

BURGESS & NIPLE				DATE:	November 11, 2023		
<i>REVIEW COMMENTS</i>							
PROJECT:		Cleveland Innerbelt Study - Payne Avenue Bridge Study Memorandum			PROJECT NO:	60054	
REVIEWERS:		James Calanni (D12); Patrick Toman (D12); Drake Brauer (D12); Mike Herceg (D12); Dayna Mallas (D12)		PHASE:	TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM	SHEET:	
Comment #	Tech Memo Page No.	Details	Reviewer Comment	Reviewer	Designer Response	Comment addressed by:	Comment Completed (X) / No action required (NAR) / Consider in Next Steps (NS)
1			It appears the building in the SW quadrant of the bridge is very close to the right of way. Will raising the profile affect this building?	Calanni	<i>This is a good point. This would need to be evaluated during the next phase of project development once additional information regarding the building is obtained and likely conversations occur with the building owner. There are two doors that open up on the sidewalk along Payne Avenue. If the profile is raised, it would need to be evaluated if the pedestrian access route (PAR) width of the sidewalk could be maintained in the same elevation/location to maintain access to the building. The sidewalk is very wide and could allow for a solution that raises the profile of the roadway and makes the elevation up before getting to the building. This would need to be evaluated.</i>	Toombs	NS
2			Alternative 1 has a very short center span with respect to the approach span lengths. Will uplift occur at either pier?	Calanni	No, the minimum reactions for both piers for both interior and exterior girders are positive so won't experience uplift.	Ackerman	NAR
3	5		Alternative 2 is a two-span bridge, but the narrative provides superstructure depths for three spans. (See pdf sheet 5/53). Please correct discrepancy.	Calanni	Narrative was updated to state the depths are for Span 1, over the pier, and Span 2.	Ackerman	X
4			Will a two-span bridge option work if the girder spacing is tightened significantly and the span-to-depth ratio requirement is waived?	Calanni	It is probably feasible to design the girders this way, but based on our analysis of using 11 girders that were spaced at 6-feet, the increased steel weight would be substantial and the subsequent cost increase would be several million dollars.	Ackerman	X
5			Looks like this has some potential. Interesting span arrangement though. I would think we would go with the full closure since there are many alternate routes available.	Herceg	<i>A full closure is a valid alternative for vehicular traffic for the reasons stated in the comment. Other considerations, including maintaining utilities across the structure, may need to be evaluated to determine if the bridge can be completely removed from service during construction</i>	Toombs	NS
6	3		I agree with Mike [Herceg] that this has some potential. My only comment is on sheet 3 the consultant mentions the plan is to finish increasing vertical clearance with the major reconstruction project. The consultant will have to be mindful of how deep they place footers for piers and abutments to account for lowering the pavement. We are running into footer conflicts on all the other major rehab projects right now.	Brauer	<i>This is a good point. We agree that the footing depths would need to be carefully considered as additional design occurs during the next phase of project development.</i>	Ackerman	NS
7			For Alternative 3 – are the ROW impacts expected to be the same as Alternative 1? Would be nice if the memo had a simple statement of Alternate 3 ROW impacts. – Even though the \$20M price tag really takes this out of the running.	Mallas	The ROW impacts are expected to be similar between the two alternatives because the abutment locations would be the same.	Ackerman	NAR
8			If the utilities located on the existing structure are determined to still be in service, are we still going to prefer the detour – and anticipate that a separate utility bridge would be required for the utilities (Water, Gas, Fiber Optic)?	Mallas	<i>This is a good point and one that would need resolved during the next phase of project development. The bridge could be phased which would allow utilities to be maintained across the bridge. There are also a lot of adjacent parallel routes so the bridge phasing could be only what is needed for maintaining utilities and not necessarily for vehicular traffic.</i>	Toombs	NS

BURGESS & NIPLE				DATE:	November 11, 2023		
<i>REVIEW COMMENTS</i>							
PROJECT:		Cleveland Innerbelt Study - Payne Avenue Bridge Study Memorandum			PROJECT NO: 60054		
REVIEWERS:		James Calanni (D12); Patrick Toman (D12); Drake Brauer (D12); Mike Herceg (D12); Dayna Mallas (D12)		PHASE: TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM		SHEET:	
Comment #	Tech Memo Page No.	Details	Reviewer Comment	Reviewer	Designer Response	Comment addressed by:	Comment Completed (X) / No action required (NAR) / Consider in Next Steps (NS)
9			If the acquisition at Ramp C3 can't be avoided, could it be an option to investigating possibility of eliminating Ramp C3 to avoid acquiring the Cleveland Foodbank building and to keep the connection between E27th and E30th?	Mallas	This is a possibility. Changing the access by removing proposed Ramp C3 would require revising the Interchange Modification Study (IMS) which would require additional traffic analysis to show that the ramp terminal intersection with Superior Avenue wouldn't poorly operate with the additional traffic. An additional study is being completed to evaluate potential geometric modifications to create additional space between the building and proposed Ramp C3.	Toombs	NAR
10			Closing and detouring Payne Ave. to construct the bridge appears preferable due to the height of temporary shoring that would be required to build part-width in two phases. B&N discusses temporary shoring requiring tiebacks or potential use of wire faced MSE walls, but existing underground utilities on Payne Ave. may affect feasibility of both options.	Toman	<i>Agreed. This would need to be evaluated and confirmed during the next phase of project development when additional location services and utility coordination occurs with the owners.</i>	Toombs	NS
11			Agree that it makes sense to pursue a design exception for vertical clearance over existing IR-90 for and achieve full 16.5' minimum vertical clearance via the future profile of proposed IR-90.	Toman	Good to know that this is a tool in the toolbox to use during the next phase of project development if needed.	Toombs	NAR