

## FY20 – PAVEMENT SCOPE OF SERVICES

PROJECT NAME:	PIC-SR 316/752-13.05/0.000	PID: 107824
County:	Route:	SECTION:
PIC	316	13.05-13.68
PIC	752	0.00-1.74
PIC	752	1.92-8.43

### 1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION:

PIC-SR 316 – 13.05-13.68 Functional Class: 05 – Major Collector (Rural)

PIC-SR 752 – 0.00-1.74 Functional Class: 05 – Major Collector (Rural)

PIC-SR 752 – 1.92-8.43 Functional Class: 05 – Major Collector (Rural)

### 2. PURPOSE AND NEED:

PIC-316-13.05-13.33 was last maintained in 2010 by PID 83638. This route is currently displaying deteriorations including raveling (LO), rutting (LO), transverse cracks (MF), edge cracking (MF) and crack seal deficiencies (O). Resurfacing and repairs are needed on this route to ensure pavement integrity and to provide the traveling public with safe driving surfaces.

PIC-316-13.05-13.33

2017 PCR: 79

2017 Structural Defect: 12.0

Note: This section of pavement is composite pavement.

PIC-316-13.33-13.68 was last maintained in 2010 by PID 83638. This route is currently displaying deteriorations including raveling (LO), crack seal deficiencies (E), rutting (LO), traverse cracks & an unjointed base (MF), wheel track cracks (LO), block and transverse cracking (LO), longitudinal joint cracks (flexible pavement widening crack) (MF), thermal cracks (MO). Resurfacing and repairs are needed on this route to ensure pavement integrity and to provide the traveling public with safe driving surfaces.

PIC-316-13.33-13.68

2017 PCR: 81

2017 Structural Defect: 7.3

Note: This section of pavement is flexible pavement.

PIC-752-0.00-1.74 was last resurfaced in 2007 by PID 25600. PIC-752-1.92-8.43 was last maintained in 2007 by PID 79313. This route is currently displaying deteriorations including raveling (LO to MO), crack seal deficiencies (E, F, and O), rutting (LF to LO), wheel track cracks (LO), block and transverse cracking (LO), longitudinal joint cracks (LO, MF, and MO), edge cracking (LO to MO), and thermal cracks (MO). Resurfacing and repairs are needed on this route to ensure pavement integrity and to provide the traveling public with safe driving surfaces.

PIC-752

2017 PCR: 76 to 98

2017 Structural Defect: 0.0 to 10.8

Note: This section of pavement is flexible pavement.

**3. PROJECT INITIATION PACKAGE:** Yes  No

Site visit conducted 5/22/18 with Dave Rankin, Scott Rice, Tim Peddicord, Bob Mcneill, Grace Wesner, Frank Christman and Chris Tebbe.

All noted red flags from field visits contained within scope.

**4. PROJECT LIMITS:**

From: PIC-316-13.05 (*Jefferson Avenue*)

To: PIC-316-13.68 (*Station Street*)

Project Length: 0.63 centerline miles

Work Length: 0.63 centerline miles

From: PIC-752-0.00 (*Intersection with US 23*)

To: PIC-752-1.74 (*0.01 mile West of Poplar Street*)

Project Length: 1.74 centerline miles

Work Length: 1.74 centerline miles

From: PIC-752-1.92 (*0.10 mile East of Intersection with SR-316*)

To: PIC-752-8.43 (*Intersection with SR 674*)

Project Length: 6.51 centerline miles

Work Length: 6.51 centerline miles

Total Project Length: 8.88 centerline miles

Total work Length: 8.88 centerline miles

The following sections are inside a Village:

*The Village of Asheville:*

- PIC-316-13.05 to 13.68
- PIC-752-0.90 to 0.98
- PIC-752-1.19 to 1.31
- PIC-752-1.58 to 2.32

**5. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF WORK:**

1325 yd<sup>2</sup> Item 251-Partial Depth Pavement Repair (Asphalt Concrete Base), As Per Plan:  
Repair areas shall be determined by the project engineer before the beginning of work.  
Repairs shall consist of removing 3” of pavement and placing 3” of Item 301 – Asphalt Concrete Base, PG64-22. Work shall be performed prior to resurfacing and repair areas are to be included into general resurfacing. To Be Determined with Pavement Engineer/County Manager during detailed field review.

*Designer Note:*

- *At PIC-752-1.37: repair needs to be included over top of the concrete capped culvert (under RR bridge)*
- *Approximately 1% of the surface area of PIC-752 is to be repaired with this project using Item 251 repair type.*
- *Final locations and quantities need to be requested by the designer at least 1 month prior to Stage 3 file date.*

XXyd<sup>2</sup> Item 251-Partial Depth Pavement Repair (Asphalt Concrete Base), As Per Plan:  
Repair areas shall be determined by the project engineer before the beginning of work.  
Repairs shall consist of removing 5” of pavement and placing 5” of Item 301 – Asphalt Concrete Base, PG64-22. Work shall be performed prior to resurfacing and repair areas are to be included into general resurfacing. To Be Determined with Pavement Engineer/County Manager during detailed field review.

*Designer Note:*

- *This quantity is to be used to correct some of the bad edge failure along SR-752.*
  - o *Some spots of edge failure within the Village of Ashville corp limits*
- *Final locations and quantities need to be requested by the designer at least 1 month prior to Stage 3 file date.*

TBD yd<sup>2</sup> Item 253- Pavement Repair, As Per Plan:  
Repair areas shall be determined by the project engineer before the beginning of work.  
Repairs shall consist of removing X”-X” of pavement and placing X” of Asphalt on X” of Item 304. Work shall be performed prior to resurfacing. To Be Determined with Pavement Engineer/Village during detailed field review.

*Designer Note:*

- *This repair type is to be used on SR-316*
  - o *These repairs are intended to be adjacent to the curb and gutter replacement*
  - o *Started with 2’ wide repairs, but in agreement with the Village, a wider repair may be more beneficial*
- *One spot of base failure along SR-752 within the Village of Ashville limits*
  - o *~SLM 1.89 – heading East at the new intersection with SR-316*
  - o *Heavy trucks damaged the new pavement*
  - o *The Village requests that this repair be included with this project, but is going to check if this can get funded some other way*

General Work to be performed on PIC-316:

1.5” Item 254 – Pavement Planing, Asphalt Concrete (check with Village if they want milled material)  
1.5” Item 441 – Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, Type 1, PG64-22  
Item 407 – Non-Tracking Tack Coat  
\*Potential for variable depth milling to reduce the centerline pavement thickness and flatten the cross slope in order to maximize curb reveal/preserve the curb

General Work to be performed on PIC-752-0.05-5.09 & 5.27-8.43:

1” Item 897 – Fine Planing, Class A  
1” Item 424 – Fine Graded Polymer Asphalt Concrete, Type B  
Item 407 – Non-Tracking Tack Coat  
Item 617 – Compacted Shoulder Aggregate (average 2” deep and 1’ wide)  
Safety Edge

General Work to be performed on PIC-752-0.00-0.05 (rutted at intersection with US-23) & PIC-752-5.09-5.27 (rutted at intersection with Winchester Road):

3” Item 254 – Pavement Planing, Asphalt Concrete  
3” Item 442 – Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, 12.5mm, Type A (446), PG76-22M  
Item 407 – Non-Tracking Tack Coat

Item 617 – Compacted Shoulder Aggregate (average 2” deep and 1’ wide)  
Safety Edge

**Notes:**

- (1). Butt joints begin/end of project, at milling limits, and bridges not being paved over. Not intended to include butt joints at paved driveways.
- (2). Item 623 – Monument Box Adjusted to Grade - 4 each
- (3) Item 611 - Manhole Adjusted to Grade – 4 each
- (4). Item 638 – Valve Box Adjusted to Grade – 4 each
- (5). Curb and gutter replacement on SR-316 within the Village of Ashville – locations where necessary - The Village intends to raise the curb and gutter (and sidewalk) in areas where this is possible. Curb and gutter will be replaced (along with full depth pavement repairs along the curb line) where the curb and sidewalk cannot be raised. Locations and quantities will be determined once survey has been completed and additional pavement coring.
- (6). Existing Plans, Copy of Destape, and SLD’s have been placed in following location in project folder:  
[I:\ProjectData\107824\\_PIC-316-13.05\ProjAdmin\Planning\Scopes\Existing Info](I:\ProjectData\107824_PIC-316-13.05\ProjAdmin\Planning\Scopes\Existing Info)

**6. PRIOR STUDIES/PLAN (IDENTIFY):**

2010	PID 83638	PIC-316-13.05-13.68	0.75” Item 424 Fine Grade Polymer Concrete, Type B
1999	PID 17000	PIC-316-13.05-13.68	0.75” Item 448 Intermediate, 1.25” Item 448 Surface
2007	PID 79313	PIC-752-1.82-8.43	0.75” Item 424 Fine Grade Polymer Asphalt Concrete, Type B Heavy
1999	PID 17000	PIC-752-1.82-8.43	0.75” Item 448 Intermediate, 1.25” Item 448 Surface

\*County crews chipsealed SR-752 from the Eastern Ashville corp to SR-674

**7. DESIGN SPEED:** PIC-316 35 mph (25 mph in Ashville)  
PIC-752 55 mph (35 mph in Ashville)

**8. ALIGNMENT:** New  Existing  Combination  Journalized Alignment

**9. PROFILE:** New  Combination  Salvage

**10. SCHEMATIC PLAN:** Yes  No

**11. TYPICAL SECTION:** Yes  No

**12. TRAFFIC DATA:**

	CURRENT TRAFFIC (PIC 2016)		OPENING DAY (2020)		DESIGN YEAR (2032)	
	ADT	ADTT	ADT	ADTT	ADT	ADTT
PIC-316-13.05- 13.68	4339	93.24	4700	94	4800	96
PIC-752-0.00- 8.43	4875	341.25	5200	364	6300	441

**13. Crash Analysis:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

This project does require a crash analysis for SR-316. An email requesting the crash analysis was sent on 5/29/18 to the D6 Safety Team, and a response was requested by 6/12/18. Any recommendations based on the results of the crash analysis have been added to the scope. A copy of the crash analysis has been placed within the project planning folder.

SR-752 is considered a surface treatment and no crash analysis is required.

**14. TYPE OF ACCESS:** Limited  Controlled  Non-Controlled

**15. FENCING:** Yes  No

**16. LIGHTING:** Yes  No

**17. SIGNING:** Yes  No

- SR-316 – Village of Ashville:
  - o Scioto Street: 2 no pedestrian crossing signs needed
  - o Cromley Street: 2 pedestrian crossing signs needed
    - Need a permanent stop sign here, as well (will the Village replace this prior to the project?)
  - o Main/Long Street: 2 no pedestrian crossing signs needed
  - o Wright Street: 2 pedestrian crossing signs needed
- SR-752: Curves at ~SLM 4.36
  - o Some of the curve signs have been wiped out here. Replace with this project or do it sooner?

**18. GUARDRAIL:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

**19. SIGNALS:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

- The Village of Ashville requests that ODOT determine if the three signals along SR-316 are warranted
  - o The following intersections are the signals that need a warrant analysis:
    - Station Street and SR-316
    - SR-316 at Main and Long Streets
    - Scioto Street and SR-316
  - o The Village wishes to incorporate safe crosswalk upgrades if the signals are not warranted

\*Signal warrant request sent on 5/24/18

**20. PAVEMENT MARKING:** Yes  No

PIC-316/752

Item 644 – Thermoplastic Pavement Marking

Item 646 – Epoxy Pavement Marking (for all concrete bridge decks)

The epoxy needs to be alternate bid for Polycarb Mark 55.4.

All center lines shall be 4". All edge lines and lane lines shall be 6".

Standard crosswalk striping should be included along SR-316 and SR-752:

- There is one spot that has existing ladder crosswalk striping across SR-752
  - o This is a flashing crosswalk to get to and from Teays Valley High School
  - o **Stripe back with ladder striping or replaced with standard crosswalk?**

Include school markings and RR striping with this project.

Replace stop bars where they are affected by the paving operation

- Only replace if they were in place beforehand

*Designer Note:*

- *PIC-752 is not a truck route, so lanes need to be striped at 10' wide*

**21. DELINEATION:**

Barrier Reflectors: Yes  No

Delineators: Yes  No

Raised Pavement Markers: Yes  No

There are no special RPMS needed for PIC-316-13.05-13.68.

There are special RPMs needed for PIC-752-0.00-8.43. Follow the link below to see the specifications:  
[\\D06fs002\CADD\\$\ProjectData\107824\\_PIC-316-13.05\ProjAdmin\Planning\Scopes\Existing Info\C6\\_D6.xlsx](\\D06fs002\CADD$\ProjectData\107824_PIC-316-13.05\ProjAdmin\Planning\Scopes\Existing Info\C6_D6.xlsx)

**22. ROADSIDE DEVELOPMENT:** Yes  No

**23. REST AREAS:** Yes  No

**24. DRAINAGE/CULVERTS:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

- a. Perform a 3" mill/fill pavement repair at all culverts that have been capped with concrete.
- b. Aggregate drains need to be installed in all full depth repair locations.
- c. Drainage work to be included within the Village of Ashville
  - i. Catch basins, conduit, etc. – **a more detailed survey will be performed by the Village**

**25. INTERCHANGES:** Yes  No

26. **BRIDGES** (Tim Peddicord):      Yes       No       Possible  (To Be Determined)

If applicable see attached Bridge Scope of Work

27. **INVESTIGATE PREFABRICATED STRUCTURE:**      Yes       No

28. **SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION:**      Yes       No

29. **BIKEWAYS:**      Yes       No

30. **MASS TRANSPORTATION:**      Yes       No

31. **RAILROADS:**      Yes       No

Designer to coordinate with Norfolk Southern Railroad for crossing at PIC-316 SLM 13.29 and PIC-752 SLM 1.58. **Agreement will be required.** Initial coordination should begin immediately and be sent out with “Begin In-House Design” submittal.

*Note: There is an abandoned RR that crosses PIC-316 at 13.24 and PIC-752 at 1.58.*

32. **SERVICE ROADS:**      Yes       No

33. **SIDE ROADS:**      Yes       No

Pavement at all approaches should extend back to the right of way limits, with a minimum distance of 20' beyond the edgeline with the following exceptions:

- SR-316:
  - o West Station Street – this roadway will be paved prior to the resurfacing project
- SR-752:
  - o Walnut Creek Pike:
    - North Side has been paved recently – match break
  - o Winchester Road – pave back to pavement break on either side of the intersection
    - *Designer to provide plan sheets at this intersection*
  - o Ett-Noecker Road – pave back to pavement break on either side of this intersection
    - *Designer to provide plan sheets at this intersection*
  - o Ringgold Northern Road:
    - South side has been paved recently – match break
  - o Plazier Road – pave back 20' or to existing break (whichever is closest)

34. **RETAINING WALLS:**      Yes       No

35. **NOISE WALL:**      Yes       No

36. **AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY AND/OR MAPPING:**      Yes       No

37. **FIELD SURVEYS:**      Yes       No       Possible  (To Be Determined)

- No internal field survey is needed. The Village of Ashville plans to perform additional survey work along SR-316.

**38. MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC:** Yes  No   
No lane closure hour restrictions. Lane Closures anticipated to be single lane via flaggers. Final coordination with MOT Engineer.

LEO hours need included at all signalized intersections.

**39. MAINTENANCE OF PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)  
V/Gary – do we need to incorporate maintenance of pedestrian traffic when working on the sidewalk with this project?

**40. MAINTENANCE OF RAILROAD TRAFFIC:** Yes  No   
Designer to coordinate with Norfolk Southern for crossings at PIC-316 SLM 13.290 and PIC-752-1.58. Agreement will be required. Initial coordination should begin immediately and be sent out with “Begin In-House Design” submittal.

**41. ADDITIONAL SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

**42. R/W ACQUISITION ANTICIPATED:** Yes  No

**43. R/W ENCROACHMENT:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

- SR-752:
  - o House #3660 – brick mailbox – is this an encroachment?

**44. UTILITY IMPACTS ANTICIPATED:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

A more detailed survey is being conducted by the Village of Ashville along SR-316. Once the survey has been completed, it will be easier to determine whether or not utilities will be impacted.

No utilities will be impacted along SR-752.

1. No utility impact anticipated on this project due to the scope of the work in relation to the proximity to the existing utilities within the construction limits of the project.
2. All aerial crossings of utilities will need to be taken into consideration because they will remain during project.
3. If any depth of pavement changes, take underground utilities into consideration at the impacted station locations if applicable.
4. All guardrail replacements must be placed in the same location or it is the expectation of the contractor to place the guardrail in locations that do not cause conflicts with underground utilities.

*Designer Note – Please add the following plan note –*

**UTILITIES:**

*THE ODOT CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO CONTACT OUPS A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS EXCLUDING WEEKENDS AND HOLIDAYS TO PERMIT ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AN OPPORTUNITY TO MARK THEIR LINES. IT IS ALSO THE ODOT CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO CONTACT ALL NON-MEMBERS OF OUPS DIRECTLY A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS' NOTICE EXCLUDING WEEKENDS AND HOLIDAYS TO PROVIDE THEM WITH THE SAME OPPORTUNITY.*

IT IS ODOT'S EXPECTATION THAT ALL GUARD RAIL POSTS WILL BE INSTALLED IN THE SAME LOCATIONS AND THERE WILL BE NO DISRUPTION TO UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. IF THERE IS A UTILITY MARKING WITHIN THE TOLERANCE ZONE OF A UTILITY LOCATE FROM THE PROPOSED GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT IT IS THE ODOT CONTRACTORS RESPONSIBILITY TO DIRECTLY CONTACT THE IMPACTED UTILITY AND WORK WITH THEM TO FIND A SOLUTION THAT DOES NOT CHANGE THE GUARDRAIL PLACEMENT OR DAMAGE THE EXISTING UTILITY. NO UTILITY RELOCATION WILL BE REIMBURSED NOR WILL DELAY CLAIMS BE PERMISSIBLE BASED ON ON LACK OF COORDINATION BETWEEN THE ODOT CONTRACTOR AND THE IMPACTED UTILITY.

**45. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE ANTICIPATED:**

- C1
- C2
- D1
- D2
- D3
- Other Higher Level Document

**46. PROJECT LIMITS WITHIN FLOODPLAIN:** Yes  No

Due to the Environmental Document being a Level C1 – it does not matter if the project is located within a floodplain. If the environmental document level changes, then existing floodplains will need to be researched.

**47. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ANTICIPATED:**

**48. COMPLETE STREETS CONSIDERATION:** Yes  No

ADA Curb Ramps required at crosswalk locations within Village Limits.

- There are ~34 curb ramps that need upgraded along SR-316 with this project
  - o Jefferson Avenue: 4 curb ramps
    - 1 spot with a steep grade – may need to redo sidewalk at this corner
  - o Scioto Street: 2 landing pads and curb ramps
  - o Cromley Street: potential spot for CDBG intersection upgrade
    - 2 ramps needed on the North side of the intersection
    - 2 new ramps and crosswalk (across SR-316) because the sidewalk ends on the South side of the intersection
  - o RR Tracks: 2 curb ramps needed on the North side (no sidewalk on the South side)
  - o Main and Long Street: replace all 4 curb ramps
  - o Wright Street: Replace all 4 curb ramps
  - o Church Street: Replace 2 curb ramps
  - o Madison/Plum Street:
    - The Village has requested potentially placing RRFB crosswalks in two locations at this intersection because there is low visibility – **is this possible?**
    - Replace 4 curb ramps
  - o Cherry Street: Replace 2 curb ramps
  - o Harrison Street: Replace 2 ramps
  - o Station Street: West side of the intersection is getting upgraded with CDBG funding

- 2 curb ramps needed on the East side of the intersection

**49. NHS ROUTE:** Yes  No

**50. FEDERAL TRUCK ROUTE (FAP):** Yes  No

**51. DRIVEWAYS:** Yes  No

This project shall include items for the paving of drive aprons. Work for all drive aprons shall include paving to the existing conditions. If the apron is asphalt then pave it with mainline pavement. If the apron is aggregate then use Item 617. (Typically - 5' (ex. Asphalt), 5' (ex. aggregate), 2' (ex concrete).

- On SR-316: the Village of Ashville wishes to have driveway aprons paved with concrete. **Is this still the intent with this project?**
- On SR-752: pave the driveway aprons using asphalt (match mainline pavement)

**52. MAILBOX APPROACHES:** Yes  No

This project shall include items for the paving of mailbox pullouts. Work for all mailboxes shall pave to existing conditions – if it is asphalt pave it, if it is aggregate – use 617

**53. ITS (Nick Hegemier):** Yes  No

**54. RWIS Sensor:** Yes  No

**55. ATR:** Yes  No

**56. LEGISLATION:** Yes  No

*This project goes through the Village of Ashville. See Scope Item 4 for the Village limits.*

- *This project will require funding from the Village of Ashville for drainage upgrades, along with pavement repairs along SR-316. Only consent legislation may be needed for SR-752. At this time, the amount of participatory legislation is unknown from the Village of Ashville.*

**57. OTHER WORK NOT DESCRIBED ABOVE:** Yes  No  Possible  (To Be Determined)

- This will be a Part 1/Part 2 project
  - o The Village of Ashville will complete the design for SR-316 because of the heftier design efforts such as the curb and gutter replacement, any drainage work and the full depth pavement repair locations, along with the resurfacing on SR-316

**58. DELIVERABLES REQUIRED (but not limited to):**

- Prelim Coordination Plan (Env and R/R)
- Stage 3 Plan for Review
- Final Plan Package

All Project Development to follow the current version of the ODOT Plan Development Process and applicable

Design Manuals.

## CULVERT SCOPE OF WORK

### 3.0 Culvert:

3.0.0 Source Layer: TIMS Assets\TIMS.TIMS.WGIS\_CULVERT

#### 3.0 Culvert 1

Association Type:	Along Linear Project
Distance to Project Segment:	0.0 meters
3.1.1 [CULVERT_FILE_NUMBER]	1836593
3.1.2 [CRS]	PIC-752-7.739
3.1.3 [NLFID]	SPICSR00752**C
3.1.4 [COUNTY_CD]	PIC
3.1.5 [ROUTE_TYPE]	SR
3.1.6 [ROUTE_NBR]	00752
3.1.7 [CTL_BEGIN_NBR]	7.739
3.1.8 [CRS]	PIC-752-7.739
3.1.9 [CULVERT_OWNER]	S
3.1.10 [FEATURE_INTERSECTED]	-
3.1.11 [STATUS]	A
3.1.12 [CULVERT_SHAPE]	1
3.1.13 [MATERIAL]	2
3.1.14 [SPAN_INCHES]	12
3.1.15 [RISE_INCHES]	12
3.1.16 [LENGTH_FEET]	44
3.1.17 [MATERIAL_CONDITION]	6
3.1.18 [CULVERT_ALIGNMENT]	7
3.1.19 [SHAPE_RATING]	None
3.1.20 [SEAMS_OR_JOINTS]	None
3.1.21 [SLAB]	None
3.1.22 [ABUTMENTS]	None
3.1.23 [SCOUR]	None
3.1.24 [GENERAL_APPRAISAL]	5
3.1.25 [COMMENT_INSP]	Crushed pipe ends
3.1.26 [INSPECTION_DATE]	2017-02-01 13:38:11

- Can the county perform the work on this culvert prior to the project?

## BRIDGE SCOPE OF WORK

### 2.0 Bridge 1

<b>Association Type:</b>	<b>Along Linear Project</b>
<b>Distance to Project Segment:</b>	<b>0.0 meters</b>
2.1.1 [SFN]	6503608
2.1.2 [NLFID]	SPICSR00752**C
2.1.3 [COUNTY_CD]	PIC
2.1.4 [ROUTE_TYPE]	SR
2.1.5 [ROUTE_NUMBER]	00752
2.1.6 [CTL_BEGIN_NBR]	0.54
2.1.7 [DECK_AREA]	1712
2.1.8 [MAIN_STRUC_TYPE]	112
2.1.9 [FEATURES_INTERSECTED]	MUD RUN #
2.1.10 [STRUCTURE_LENGTH]	53.5
2.1.11 [WEAR_SURF_DT]	2001-08-17 00:00:00
2.1.12 [TYPE_OF_WEARING_SURFACE]	C
2.1.13 [WEARING_SURF_CONDITION_RATING]	1
2.1.14 [GEN_APPR_CONDITION_RATING]	6
2.1.15 [BRIDGE_RAILINGS]	1

- Washout on the NE corner of the GR run
- Seal with GFR
- Some minor cracking on the bridge deck
- Pave up to the bridge deck

### 2.5 Bridge 6

<b>Association Type:</b>	<b>Along Linear Project</b>
<b>Distance to Project Segment:</b>	<b>0.0 meters</b>
2.6.1 [SFN]	6503632
2.6.2 [NLFID]	SPICSR00752**C
2.6.3 [COUNTY_CD]	PIC
2.6.4 [ROUTE_TYPE]	SR
2.6.5 [ROUTE_NUMBER]	00752
2.6.6 [CTL_BEGIN_NBR]	1.34
2.6.7 [DECK_AREA]	1539
2.6.8 [MAIN_STRUC_TYPE]	321
2.6.9 [FEATURES_INTERSECTED]	UNDER CSX RR
2.6.10 [STRUCTURE_LENGTH]	32.0
2.6.11 [WEAR_SURF_DT]	1986-01-01 00:00:00
2.6.12 [TYPE_OF_WEARING_SURFACE]	N
2.6.13 [WEARING_SURF_CONDITION_RATING]	
2.6.14 [GEN_APPR_CONDITION_RATING]	4
2.6.15 [BRIDGE_RAILINGS]	N

- Do not reduce vertical clearance
- There is currently flooding under this bridge

- County crews are upgrading the drainage structures underneath and working to get water to the creek
- They are adding new sensors to detect flooding under the bridge so that the high water sign with flash its lights sooner
  - Cameras will be added and the sensors will send an email notification to a group of people to notify them that there is flooding and help determine if the road needs closed sooner

## 2.1 Bridge 2

<b>Association Type:</b>	<b>Along Linear Project</b>
<b>Distance to Project Segment:</b>	<b>0.0 meters</b>
2.2.1 [SFN]	6503675
2.2.2 [NLFID]	SPICSR00752**C
2.2.3 [COUNTY_CD]	PIC
2.2.4 [ROUTE_TYPE]	SR
2.2.5 [ROUTE_NUMBER]	00752
2.2.6 [CTL_BEGIN_NBR]	3.34
2.2.7 [DECK_AREA]	8740
2.2.8 [MAIN_STRUC_TYPE]	322
2.2.9 [FEATURES_INTERSECTED]	WALNUT CREEK
2.2.10 [STRUCTURE_LENGTH]	273.0
2.2.11 [WEAR_SURF_DT]	1992-01-01 00:00:00
2.2.12 [TYPE_OF_WEARING_SURFACE]	2
2.2.13 [WEARING_SURF_CONDITION_RATING]	1
2.2.14 [GEN_APPR_CONDITION_RATING]	8
2.2.15 [BRIDGE_RAILINGS]	1

- Seal the deck with non-epoxy sealer
- Replace strip seal glands within steel joints
- Investigate jacking up the approach slab
  - Run smoothness over?
  - The approach slabs are dipping at both ends

## 2.4 Bridge 5

<b>Association Type:</b>	<b>Along Linear Project</b>
<b>Distance to Project Segment:</b>	<b>0.0 meters</b>
2.5.1 [SFN]	6503683
2.5.2 [NLFID]	SPICSR00752**C
2.5.3 [COUNTY_CD]	PIC
2.5.4 [ROUTE_TYPE]	SR
2.5.5 [ROUTE_NUMBER]	00752
2.5.6 [CTL_BEGIN_NBR]	4.61
2.5.7 [DECK_AREA]	1539
2.5.8 [MAIN_STRUC_TYPE]	231
2.5.9 [FEATURES_INTERSECTED]	BEAR RUN CREEK
2.5.10 [STRUCTURE_LENGTH]	51.2
2.5.11 [WEAR_SURF_DT]	2000-06-08 00:00:00
2.5.12 [TYPE_OF_WEARING_SURFACE]	6
2.5.13 [WEARING_SURF_CONDITION_RATING]	1

<b>2.5.14 [GEN_APPR_CONDITION_RATING]</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.5.15 [BRIDGE_RAILINGS]</b>	<b>1</b>

- Pave over
- Saw and seal joints at 4 locations

### 2.2 Bridge 3

<b>Association Type:</b>	<b>Along Linear Project</b>
<b>Distance to Project Segment:</b>	<b>0.0 meters</b>
<b>2.3.1 [SFN]</b>	<b>6503713</b>
<b>2.3.2 [NLFID]</b>	<b>SPICSR00752**C</b>
<b>2.3.3 [COUNTY_CD]</b>	<b>PIC</b>
<b>2.3.4 [ROUTE_TYPE]</b>	<b>SR</b>
<b>2.3.5 [ROUTE_NUMBER]</b>	<b>00752</b>
<b>2.3.6 [CTL_BEGIN_NBR]</b>	<b>6.87</b>
<b>2.3.7 [DECK_AREA]</b>	<b>538</b>
<b>2.3.8 [MAIN_STRUC_TYPE]</b>	<b>395</b>
<b>2.3.9 [FEATURES_INTERSECTED]</b>	<b>MIMONI DITCH</b>
<b>2.3.10 [STRUCTURE_LENGTH]</b>	<b>15.0</b>
<b>2.3.11 [WEAR_SURF_DT]</b>	<b>2000-06-08 00:00:00</b>
<b>2.3.12 [TYPE_OF_WEARING_SURFACE]</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>2.3.13 [WEARING_SURF_CONDITION_RATING]</b>	
<b>2.3.14 [GEN_APPR_CONDITION_RATING]</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3.15 [BRIDGE_RAILINGS]</b>	<b>N</b>

- Pave over
- The bottom of the pipe was recently paved
  - o The GA rating will go up now

### 2.3 Bridge 4

<b>Association Type:</b>	<b>Along Linear Project</b>
<b>Distance to Project Segment:</b>	<b>0.0 meters</b>
<b>2.4.1 [SFN]</b>	<b>6503748</b>
<b>2.4.2 [NLFID]</b>	<b>SPICSR00752**C</b>
<b>2.4.3 [COUNTY_CD]</b>	<b>PIC</b>
<b>2.4.4 [ROUTE_TYPE]</b>	<b>SR</b>
<b>2.4.5 [ROUTE_NUMBER]</b>	<b>00752</b>
<b>2.4.6 [CTL_BEGIN_NBR]</b>	<b>7.44</b>
<b>2.4.7 [DECK_AREA]</b>	<b>646</b>
<b>2.4.8 [MAIN_STRUC_TYPE]</b>	<b>395</b>
<b>2.4.9 [FEATURES_INTERSECTED]</b>	<b>PAINTER RUN</b>
<b>2.4.10 [STRUCTURE_LENGTH]</b>	<b>23.0</b>
<b>2.4.11 [WEAR_SURF_DT]</b>	<b>2000-06-08 00:00:00</b>
<b>2.4.12 [TYPE_OF_WEARING_SURFACE]</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>2.4.13 [WEARING_SURF_CONDITION_RATING]</b>	
<b>2.4.14 [GEN_APPR_CONDITION_RATING]</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.4.15 [BRIDGE_RAILINGS]</b>	<b>1</b>

- Pave over

## GUARDRAIL SCOPE OF WORK

### PIC-316

No guardrail work needed on PIC-316 between SLM 13.05 – 13.68.

### PIC-752

ADT: ???? (6,300)

The determination of the “overall” condition of guardrail on this section of SR-752 would rate less than decent. Did not encounter any sections that were exceedingly low. All Anchor Assemblies were type A’s and would warrant upgrading according to the ADT in the scope (6,300). However it was discussed that the 6,300 ADT may not apply to most of the areas where the guardrail is located and that 6,300 ADT is the high count at US-23. My evaluation would lean towards total upgrades and replacements but I will defer the final decision to Planning, where actual ADT and funding availability can be evaluated.

#### **PIC-752-0054 (BRIDGE) (both sides)**

- Overall condition: “Less than Decent”
  - Small “washout” next to bridge
  - Old style BTA’s to be upgraded to Type 4
  - Guardrail old and beat up
  - Existing Type A anchors
  - Overall Ex. Bridge railing DBR – OK – (Do not Retro) but would recommend replacing bridge panels (only) – they show wear and age.

#### **PIC-752-3.05 (both sides)**

- Overall condition: “Less than Decent”
  - Existing Type A anchors
  - Ex. Guardrail wrapping around Hoover Rd. all new – do not disturb the radius. (tie into)
  - All guardrail on the state route low, old and beat up

\*There is a washout under the GR on the NW side of this run

Matt/Jon – Could you provide input on what to do?

#### **PIC-752-3.19 – 3.25 (both sides)**

- Overall condition: “Less than Decent”
  - Existing Type A anchors
  - Ex. Guardrail is tall enough (maybe too tall)

\*There are washouts under this GR run on both the North and South sides. There would be room to pave a wider shoulder on the North side.

Matt/Jon – Could you provide input on what to do?

#### **PIC-752-0344 (BRIDGE) (both sides)(over Walnut Creek)**

- Overall condition: “Less than Decent”
  - Good on bridge – need reflectors added

- Ex. Type 4 BTA's pretty good
- All rail off the bridge low, beat up, old
- Existing Type A anchors

**PIC-752-4.36 (outside curve only)**

- Overall condition: "Less than Decent"
  - Existing Type A anchors
  - old and beat up

**PIC-752-0461 (BRIDGE) (both sides)**

- Overall condition: "Less than Decent"
  - Old style BTA's to be upgraded to Type 4
  - Guardrail old and beat up
  - Existing Type A anchors
  - Overall Ex. Bridge railing DBR – OK – (Do not Retro)

**PIC-752-0753 (both sides)**

- Overall condition: "Less than Decent"
  - Huge Offset – good – may need some grading from EOP to face of GR
  - Guardrail old (decent) – good height
  - Existing Type A anchors
  - If replacing – use long posts both sides – or move in 2' if you have to.