

## **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
<b>CONSTRUCTABILITY</b>						
<b>A. PLANS – ROAD</b>						
*	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

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

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

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

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

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

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?					
<b>J. SCHEDULE &amp; SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>						
*	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?					
<b>K. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS?</b>						
*	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?					
<b>NOTE No.</b>	<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS</b>					

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
<b>CONSTRUCTABILITY</b>						
<b>A. PLANS – ROAD</b>						
*	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

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

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

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

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

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

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?					
<b>J. SCHEDULE &amp; SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>						
*	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?					
<b>K. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS?</b>						
*	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?					
<b>NOTE No.</b>	<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS</b>					

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

