCTURE OF THE EXISTING ROADWAY? WHERE WERE CORES TAKEN?					
*	10. WHAT ARE THE LOCATIONS OF GEOTECH INVESTIGATIONS? WHEN WERE THEY TAKEN?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	11. IS THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING COMPLETED AS NECESSARY?					
*	12. IS THERE SUFFICIENT ROOM FOR CONCRETE PAVEMENT CONSTRUCTION PHASING?					
*	13. CHECK FOR CONFLICTS WITH EXISTING/PROPOSED DRAINAGE.					
*	14. IS EXISTING DRAINAGE AFFECTED BY THE TEMPORARY PAVEMENT?					
B. PAY ITEMS & COST ESTIMATE						
*	1. ARE PAY ITEMS APPROPRIATE?					
*	2. ARE PAY ITEMS CONSISTENT WITH SPECIFICATIONS?					
*	3. DOES THE ESTIMATE INCLUDE A PAY ITEM FOR ALL WORK INCLUDED IN THE PLANS? DO PAY ITEMS REFLECT SCOPE OF WORK?					
*	4. ARE COST ESTIMATES AND UNIT PRICES APPROPRIATE FOR TYPE OF PROJECT?					
*	5. HAS STAGE 3 COST ESTIMATE BEEN CHECKED?					
*	6. WERE ALL TEMPORARY ITEMS FOR MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC INCLUDED?					
*	7. PAVEMENT REMOVAL ITEM? IS ASPHALT PAVEMENT REMOVAL INCLUDED IN THE COMMON EXCAVATIONS? IS TEMPORARY PAVEMENT?					
*	8. RPM REMOVAL ITEM?					
*	9. REMOVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL ITEM?					
*	10. LINE REMOVAL FOR PHASING ITEM?					
*	11. PIPE REMOVAL ITEM?					
*	12. CZ UNITS FOR BARRIER WALL ITEM?					
*	13. MOB/DEMOB FOR SEEDING ITEM?					
C. QUANTITIES						
*	1. ARE QUANTITIES RELIABLE AND VERIFIABLE?					
*	2. ARE QUANTITY ESTIMATES DEVELOPED TO APPROPRIATE LEVEL FOR THIS REVIEW?					
D. SPECIAL PROVISIONS						
*	1. DO SPECIAL PROVISIONS INCLUDE MEASUREMENT AND BASIS OF PAYMENT?					
*	2. ARE ANY SPECIAL PROVISIONS OMITTED?					
*	3. ARE THERE ANY APPARENT CONFLICTS BETWEEN PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS OR SPECIAL PROVISIONS?					
*	4. ARE ALL REQUIRED PERMITS DETAILED IN SPECIAL PROVISIONS?					
*	5. ARE REQUIRED LANES AND CLOSURE PERIODS CLEARLY IDENTIFIED?					
*	6. IS SPECIAL COORDINATION REQUIRED, RR, PERMITS, REGULATORY?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	7. ARE THE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTION PERIOD IMPACTS IDENTIFIED?					
*	8. ARE UNIQUE SPECIAL PROVISIONS DEVELOPED AS NEEDED?					
E. UTILITIES AND RAILROAD						
*	1. ARE UTILITY CONFLICTS IDENTIFIED?					
*	2. ARE ALL KNOWN UTILITIES INDICATED ON PLANS?					
*	3. CHECK DRIVEWAYS/SIDEWALKS FOR CONFLICTS WITH UTILITIES.					
*	4. CAN REASONABLE CHANGES BE MADE TO AVOID UTILITY CONFLICTS?					
*	5. ARE UTILITIES TO BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION? IF SO, ARE PROVISIONS IN PLACE?					
*	6. ARE POLE RELOCATIONS IN CONFLICT WITH PROPOSED SIDEWALKS?					
*	7. IS RAILROAD COORDINATION IN PROGRESS AS REQUIRED?					
*	8. DO THE STRUCTURES FIT IN THE R/W?					
F. ENVIRONMENTAL						
*	1. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTIONS PERIOD IMPACTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED?					
*	2. HAVE ALL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS BEEN MET? RULE 5?					
*	3. ARE DUST AND NOISE CONTROL MEASURES IDENTIFIED?					
*	4. IF THE WORK IS LOCATED ADJACENT TO A RESIDENTIAL AREA OR OCCUPIED BUILDING, PROVISIONS MAY BE REQUIRED TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACT OF NOISE PRODUCING ACTIVITIES, SUCH AS RESTRICTED WORK HOURS OR TEMPORARY NOISE BARRIERS.					
*	5. ARE REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS IDENTIFIED & APPLICATIONS DRAFTED? HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INVESTIGATIVE REPORT?					
*	6. ANY ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVE COMMITMENT INSTEAD OF PERMITS?					
*	7. HAVE THE MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS BEEN IDENTIFIED & PLANS DEVELOPED?					
*	8. IF PRESENT, ARE HISTORICAL STRUCTURES IDENTIFIED ON PLANS WITH CLEAR INSTRUCTION ON LIMITATIONS AND HANDLING?					
G. RIGHT OF WAY						
*	1. SUFFICIENT R/W AVAILABLE FOR ALL OPERATIONS?					
*	2. IS TEMPORARY R/W FOR CONSTRUCTION ACCESS IDENTIFIED?					
*	3. IS THERE SUFFICIENT R/W TO RELOCATE ALL UTILITIES?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	4. HAS THE REQUIRED R/W BEEN IDENTIFIED AND SUFFICIENT FOR THE PROJECT AND ALL NECESSARY CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS?					
*	5. ACCESS TO WORK AREAS?					
H. CONSTRUCTION PHASING						
*	1. ARE WORK ZONE WIDTHS ADEQUATE FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NEEDS?					
*	2. ARE THERE GRADE CHANGES BETWEEN PHASES THAT WON'T ALLOW ACCESS TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES?					
*	3. IS THERE ENOUGH HORIZONTAL CLEARANCE FOR BARRIERS, SHORING, AND CONSTRUCTION ACCESS?					
*	4. ARE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION PHASES APPROPRIATE AND CONSTRUCTIBLE?					
*	5. HAVE UNIQUE SPECIAL REVISIONS REQUIRED BY THE CONSTRUCTION PHASING BEEN DRAFTED?					
*	6. ARE THERE AREAS WITH RESTRICTED ACCESS?					
*	7. ARE TRAVEL LANES ADEQUATE? WIDTH? NUMBER? WIDE LOADS?					
*	8. DOES STAGING CAUSE SPECIAL CONDITIONS (I.E. STRUCTURAL ADEQUACY/STABILITY)? IF SHOULDERS ARE REQUIRED TO CARRY TRAFFIC DURING STAGE CONSTRUCTION, ARE THEY STRUCTRALLY ADEQUATE OR SHOULD RECONSTRUCTION BE REQUIRED?					
*	9. PROPOSED ADJACENT CONTRACTS, RESTRICTIONS, CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED AND ACCOUNTED FOR?					
*	10. WILL TRAFFIC SIGNAL PREFORMED LOOPS WORK WITH PHASING?					
*	11. DOES PROPOSED DRAINAGE FUNCTION DURING CONSTRUCTION PHASES?					
I. TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLANS						
*	1. EMERGENCY VEHICLE TRAVEL THROUGH CLOSURE AREAS?					
*	2. "DROP OFFS" DUE TO CONSTRUCTION PHASING ADDRESSED TO SAFELY MAINTAIN TRAFFIC LANES.					
*	3. ARE PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, ADA NEEDS CONSIDERED?					
*	4. ARE EXITS AND ENTRANCES TO WORK ZONES ADEQUATE AND SAFE?					
*	5. IS DETOUR NECESSARY FOR AVERTING DELAYS/CONGESTION?					
*	6. IS THERE ADEQUATE VERTICAL CLEARANCE IN ALL PHASES OF THE MOT?					
*	7. ARE APPROACH AND DRIVEWAY GRADE APPROPRIATE AND HAS CONSTRUCTION PHASING AND PROPERTY OWNER ACCESS BEEN CONSIDERED?					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

EVALUATION CRITERIA		Y	N	N/A	NOTE	FLAG
*	8. ADEQUATE TURN LANES PROVIDED TO AVOID TRAFFIC BACKUPS?					
*	9. DOES THE TMP ADEQUATELY ADDRESS SITE CONDITIONS AND TRAFFIC VOLUMES?					
*	10. DOES THE MOT PLAN ADDRESS ADEQUATE WORK AREA FOR CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS?					
*	11. ARE CONFLICTS WITH OTHER WORK IN AREA OF PROJECT BEING ADDRESSED?					
*	12. DOES SIGNING MEET TRAFFIC NEEDS IN EACH PHASE?					
*	13. ARE WORK ZONES LARGE ENOUGH FOR EQUIPMENT ACCESS?					
J. SCHEDULE & SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS						
*	1. IS LETTING SCHEDULE APPROPRIATE FOR DESIRED COMPLETION DATE?					
*	2. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS OTHER WORK IN AREA OR RELATED CONTRACTS IN PROJECT?					
*	3. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTION PERIODS?					
*	4. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS LOCAL EVENTS, HOLIDAYS, ETC.?					
*	5. DOES SCHEDULE ADDRESS UTILITY RELOCATION TIMELINE?					
K. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS?						
*	1. ARE UNIQUE SPECIAL PROVISIONS DEVELOPED AS NEEDED?					
*	2. ARE APPROACH AND DRIVEWAY GRADES APPROPRIATE AND HAS CONSTRUCTION PHASING AND PROPERTY OWNER ACCESS BEEN CONSIDERED?					
*	3. ANY SUBDIVISIONS OR COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL AREAS NOT INDICATED? CONFLICTS WITH ADJACENT PROJECTS, IF ANY?					
NOTE No.	REVIEWER COMMENTS					

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

NOTE
No.

REVIEWER COMMENTS

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NECESSARY)

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, **N** - No, **NA** - Not Applicable, **Note** - See note number, **Flag** - Item requires priority attention

