

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 Ashville:

- 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 yd²

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.

XXyd² 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 yd² 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

The pavement in this area was already repaired by the Village to avoid failure of the pavement. This area should only need overlay.

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.**

The survey work is being completed and we expect to have the topographic survey by mid-October. We expect the curb and gutter to be replaced in the areas that we show on the preliminary plan that we sent on September 19th. We conducted several extensive site visits to determine the fall from the right-of-way and road surface drainage to determine the limits of the work in the various areas. I have confidence that the design based on the survey will be within 5% of what we estimated.

Based on our preliminary design we are looking at the following edge milling, curb and gutter quantities for the work on PIC-316:

- Item 202 – Curb Removed – 5150 LF
- Item 202 – Walk Removed – 25516 SF
- Item 608 – Concrete Walk – 24616 SF
- Item 609 – Curb Ramps – 38 EA
- Item 609 – Straight 18” Concrete Curb with 4” Underdrain – 4853 LF
- Item 253 – Pavement Repair, As Per Plan – 2805 SY [Assumes 4’ wide edge milling at variable depths of 0” to 4”]

- (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

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?)

• The Village will change the preliminary design to reflect the installation of permanent Signage at all necessary locations.

- Formatted: Not Highlight
- Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering
- Formatted: Font color: Light Blue

- o Main/Long Street: 2 no pedestrian crossing signs needed
- o Wright Street: 2 pedestrian crossing signs needed

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

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

- The Village of Asheville 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 After performing signal warrants, none of the above signals are warranted to stay in place
 - The Village of Asheville is to advise how to move forward at these signalized intersections.

The Village is going to look at specific ways to address the removal of the signalized intersections. I reviewed the signal warrant information provided on 9-25-18 and the signals at the above-referenced intersections do not meet any of the various warrants.

If these are to go to 4-way stops: Who pays for the removal of the signals and erection of proper permanent signage? Is there a desired timeline for removal of the signals from ODOT?

The intersection at Madison\Plum and SR 316 (Long Street) has a significant number of pedestrians during school hours and should be considered part of a Safe Route to Schools. We will include in our project estimate the installation of a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) system at this intersection.

- 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? This looks like a safe routes to school 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

The survey work is being completed and we expect to have the topographic survey by mid-October. We expect the storm sewer work to be close to what is shown on the preliminary plan that we sent on September 19th. We conducted several extensive site visits to determine the existing drainage system and drainage patterns to determine the limits of the work in the various areas. I have confidence that the design based on the survey will be within 5% of what we estimated.

Based on our preliminary design we are looking at the following drainage quantities for the work on PIC-316:

- Item 202 – Manhole Removed – 6 EA
- Item 202 – Catch Basin or Inlet Removed – 30 EA
- Item 604 – Catch Basin – 20 EA
- Item 604 – Curb & Gutter Inlet – 33 EA
- Item 604 – Manhole Adjusted to Grade – 5 EA
- Item 604 – Manhole – 16 EA
- Item 611 – 12” Conduit, Type B – 977 FT
- Item 611 – 15” Conduit, Type B – 556 FT
- Item 611 – 18” Conduit, Type B – 455 FT

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.

Designer Note:

- There is an abandoned RR that crosses PIC-316 at 13.24 and PIC-752 at 1.58. Please, still provide plan sheets at these locations to coordinate with CO about whether or not RR coordination is needed at abandoned RR tracks.

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. While SR752 does not have any "Special Event" restriction, US23 does that no work shall take place at the intersection during special events: Circleville Pumpkin Show & 3 hours prior to kickoff on OSU home football game days.

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? Yes, pedestrian accommodations within work zones should be provided if some sidewalks are to be closed for reconstruction.

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
 - R/W and survey working to determine if this location is 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.

The survey work is being completed and we expect to have the topographic survey by mid-October. We do not expect conflicts with private utilities based on the work planned but we will notify ODOT of any potential conflicts. We are keeping all the work within existing right-of-way, so we will coordinate any relocation work, if necessary.

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

- RR Tracks: 2 curb ramps needed on the North side (no sidewalk on the South side)
- Main and Long Street: replace all 4 curb ramps
- Wright Street: Replace all 4 curb ramps
- Church Street: Replace 2 curb ramps
- 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
- Cherry Street: Replace 2 curb ramps
- Harrison Street: Replace 2 ramps
- Station Street: West side of the intersection is getting upgraded with CDBG funding
 - 2 curb ramps needed on the East side of the intersection

Installation of RRFBs cannot be funded by Central Office safety money. A rough estimate for the Village to install RRFBs in the 3 locations where the signals are not warranted is \$30,000. The Village of Asheville is to advise whether or not they wish to add them to the project.

The intersection at Madison/Plum and SR 316 (Long Street) has a significant number of pedestrians during school hours and should be considered part of a Safe Route to Schools. We will include in our project estimate the installation of a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) system at this intersection.

We do not anticipate the need for RRFB's at the other intersections, as long as they are controlled with stop signs.

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 Asheville wishes to have driveway aprons paved with concrete. Is this still the intent with this project?

The Village standards require the installation of concrete alley and driveways within the right of way. So it is our intent to replace drive approaches as necessary and as shown on the preliminary design plans.

Based on our preliminary design we are looking at the following alley and driveway approach quantities for the work on PIC-316:

Item 452 – 6" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement, Class C – 382 SY [Driveways – COC 2201]

Item 452 – Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement, Class C – 183 SY [Alleys – COC 2150, Type III]

- 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

Commented [GW1]: County to perform work on this culvert prior to the project occurring.

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	[NLFD] 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_ALICNMENT] 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 13:38:14

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

BRIDGE SCOPE OF WORK

2.0 Bridge 1

Association Type:	Along Linear Project
Distance to Project Segment:	0.0 meters
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, do not pave over bridge

2.5 Bridge 6

Association Type:	Along Linear Project
Distance to Project Segment:	0.0 meters
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

Association Type:	Along Linear Project
Distance to Project Segment:	0.0 meters
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 [per Item 512](#)
- 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

Association Type:	Along Linear Project
Distance to Project Segment:	0.0 meters
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

2.5.14 [GEN_APPR_CONDITION_RATING]	9
2.5.15 [BRIDGE_RAILINGS]	1

- Pave over [culvert using same treatment as roadway](#)
- Saw and seal joints at 4 locations

2.2 Bridge 3

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

- Pave over [using the same treatment as roadway](#)
- The bottom of the pipe was recently paved
- The GA rating will go up now

2.3 Bridge 4

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

- Pave over [using the same treatment as roadway](#)

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
 - Ensure that there is sufficient embankment and proper grading when removing and replaced the GR run because of the washouts

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)
 - Ensure that there is sufficient embankment and proper grading when removing and replaced the GR run because of the washouts
 -

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.