

# Low-Impact Bridge Program, Post-Construction Evaluations

## Lessons Learned (January 1, 2020)

**Issue:** Bridge centerline and existing roadway centerline do not align.

Recommendation on future projects: The roadway designer should check/verify the bridge plan alignment matches the roadway alignment.

**Issue:** Field Offices are not needed; the project can be managed from the Area Manager's Office.

Recommendation on future projects: The roadway designer should contact the Area Manager to discuss the need to include a Field Office in the Final Plans package.

**Issue:** The proposed off-site detour directs traffic through an active Department construction project.

Recommendation on future projects: The designer should contact the Area Manager to verify the proposed off-site detour does not direct traffic through an active Department construction project.

**Issue:** Establish permanent grassing within contract time (outside of the permanent grassing season).

Recommendation on future projects: Since the disturbed area associated with LIBP projects is typically less than one acre, consider placing sod versus planting grass.

**Issue:** The depth to achieve bearing capacity/pile driving resistance differs from Minimum Tip Elevation stated in the plans.

Recommendation on future projects: In areas around the Fall Line or where Karst topography is present, consider multiple borings per bent location.

**Issue:** Bench Mark elevation differs from the BM elevation listed in the Bridge Plans.

Recommendation on future projects: Verify topography prior to construction commencing and revise plans if necessary.

**Issue:** At 50-scale, the notes to supplement the proposed work illustrated, the 13-Series Construction Plans become cluttered.

Recommendation on future projects: Consider 20-scale 13-series Construction Plans.

**Issue:** Construction activities delayed due to nesting season.

Recommendation on future projects: Consider letting the project in a month which would minimize construction delays due to nesting season.

**Issue:** The Typical Section specifies a minimum range for HMA Overlay on the bridge, which may result in a reduction of future overlay allowances.

Recommendation on future projects: Consider adding spread rates and a maximum range for HMA Overlay on the bridge.

**Issue:** Difficulty providing adequate Erosion Control measures when proposed bent locations are close to waterway banks (when cofferdams are not included in the Final Plans package).

Recommendation on future projects: Consider moving the proposed bent location further away from the waterway banks.