

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
1	B. Mahoney (DOT Environmental)	__ General	The project would require a noise permit for work occurring during evening or nighttime hours.	Night work is not being required for this project. The DOT will not be obtaining a noise permit. The contractor may choose to obtain a noise permit at their own discretion.
1	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	__ General	Scales used on plan sheets are inconsistent, some appear to be 10 scale and others 20 scale, they should be consistent. The plans should be developed in accordance with DOT drafting standards.	Plan sheet scales were coordinated with DOT&PF PM earlier in the project. Per PS&E review meeting, scales are to remain for clarity.
2	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	__ General	Not a fan of the plan sheet organization of this plan set. The use of standard plan format/layout per our drafting manual should be used unless instructed otherwise specifically by the Project Manager. I can understand the logic of this layout if it is anticipated to be broken apart of advertisement, but otherwise is see little benefit under one contract.	Plan sheet organization was coordinated with DOT&PF PM earlier in the project. Per PS&E review meeting, sheet organization to remain.
1	C. Larson (DOT HD)	__ General	Use consistent sheet designations. For instance, summary tables use format "AH1" while sheet title is "A:H1". I think it would be clearer if you eliminated the use of colons in the sheet names.	The biggest concern is consistency. The colons help separate the site designation from the sheet type. Summary tables have been updated to show colons.
2	C. Larson (DOT HD)	__ General	Add the appropriate alignment designations everywhere, including all survey control sheets, all H sheets station callouts, and all sign summary tables.	Appropriate alignment designations have been added to all callouts and summary sheets.
3	C. Larson (DOT HD)	__ General	Fade hatch for existing concrete, all F sheets. Can't tell the difference between new and existing concrete.	Hatch for existing concrete faded.
4	C. Larson (DOT HD)	__ General	All grading plans (F sheets): Probably don't need TBC elevations at center of curb ramp landings or within ramps and flares. Please add TBC grading points at the outer edge of curb ramps and flares, where the curb is at standard height.	Grading plans have been modified to show flow line elevations. Grade callouts at curb ramps are at center of ramp only. Ramps shall be constructed per detail.
5	C. Larson (DOT HD)	__ General	All striping sheets: Dimension the lane widths from the face of curb to the center of the stripe, not from the centerline. Consider deleting the centerlines (keep the stationing and tic marks) so type of markings on the centerline are clear.	Modified dimensions. Centerlines color was adjusted to clarify markings.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
1	J. Starzec, A. Jongenelen, D. Post (DOT Planning)	___ General	No Comments.	Thank you for your review.
1	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	___ General	When providing the final PS&E submittal verify the following: 1. Compare C-sheet bid item descriptions and quantities to the Engineers Estimate to verify they match. 2. Verify each pay item in the Engineers Estimate has a basis of payment.	This has been verified.
2	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	___ General	By end of business day on January 11th please email me (ryan.norkoli@alaska.gov) a copy of all comments the design team is responding to, along with responses that have been developed at that time (organized by individual comment submission).	Comments provided as requested.
3	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	___ General	For the PS&E review meeting on January 12th provide 20 copies of all comments along with responses to the comments for which the design team has developed responses to. The preferred method of comment organization is by individual whom made the comment submission. At the design team's option, you can bring comment responses organized by plan sheet number and specification page (i.e. mixing individuals comments) but this will need to be in addition to at least 2 copies of comments organized by individual comment submissions.	Comments provided as requested.
4	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	___ General	Verify adequate expansion capacity is provided in the design of concrete medians	Specifications dictate that expansion joints occur every 36 feet.
5	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	___ General	Missing some of the most routine items to be included in a project, specifically: 1. 408(15) Asphalt Material Price modification 2. 641(6) Withholding 3. 643(23) Traffic Price modification	Items have been added.
6	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	___ General	We should discuss the Asphalt Type selected. With the short lengths and many radius areas to pave, a 401 asphalt without hard aggregate may make more sense regardless of AADT.	Hard aggregate HMA has been dropped from the plans.
1	Randy Bergt (MOA Transit)	___ General	These improvements are in the vicinity of the Downtown Transit Center could have potential impacts to bus turning movements however it appears that these movements will not be effected for lining up to the TC with the buses. Public Transportation has no comments at this time. Thank you for including Transit in the review of the projects.	Thank you for your review.
6	C. Larson (DOT HD)	___A01	Put latitude and longitude columns next to each other.	Latitudes placed next to longitudes.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
5	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_A02	Index name for Ingra sheets does not agree with the sheet titles for those sheets. They should match.	Index updated with correct sheet titles.
7	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_A02	What is the intent of note 7? Project includes removal of pavement throughout, it's a good portion of the whole contract, so what are we seeking approval from the engineer? This seems odd, was this special request? Is this typical? Never seen note like this before.	Note removed.
8	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_A02	Note 13, as to the last sentence "or other materials" or remove the "with topsoil" text to make more general. i.e. we equally don't want the bases buried with asphalt or pavement either.	Added, "or other materials" to note.
7	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_A02	Delete Std Dwg I-20.15. Sheet E1 replaces it. Change S-00.10 to S-00.11. Delete M-20.13 and M-23.12.	Changes made as requested.
8	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_A02	Consider adding a Site column (A,B,C,D) in the Alignment Designation table. Rearrange the table in site order. Also modify the Index Table to add "Site A." for example, next to the appropriate site name.	Columns added and arranged as suggested.
9	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_A02	Add an abbreviations table. Include ME, B facing, E facing, TBC, COR, COW (? – See Sheet A:F2), etc.	Abbreviation table has been added
10	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_A02	Note 11 is confusing with its reference to B Sheets (Site B?). Suggest changing the note to say "Refer to the typical section sheets provided for each site for slope exceptions."	Note modified as directed.
11	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_A02	Add a note specifying the color to be used on the median concrete slabs.	Color is specified in typical sections
1	E. Desentis (DOT)	_A02	Notes #8,9 and 11 are unnecessary.	Notes removed.
9	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	_A02	Standard Drawings "T" schedule. Jewel Lake & Raspberry signal work was moved to different project. Could remove T-53.00 and T-57.01.	Standard drawings removed as directed.
7	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	_A02	1. Change CR-T-04.01 to CR-T-04.02 2. When including T-05.10 also need to include CR-G-04.02	Changes made as requested.
9	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_A03	Suggest using a different symbol for the curve numbers as this is the same symbol used for Traffic Sign Posts.	The curve number symbol does not appear on the H sheets and the sign post symbol does not appear on the G sheets. These symbols should not be in conflict anywhere in the drawings.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
12	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_A03, D:F01	Add linetypes for CR (Crown) and GB (see Sheet D:F1, NW quadrant.)	Linetypes have been added to legend
1	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	_All	Any existing MOA street light equipment to be salvaged (street light poles, mast arms, HPS fixtures) should be returned to MOA Street Light Maintenance Orca Yard.	Special provisions have been modified as requested.
2	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	_All	Please provide lighting analysis for all intersections to determine that minimum lighting levels have been met or add illumination as necessary to meet levels with pedestrian levels with pedestrian traffic included.	Lighting analyses provided for intersections at sites B and C.
15	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_C01	603(1A) should be 603(1-12), 603(1B) should be 603(1-18)	Corrected.
2	E. Desentis (DOT)	_C01	Unclear where steel faced curb goes.	Steel facing summary table added
16	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_C01, D01, EE	Change Item 202(10) Single Mailbox Installation to 202(10A) Remove and Reinstall Mailbox.	Plans, Specifications, and Estimate have been updated per comment.
17	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_D Sheets	Add a curb summary table, including curb type (Mountable, Mountable –spill, Median, Depressed). Where is Steel Faced Curb to be installed?	Curb summary table added
18	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_D01	202(13) Removal of Fence. Quantity can't be the same as 607(3) Chain Link Fence. Existing is curved, new is straight.	Fence quantities have been updated
19	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_D02	608(6) Curb Ramp summary table – add the type of ramp (parallel, perpendicular).	Curb ramp type added to table
10	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_D03	618(2) does not match what is called out in the Engineers Estimate. Shows 618(1A) on Estimate.	Sheet revised to match Engineers Estimate
20	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_D03	615(5) Delineator, Flexible summary table – use same font size as rest of tables. 615(6) Salvage Sign summary table – change ' to " in third and fourth entries. 618(2) Seeding should be 618(1A) Seeding per the specs.	Tables and have been corrected for consistency

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
10	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	_D03	660(18) modify junction Box schedule 1. Sheet BF1 (36th & Latouche) is listed. This j-box is being replaced/relocated per sheets B:H2 & B:H3. 2. Sheet CF1 (4th & Ingra) is listed. Stationing appears to indicate the controller cabinet foundation. Is intent to modify Type 3 j-box at approx. STA. "IS" 4+ 20, 28 LT? If so, how much modification? Or is this the Type 2 j-box adjacent to the load center at approx. STA. "IS" 3+83, 27 LT? 3. Sheet DF1 (7th & D) is listed. This is a Type 2 j-box located in the asphalt roadway. J-box contains traffic signal interconnect cable. J-box is located in new curb ramp panel and flair panel. Need to relocate j-box out of curb ramp. Conduits enter horizontally through the j-box side walls. Interconnect would need to be replaced due to addition length 4. Sheet DF5 (7th & H). "SA"40+64.37, 33.85 LT is listed. J-box is shown located behind a back curb on sheet DF5. What will be change in elevation? 5. Sheet DF5 (7th & H). "SA"41+15.41, 45.85 LT j-box is listed. Sheet D:F5 doesn't indicate new curb ramp work on this quadrant. 6. Sheet DF5 (7th & H). "SA"40+63.65, 38.41 RT j-box and "SA"40+63.66, 40.86 RT are listed. This is a Type 3 j-box and only requires a single listing. What will be change in elevation? 7. Sheet DF5 (7th & H). "SA"41+15.48, 36.64 RT is listed. What will be change in elevation?	1. J-box work removed from table. 2. J-box work reference was incorrect and is removed from table. 3. J-Box relocated out of ramp and new interconnect cabling indicated on plans. 4. No change in elevation. 5. J-box removed from list. 6. Proposed grade is 0.3 feet higher than existing. 7. Minimal change in elevation.
13	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_E Sheets	Need a Type 1 manhole detail. We can provide a regional special.	MOA Type I and Type II Manhole details added
14	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_E Sheets	Need a raised median curb ramp detail, showing dimensions, materials, curbing, etc. DOT prefers sloping curb faces within median curb ramps to facilitate snow removal.	Sheet C:F4 provides grades, callouts, and dimensions for constructing the pedestrian crossing.
2	B. Nickeson (DOT M&O)	_E01	Show flex delineator on Island Nose Detail at 6" off top back of curb for oncoming traffic	Flex delineator has been added
3	E. Desentis (DOT)	_E01	Steel faced curb usually reserved for MOA barrier curb profile (less rounded). See MOA typical.	Detail derived from use in other MOA projects.
4	E. Desentis (DOT)	_E01	Note 1 – Island nose on Ingra NB at 3rd should be painted white.	PSE review meeting deemed nose to be painted yellow.
5	E. Desentis (DOT)	_E02	Is this the current hydrant typical? Shouldn't the valve be integral to the hydrant riser? Also, isn't a thrust/pier block recommended at the 90 unless it's against undisturbed ground?	Hydrant work removed from project.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
21	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_E02-E03	These sheets reference several MOA standard drawings. Do we need to include them in the contract documents?	All relevant notes from MASS have been included in details. References to MASS have been removed
6	E. Desentis (DOT)	_E03	Is this the current/standard MOA catch basin sheet?	Yes.
8	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	_E03	Both Catch Basin and Fame make reference to MOA MASS Standard Details for additional information. The content in those MASS details needs to be detailed within the plans.	All MASS references incorporated.
1	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	_F	1. Remove "Acquisition Area" from acquisitions 2. Remove "Proposed ROW Acquisition" from Temporary acquisitions and already acquired permanent acquisitions 3. Use the linetype designated in the legend for both TCE and TCP.	1 & 2 Acquisitions text removed.
3	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	_F Sheets	Street Maintenance suggests that the median nosing be called out in the plan view.	3. Linetype changed for TCE and TCP to match legend. Median nosing shown per standard DOT&PF format.
4	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	_F Sheets	MOA Street Maintenance requires that transverse asphalt joints shall not be perpendicular to the center line, but shall be skewed between fifteen and twenty-five degrees (15° and 25°).	Transverse asphalt joints skewed 15 to 25 degrees
5	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	_F Sheets	Please indicate on the plan views which curb face will require steel curb facing.	Curb facing summary table has been added to D sheets. Also called out on grade points
2	B. Mahoney (DOT Environmental)	_F01-F02	I could only find three partial ROW acquisitions throughout the plan sheets. I was informed that the total number should be five. Is this correct? If so, please identify the other two partial acquisitions.	Five partial acquisitions are complete for the two Ingra intersections.
12	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_H01	Update with newest sheet with date of 09/02/2014, as these sheets are updated periodically.	Sheet updated to 10/13/2016 version.
11	M. Sickler, K. Woo (MOA Signals)	_H01	Signal System Notes Add the following: 12. Contractor shall provide traffic control, including arrow board devices(s), for overhead inspection and locate work performed by MOA Signal Electronics. Contractor shall be on-site at completion of locates to review layout and make stationing measurements for conduit locations.	Note 12 added per request.
11	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_H01,Y96	Please clarify, and make in agreement between plans and specs, Note 9 on H1 to what is stated in the specifications. Note says, for example, symbols are inlaid 250, specs include symbols both inlaid and surface applied.	Specs and plans have been coordinated
13	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_H03	Update with newest sheet with date of 09/13/2010, as these sheets are updated periodically.	Sheet updated to 10/13/2016 version.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
22	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_H03	General Notes. Delete references to Std Dwg T-30.10.	New 10/13/2016 version doesn't contain references to standard drawing T-30.10.
23	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_H03	Standardize dimensioning formats. Units are missing on Side Mounted Traffic Signal Hardware Detail	New 10/13/2016 version has correct units.
9	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	_H03	Is the Side Mounted Traffic Signal Hardware detail really depicting a "class 3 wood pole"? Looks like a round pipe to me.	Standard detail taken from DOT FTP site.
14	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_H04	The general notes associated with the detail have two references to Standard Drawing T-30.10. This standard drawing is obsolete and CR does not use its replacement. For CR projects we detail the hardware within the plan set, look at Sheets H5 and H6...it appears you may have all that is needed? Update with newest sheet with date of 09/13/2010, as these sheets are updated periodically.	Reference to T-30.10 removed and reference to Signal Hardware Detail Sheet remains.
24	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_H04	Note 2: resistant is misspelled. Note 3: Fix indenting modifyable Hanger For Sign Mounting Detail – Is "Shurlock" the correct spelling?	Sheet updated to 10/13/2016 version. New 10/13/2016 version doesn't contain spelling and indenting errors. "Shurlock" is spelled correctly.
7	E. Desentis (DOT)	_H04	General note #4 – should not spec a sole sourced item.	New 10/13/2016 version includes "or equal."
25	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_H05	Vehicle Emitter Table: Shouldn't the MOA requirements be used?	(H6) The table shown is typical. This has been verified by Chris Bentz.
12	M. Sickler, K. Woo (MOA Signals)	_H06	EVP Installation Details. Part #6 revisions. 1. Change part type description to ¾" x 2" galvanized nipple. 2. Change quantity to "Add 2 to kit". 3. Change detail drawing. Part #6 is a shorter version of Part #9.	(H7) Part 6 revised as directed.
15	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_H07	Update with newest sheet with date of 12/01/2015, as these sheets are updated periodically.	Sheet updated to 10/13/2016 version.
16	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	_H08	Update with newest sheet with date of 12/01/2015, as these sheets are updated periodically.	Sheet updated to 10/13/2016 version.
26	C. Larson (DOT HD)	_H08	Section B-B Windbeam Cross Section – What are the units?	Updated 10/13/2016 version has units.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
27	C. Larson (DOT HD)	A:B01	1. New Roadway Structural Section Detail "C" – Add STE-1, Tack Coat 2. North Island Detail – Delete the vertical line to the left of "Varies" 3. Old Seward Highway Widening detail – Make the right 1:1 line dashed. A solid line makes it look like it's supposed to be a different material.	Requested changes have been made
8	E. Desentis (DOT)	A:B01	Normally we would expect to see 2" of type II and 2 "of V or VH. Usually we would cut out the pavement for the new curb and gutter and patch with type II (placed by hand) then come in with a mill and take out 1.75" then pave out with 2" of Type VH. This should be done where there are not widespread drainage improvements; to preserve what are already very flat intersections.	Hard aggregate HMA has been dropped from the plans.
10	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	A:B01	1. Suggest 6" concrete thickness consistent with recent Muldoon Road median install project. Will discuss in review meeting. 2. 12" of D-1 under the median is not advised, this is an expensive and slightly frost susceptible material. Select A with 2-4" of D-1 would perform better. Will discuss in review meeting. 3. 44" of D-1 is something I have never seen. Will discuss in review meeting.	Use 6" concrete. Pay item for Borrow Type A has been added to plans
28	C. Larson (DOT HD)	A:F01	1. Please verify that the northern median will provide adequate room for left turns off the highway. I watched traffic flow here for a few moments and every turning vehicle ran over the striped median. 2. Do we really want a pedestrian crossing across the south leg with an unrestricted traffic flow from the highway?	MOA and DOT traffic engineers confirmed need for crossing. Crossing has been modified to accommodate maintenance and turning concerns. Nose pulled back and refuge provided with colored concrete flush with asphalt pavement.
1	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	A:F01	The GCI underground .500 coaxial cable crossing at 'OSH' station 5+55 is not shown on the plans.	Referenced cable added to plans.
6	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	A:F01	The north bound lane north of East 34th Avenue is too narrow. Please narrow the median to provide NLT 16' clearance from curb face to curb face.	Median modified to allow 16' clearance on each side.
7	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	A:F01	OSH & E. 34th Illumination Plan? – Do not see any new illumination scheduled at this intersection.	(A H1) Illumination removed from table.
29	C. Larson (DOT HD)	A:F02	"COW"? On some of the other grading sheets, the TBC point at the center of the curb ramp is labelled "COR." On other tables just say "TBC".	Grading coordinates have been coordinated
3	B. Nickeson (DOT M&O)	A:H01	Recommend no standalone median nose	Modified to pull back nose and keep refuge area by adding colored concrete flush with asphalt pavement.
4	B. Nickeson (DOT M&O)	A:H01	Pave out radius at SE corner	A 15' radius has been added at the southeast corner

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
5	B. Nickeson (DOT M&O)	A:H01	Include delineators at median corners where there is no sign	Signs and/or delineators have been located at the ends of all medians.
17	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	A:H01	Nice signage improvements! Please check that the 36"x36" stop sign in the median at STA. 4+84 is not going to be a sight obstruction for any approach. Standard 30"x30" could be used if that makes any difference in visibility.	Post heights were adjusted to ensure that distance from bottom of bottom sign to ground is at least 3.5'.
30	C. Larson (DOT HD)	A:H01	Make sure there is enough lateral and vertical clearance at signs 3 and 5. The D3 signs are pretty long and will extend well into the curb ramp and over the access sidewalk. Can these be moved out of the sidewalk? That would be better for snow removal as well.	Signs have been relocated out of sidewalk/ramp area. Post heights have been adjusted to ensure that distance from bottom of bottom sign is at least 3.5'.
1	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	A:H01	a. Please dimension the striping for lane width. b. The OM1-1 signs are typically not required in conjunction with the R4-7 signs. c. Should you provide a W4-4P cross traffic sign for the southbound approach?	A. Lane widths added. B. OM1-1 signs removed. C. W4-4P signs added for northbound, southbound, and eastbound approaches.
1	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	A:H01	Post 2. Why is this sign being added about 40' north of an existing sign on the light pole at ~Station 3+51, 29.5' Right? Will the existing sign be removed? Suggest removing the post for sign 2 and utilize the light pole. No need to add another post, it adds to maintenance.	Sign is now on light pole.
2	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	A:H01	Post 3. Do not place in the sidewalk.	Post has been removed from sidewalk.
3	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	A:H01	~Station 4+95, 26' Right. What is the plan for the existing light pole?	Existing light pole to remain. Side walk redesigned to avoid existing light pole.
4	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	A:H01	Post 5. Do not place in the sidewalk.	Post has been removed from sidewalk.
5	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	A:H01	~Station 5+55, 57' Left. What is the plan for the existing light pole?	Light pole to be relocated (info has been added to D Sheets)
6	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	A:H01	Post 7. A no left turn symbol sign is an R3-2. Make sure signs throughout the plans have the correct designation.	Sign designation fixed.
18	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	A:H01,H02	The two W4-4p signs have an arrow inserted in the middle of the panel. This is not part of the standard sign per MUTCD or Alaska designs. Use standard panel. There is another option in the MUTCD if direction is needing to be expressed, it's a different panel.	Plans revised to show "Traffic From Right Does Not Stop", "Traffic From Left Does Not Stop", or "Oncoming Traffic Does Not Stop" as appropriate (W4-4aP)
11	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	A:H02	Post 5. Verify framing is correctly stated.	Framing has been verified.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
47	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	A:H10	No luminaire schedule available for this PIH review.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
46	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	A:H7, A:H8	Existing OH CEA Conductors xing Raspberry Road west of intersection. Will the New signal/illumination pole be in conflict with the OH conductor and clear space requirements?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
2	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	B:A01	1. Correct spelling of College Village Subdivision 2. Correct Legend for Primary Centerline Monument	Spelling corrected. Property changed to primary.
9	E. Desentis (DOT)	B:A01	"College" Subdivision, not "Collage"	Spelling has been corrected
31	C. Larson (DOT HD)	B:F01	Check grading at points BF1-4 and BF1-5. The landing elevation is higher than the top of the ramp elevation.	Grades have been revised
2	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	B:F01	Will existing power and load center be used for the temporary signal and who will be paying the bill during construction?	Yes, existing power and load center will be used for the temporary signal. Current utility payee will continue to pay power bills through construction.
45	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	B:F01	Please provide signal load center independent of any illumination at this intersection. All existing SOA lighting should remain SOA lighting.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
19	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	B:F01, H01	ROW label in the NW corner is in incorrect location.	ROW Label position corrected.
3	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	B:H01	Correct the weight of the long dash linetype at NE corner.	Long dash line was private property line and is now turned off.
3	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	B:H01	Can the existing pole in the southwest quad be used for to hang the temporary signal instead of installing TP2?	Yes, Mike Sickler with MOA signals confirmed this is possible with a temporary modification to the pole foundation. See specs for modification details.
13	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H01	Temporary Signal Note #1 calls for matching existing configuration. Plan view indicates new signal head configuration (added signal #23).	Signal 23 removed from temporary plan.
14	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H01	Plan lacks temporary wood pole on NE quadrant for spanning temporary signal cables from NE to NW quadrants. Existing lighting/traffic signal pole on NE is a slip base type. Do not use as portion of temporary signal plan.	After further investigation, you confirmed using the slip base pole in the NE quadrant is possible with a temporary modification to the pole foundation. Notes added to plans indicating coordination with MOA signals.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
20	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	B:H02	Revise note 2 last sentence to read "and existing J-Box 12". There are two j-boxes labeled as twelve so we need to distinguish or relabel boxes, plus "JB" is not defined but the junction box schedule is titled "J-Box".	Note is fixed.
21	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	B:H02	Revise notes 3-5, as collectively they imply all conduit is in place. What is the purpose of j-box 12? Does new conduit run from existing j-box 12 to new j-box 12 and then to pole 1? Plans do not show this and notes confuse the issue further. There will certainly be new conduit to the new pole foundation.	Note is revised.
22	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	B:H02	Plans show an interconnect cable, where is it being pulled from or to? Note 2 addresses the signal cables but not interconnect.	Interconnect work is now shown.
23	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	B:H02	Missing a callout for 2-3C14 cables for the ped buttons. This is the cable leaving the controller to junction box 12. You have it right going across the street but missing it from the callout on the right.	Missing callout is now added.
32	C. Larson (DOT HD)	B:H02	Add Opticon symbol on P1 mastarm.	Opticom symbol is now shown.
15	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H02	JB12 relocation modifications. 1. Need to add conduit extension work on plan view, between old JB12 and new JB12. 2. Also need to add conduit extension work on plan view, for existing conduit coming from the west that route up into exiting JB12. 3. Will need to require that detector loop lead-in cable going to JB13 & JB14 also be replaced in their entirety back to the controller cabinet. Install 1-7pr. #18 to JB13 and 1-7pr. #18 to JB14. 4. Add loop identifier numbers to loops routing to JB13 & JB14. 5. A recent site visit indicated that 2-3C lighting cables route through j-box. One cable goes to Pole 1 and the other cable continues to the west. Will need to revise work to have new lighting cable installed to the next electroliner to the west of intersection. 6. Interconnect tie-in to existing system going to the west is incomplete. New cable will need to be pulled to the 1st j-box containing interconnect to the west of intersection. Appears that existing conduit system is joint usage j-boxes, roadway lighting and interconnect. Request that circuits be separated, including separate j-boxes at 1st joint use j-box to the west. 7. In the north leg conduit crossing: Move 2 -3c #8 cables into a single 2" conduit. Route traffic signal cables in 3" conduit. Route interconnect cable in 2" conduit. Retain 3" conduit as a spare.	1. Conduit extension work added between old and new JB12. 2. Conduit extension work added from both west and north of JB12. 3. Loop cable work to JB13 & 14 added. 4. Loop identifier numbers added. 5. Work to replace lighting cable west of JB12 added. 6. Work to replace interconnect cable west of JB12 to splice added. You confirmed interconnect and lighting do not share a common j-box. 7. Cables moved as directed.
16	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H02	Delete Note #4.	Note 4 deleted.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
17	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H02	New conduits and cables aren't indicated between new JB12 and new P1.	Conduits and cables between new JB12 and P1 added.
18	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H02	Opticom detector symbol is missing from P1 mast arm.	Opticom symbol added.
19	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H02	Phase Diagram. 1. Move pedestrian movement symbol to the right side of Phase 4 block. 2. Move pedestrian movement symbol to the left side of Phase 8 block.	Symbols moved.
7	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	B:H02	Recommend review of BIKE ROUTE signing against Bike Plan. There is no bike lane. Is this an ideal bike route? What does MOA prefer on this road?	Per S. Rzepka, MOA prefers this sign be removed and salvaged. Sign was removed from plans.
24	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	B:H03	Need to address the Luminaire Schedule and Lamp Schedule as this is not what is to be used on a signal pole over an intersection. The selection you have shown is for a wall mount used on a wall or tunnel, not for roadway lighting.	Luminaire schedule has been updated.
8	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	B:H03	E.36th & LaTouche Luminaire & Lamp Schedules – 150W HPS scheduled. Should the wattage be higher for this type of intersection? Has an illumination study been done to determine it meets MOA DCM Chapter 5 standards?	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project. Luminaire and lamp schedule are now updated.
1	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	B:H03	Through another project we came to the conclusion that Latouche St is the most consistent spelling (no capital T). Please update Street name signs.	Street sign updated to show lower case "t".
20	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H03	Widths of approach lanes to P1 aren't indicated. Approach lane "markings" are to edge of gutter, not to face of curb. Signals on mast arm are shown with an 11' offset. Designer should confirm that offsets are correct.	Widths added to elevation and offsets corrected.
21	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H03	P1 is shown having a 50' luminaire mounting height. MOA has used 40' mounting height in past projects.	Luminaire height changed to 40'
22	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H03	Pole No. 1 detail. 1. Relocate pedestrian signal #28 to standard mounting location. 2. Show signal #21 to the north side of pole.	Pedestrian signals and signal 21 moved to correct location.
23	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	B:H03	Luminaire Schedule & Lamp Schedule. Wattage is listed as 150. As this is a signalized pedestrian crossing, should wattage be 250?	Luminaire schedule has been updated.
33	C. Larson (DOT HD)	B:H03, C:H05	Add centerline line at rain cap.	Centerline at rain cap is now shown.
34	C. Larson (DOT HD)	B:H04	Last thickness in table. Change to "0.125".	Showing thickness is no longer DOT standard.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
2	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	B:H04	Through another project we came to the conclusion that Latouche St is the most consistent spelling (no capital T). Please update Street name signs.	Street sign updated to show lower case "t".
48	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	B:H1	Signal System Notes: Note 4, Note 5 & Note 7. There are no existing signal poles, controller cabinets and jboxes at this intersection.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
49	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	B:H1/B:H2	Will there be signals installed at this location? BH2 does not address a signal but all notes on BH1 address.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
50	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	B:H3	Will there be any signals requiring a summary table? Any illumination changes? Not noted/symbolized on BH2.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
35	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:B01	1. New Roadway Structural Section detail : Add STE-1, Tack Coat 2. E. Third Avenue - Typical Section: a. Add pavement black hatch. b. Move dimensioning arrow at top of the detail to the right. c. Say 4" Min Aggregate Base Course for D-1 under the median. d. Make the 1:1 line at the far left of the detail be dashed. e. Is that entire wedge of material under the left sidewalk going to be D-1? Can't we backfill with some of the excavated material? f. The median curb gutter pan should slope away from the median. Do the TBC grading points on the median reflect this?	1. STE-1, Tack Coat has been added 2a. Black hatch has been added 2b. Dimension arrow has been moved 2c. Clarify 2d. Line has been changed to dashed 2e. Structural Detail C has been modified to include 42" of Borrow, Type A. 2f. Typical section has been corrected; grading points reflect correct grading
10	E. Desentis (DOT)	C:B01	44" is a lot of D1. Also the note for 4" in the median does not look right.	This was intended, but design now calls for 42" of Type A Borrow
24	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:B01	Detail "C" indicates 44" of D-1.	This was intended, but design now calls for 42" of Type A Borrow
12	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	C:B01	Same 44" D-1 thickness Detail on this sheet.	This was intended, but design now calls for 42" of Type A Borrow
38	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:F01	Looks like new j-boxes are going in at the bottom the curb ramps on the NW and SE corners.	JBs are existing and are being relocated.
39	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:F01	1. Check the grading. CF1-6 is higher than CF1-7, and yet it is at the bottom of a ramp. 2. CF1-31: Add ME to table. 3. Can't tell what the CF1-9 grading point label is pointing to. 4. Driveway Sta IS 6+00 RT and alley Sta IS 6+45 RT. What is the surface course material? Type VH HMA? Provide an approach typical section.	Grading has been corrected and points have been updated. Approach typical section added to plans

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
4	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	C:F01	1. Use correct linetype for ROW acquisition at SE corner. 2. Show the existing ROW for the SE corner as it continues around the curve. 3. Remove "Acquisition Area" text from acquisitions 4. Remove "Proposed ROW Acquisition" from Temporary acquisitions and already acquired	1. Linetype changed to ROW line. 2. ROW shown to view extents. 3. Acquisitions text removed. 4. Acquisitions text removed.
4	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	C:F01	ACS aerial 200 pair crossing Ingra Street at 'IS' station 6+14 is mislabeled. Should be OT.	ACS utility labeling corrected.
5	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	C:F01	There should be a water valve box to the fire hydrant on the NE quadrant of Ingra and 4th Avenue. Confirm location of the valve and adjust as required (RD 19527).	Valve identified and added to plans.
6	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	C:F01	AWWU redlines indicate a water valve in the 4th-3rd alley, but none shown on the plans. Confirm valve location and adjust as required (RD 6382).	Valve identified and added to plans.
7	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	C:F01	ENSTAR redlines indicate a natural gas valve in the 4th-3rd alley, but none shown on the plans. Confirm valve location and adjust as required (GRID 1232).	Valves could not be identified in the field, so they were added based on Enstar record drawings.
8	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	C:F01	Manhole cover shown within the new curb/gutter. Confirm location and evaluate whether cone rotation or other action is required.	Cone and reducing slab to be rotated to get access lid out of curb and gutter. Ladder rungs will be removed and reinstalled. Notes added to plans to indicate needed work. Field verified that this is possible
9	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:F01	Grading Plan: Spelling of Acquisition in SW corner.	Acquisitions are complete and text removed from plans.
10	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:F01	Please note the NE curb return radius does not meet the minimum specified permitted in the MOA Design Criteria Manual. Please clarify.	For returns at prohibited turning movements (one-way), DCM minimum is 5 feet. (See Figure 1-22, Note 6)
11	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:F01	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
25	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:F01	Load center is indicated as being outside of ROW. This is a very old "Skyline" type with a meter main utility meter/disconnect bolted to the back of the original enclosure. The load center enclosure mount is wobbly. No post supports; load center only sits atop conduits entering bottom of enclosure. [See picture in original comment doc.] Request that deficient old center be replaced.	Load center verified to be farther south than previously shown, and is now shown outside of the project limits. Since load center is outside of disturbance area, it will not be replaced by this project.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
26	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:F01	There are two Type 2 j-boxes located in the asphalt roadway on E. 4th at approx. "IS" 4+40, 36 LT and at "IS" 4+80, 32 LT. Both j-boxes are in the traveled way, not in shoulder areas. Our records indicate that traffic signal cabling doesn't route through j-boxes, but possible lighting circuits do. Asphalt removal limits encompass these j-boxes. J-boxes should be moved out of roadway. Designer should contact ML&P regarding if active lighting circuits in j-boxes.	ML&P has commented that these two j-boxes are not theirs. We popped the lid on the north j-box and confirmed lighting circuits. JB's are relocated to sidewalks adjacent to light poles.
36	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:F01-C:F02	This is a fairly extensive reconstruction on sloping terrain. Can this be built based only on a few TBC grading points, and no roadway profile? If no profile is to be provided, consider adding some grading points on the crown. Add more TBC grading points at Ingra and 3rd .	Additional grading points have been added.
37	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:F01-C:F02	Consider using a smaller scale for these plan views, and moving the tables to their own sheets.	All F-Sheets have been chagned to 1"=10'. All H-Sheets remain at 1"=20'
40	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:F02	1. Lower right corner: Ingra is misspelled. 2. Can you put an angle in the median curb cut so that direction of movement will be more perpendicular to the curb lines at each end? 3. Where is the roadway crown on E 3rd west of the new median? I assume it is on the centerline. Show how the crown transitions from a high point at the median back to the centerline. 4. Show how the driveway at Sta 3A 18+75 LT will be reconstructed? Show cut/fill lines. Will a TCE be needed? Approach typical section? 5. There is an existing curb inlet at Sta IS 7+74.81, 22 RT that is being removed, and replaced by S2-1 at Sta IS 8+10.51, 20.37 RT. Consider relocating S2-1 to a point along Ingra that will capture the drainage before it reaches the curb ramp on the SE corner. 6. Provide a detail for the curb ramp on the SE corner. Why can't a standard perpendicular curb ramp be built here? 7. There are some dramatic grade changes at this location. Please provide more grading points. It would be helpful to have points directly across the road/lane from each other so that you can see at a glance if the slopes are working. Show pavement surface contours. 8. Looks like the west end of the median is too low relative to the south curb....and the slope across the wide turn lane between CF2-2 and CF2-17 is about 0.15%, but it's hard to tell from the info given....	1. Spelling has been corrected 2. The angle has been coordinated with MOA 3. the crown corresponds with the asphalt cut line. The curb on the north side of the median is a catch-type expressway curb & gutter. To collect water captured by this curb the existing storm drain manhole in the intersection (S3-1) will be converted to a field inlet. 4. The driveway will be constructed at a 15% slope within the existing ROW. 5. A catch basin will be installed directly over the sewer line. 6. Grading points provided at all points within ramp. The grade changes prevent the standard curb ramp 7. Additional grading points provided, contours shown on project C. 8. Grades have been corrected and contours are shown.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
2	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	C:F02	Per the MOA Traffic Engineer, provide an ADA compliant ramp on the east leg for north/south pedestrian movements.	ADA compliant ramp provided. 3rd Avenue crossing cross slope is 6% and impracticable to correct within the scope of the project.
5	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	C:F02	1. Remove "Acquisition Area" text from acquisitions 2. SW corner (E-1, E-2, E-3, E-4) have been acquired, show the correct linetype and location for existing ROW 3. SE corner use correct linetype for existing ROW 4. Correct spelling of Ingra in the title block 5. Mask text for CF2-2	1. Acquisitions text removed. 2. Proposed ROW changed to ROW. 3. Existing PUE line changed to ROW. 4. Spelling corrected. 5. Grading point labels are revised.
11	E. Desentis (DOT)	C:F02	Median with ped cuts like this are difficult to remove snow from. Check with maintenance to see if this is close to their preferred layout.	Median configuration coordinated with MOA street maintenance
9	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	C:F02	Consider adding the new pole (P5) to this sheet. Can't find detail on it until sheet C: H5.	Pole symbol added to this sheet.
10	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	C:F02	There is a water valve box at approximate station 'IS' 8+00, Left that requires adjustment. Not eligible in the detail on this sheet and not included in the table on Sheet D3.	Valve added to 'D' sheet table.
12	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:F02	Please note the SE curb return radius does not meet the minimum specified permitted in the MOA Design Criteria Manual. Please clarify.	For returns at prohibited turning movements (one-way), DCM minimum is 5 feet. (See Figure 1-22, Note 6)
13	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:F02	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
27	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:F02	Will SD inlet and manhole in vicinity of STA. "IS" 7+75, 22 RT be removed?	The existing catch basin will be replaced with a MOA Type I manhole (S3-5), and will receive runoff from new MOA Catch Basin S3-3
52	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:H	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection -- Arterial/Collector and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
25	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H01	Remove note 3 and 5, as this information is covered in the specification and these notes are not used on other signal sheets where they would also apply. Leave it in specs.	Notes Removed.
26	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H01	Will a temp signal be needed here to complete this work?	Note 3 has been added to C:H1.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
27	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H01	Sheet boarder says this sheet is at 10 scale, believe it is noe like 40 scale. Use standard scaling as stated previous and be consistent throughout plans. Scale issue has led to incorrect use and/or view of existing vs. new features/linetypes/symbols. i.e. j-boxes on this sheet all look new, but they are not based on other info in plans.	Sheet scale has been changed to 10. Scale callout on border matches sheet scale. Existing and new linetypes are now correct.
28	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H01	Need notes to describe how wiring/conduits are to be intercepted/reused/replaced. No info really describes this ant the line-work is not clear enough to depict this, or the intended work.	Note and wiring diagram on C:H2 describe intended work.
29	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H01	Appears that there are 2 j-boxes at or near pole 3 suggest numbering this j-box, it is not numbered but looks like it is being used.	Only one type III junction box is needed near pole 3. Extra junction box has been deleted.
41	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:H01	1. J-Boxes 3, 4, and 5 are shown as new installations on this sheet, but only #2 is shown as new on C:H2. Is this a linetype problem? 2. Is the luminaire on the NW corner being moved? If not, check to see if there will be adequate sidewalk width past the pole foundation once the curb ramp backing curb is constructed in front of it.	1. Linetype issue is corrected. J-boxes 2, 3, & 4 are proposed. 2. Yes, luminaires on NW and SW corners are shown relocated out of ramps.
6	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	C:H01	1. Use correct linetype for permanent acquisition at SE corner 2. Show the existing ROW for the SE corner as it continues around the curve	1. Proposed ROW changed to ROW. 2. Existing ROW shown to view extents.
28	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H01	Plan appears to indicate new electrolrier poles on NW & SW corners, but work isn't indicated on C:H2 and C:H3 sheets. Existing poles have a 'pier' type foundation and are located in the existing sidewalk along 4th. Do existing pole foundations provide for acceptable ADA clearance width.	Poles are shown relocated, and work included in C:H2 and C:H3.
29	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H01	Delete pedestrian push button #88 from plan.	Pedestrian push button #88 removed.
30	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H01	Correct phase diagram to show Phase 1 as NB and Phase 2 as EB.	Phase diagram changed as directed.
30	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H02	This sheet depicts the work better than C:H1, but still not using correct linetypes per index sheet H1.	Linetype has been corrected.
31	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H02	Describe work to be done with the interconnect. Not shown in runs from j-box 2 back to controller or elsewhere. It appears to terminate in j-box 2.	Interconnect work is now shown.
32	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H02	Do you really want a 14" conduit running from j-box 2 to the interconnect?	Existing conduit size is 1.5". The 14" conduit callout is now deleted.
33	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H02	Missing the j-box that is shown on sheet C:H2, between j-box 3 and pole 3.	Extra j-box has been deleted.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
31	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H02	Wiring diagram. - New 12 pr. #19 interconnect cable will need to be installed between the 4th & Ingra controller cabinet and the 5th & Ingra controller cabinet. - IC conduit going south from JB2 is 1½". - Modify conduit quantity between P2 and JB2 to indicate 1-3" and 2-2" new conduits. - Show lighting cable between P2 and load center as new. - Show interconnect cable between JB2 and controller cabinet as new and as #19 AWG. - Delete new 1-3#14 between controller cabinet and P2. No push button on pole. - South leg road crossing consists of 3-2" conduits. Route IC, lighting and TS cables in separate conduits. No spare conduit in the road crossing. - Show JB4 as new. - Need to show conduit intercept/extension work at JB4. - Conduit & cable quantities between existing JB4 and P4 are a single 2" conduit containing 2-3c #8 and 1-7c#14. - Need to show new cabling that routes through relocated JB4. - North leg road crossing consists of 3-2" conduits. Route IC, lighting and TS cables in separate conduit. No spare conduit in the road crossing. - West leg road crossing consists of 3-2" conduits. Route IC, lighting and TS cables in separate conduit. Conduit containing TS cables will be nearly filled to 38% capacity. No spare conduit in the road crossing. - Between controller cabinet and JB3, there are only 2-3" conduits. This results in the cabinet power feed conductors being routed in same conduit with TS and interconnect cables. - Show JB3 as new. - Need to show conduit intercept/extension work at JB3.	- Interconnect cable work added. - Conduit size corrected. - Conduit quantity corrected. - Lighting cabled changed to new. - Interconnect cable changed to new. - Push button cable removed. - Conduit size corrected. - JB4 shown as new. - Conduit intercept/extensions added. - Conduit and cable quantity corrected. - Same comment applies to pole 3. - New cabling shown. - Conduit sizes corrected. A spare conduit was added. - Conduit sizes corrected. A spare conduit was added. - Existing condition to remain. - JB3 changed to new. - Conduit work added at JB3.
34	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H03	- Need to show new cabling that routes through relocated JB3. - If new electrolliers (with pedestrian signals) are being installed on NW and SW quadrants – need to add to plan. - Request the installation of spare conduits in all road crossings, particularly the west side crossing. - Request that controller foundation be replaced so that additional conduit can be routed up into controller foundation. J-box schedule shows all new j-boxes, sheet H2 symbols conflict with these remarks. What is the plan?	- Cabling is now shown. - Poles have been added to plans. - Spare road crossings have been added to west and south crossings. - This is out of scope work that would involve undesirable utility relocation. J-box schedule now matches C:H2. J-box 2, 3, & 4 are all new.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
35	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H03	Foundation schedule typically indicated an installation, the existing P2 is shown both here and in the pole salvage schedule. Should remove from the foundation schedule, don't see a reason to list it twice.	Existing P2 is now removed from foundation schedule.
36	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H03	Add j-box number to missing j-box number in J-Box Schedule.	J-box schedule has been revised to remove extra row.
37	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H03	Need to address the Luminaire Schedule and Lamp Schedule as this is not what is to be used on a signal pole over an intersection. The selection you have shown is for a wall mount used on a wall or tunnel, not for roadway lighting.	Luminaire schedule has been updated.
42	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:H03	Opticom Detector Schedule table: Shouldn't the facing direction be west?	Direction was changed to west in opticom detector schedule.
14	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:H03	E.4th & Ingra - Luminaire & Lamp Schedules – 150W HPS scheduled. Should the wattage be higher for this type of intersection? Has an illumination study been done to determine it meets MOA DCM Chapter 5 standards? All the existing SLs are 400W.	Intersection lighting has been evaluated and fixtures revised accordingly.
32	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H03	Change signal head numbering to reflect correct phasing.	Correct phasing is now shown.
33	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H03	Signal Pole 2 detail. 1. Shift signal #81 to south side of pole shaft. 2. Increase offset between signal #84 and R3-8LS sign to a minimum of 1'. 3. R6-2L sign is 30"x36"". Larger than previous size. 4. R3-1 sign is 24"x24". Should this be larger 36"x36" size? 5. P2 is shown having a 50' luminaire mounting height. Believe existing pole has 40' mounting height. 6. Need to install a single R10-3E "Modified" meaning of pedestrian signal sign.	1. Signal 21 (previously 81) has been shifted. 2. Offset between signal 24 (previously 84) and R3-8LS is 1' (52.4' + 11" + 1' separation + 15" = 55.6") 3. Size of R6-2L sign is 30"x36" for a multilane highway per MUTCD. 4. R3-1 size has been changed to 36"x36". 5. Mounting height is now 40'. 6. Modified R10-3E has been added.
34	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H03	J-Box Schedule. JB3 appears to have 2 listings. JB3 is a Type 3.	Second j-box 3 listing has been removed.
35	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H03	Luminaire Schedule & Lamp Schedule. Wattage is listed as 150. As this is a signalized pedestrian crossing, should wattage be 250?	Luminaire schedule has been updated. Wattage is now 250.
38	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H04	Label the lane guide skips and radius for the right turners southbound off Ingra St. at 4th Ave.	Guide skips labels added.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
39	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H04	Remove the 8" white dotted and continue the 4" white skip to the beginning of the 8" white lane line at 3rd Ave.	PSE review meeting deemed this comment not applicable.
40	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H04	Appears that sign 1 is in the sidewalk. Should we use this sign (W1-6R) as it is a large sign at this location? Will it fit w/o being an obstruction?	Sign has been removed.
41	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H04	Show sign post 4 as a double sign. Shows a R3-108B and a R5-1 on same post back to back of each other. Throughout plans, on all back to back signs, make this change.	Sign symbol is now showing a double sign.
43	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:H04	Add the radius of the turning skip stripe.	Radius label has been added.
3	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	C:H04	a. Dimension the striping or lane widths b. Verify the parking lane shoulder stripe width on Ingra at 3+75. Typically these are 4" white. c. Delete the arrow pavement markings shown on 4th Ave. d. Delete the through arrow marking on Ingra at 4+10, 6' left.	A. Dimensions added. B. Stripe label corrected to 4". C. Markings deleted. D. Marking deleted.
7	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	C:H04	1. Use correct linetype for ROW acquisition at SE corner. 2. Show the existing ROW for the SE corner as it continues around the curve. 3. Mask the 'Left Turn Only' Sign	1. Proposed ROW changed to ROW. 2. Existing ROW shown to view extents. 3. Sign is now on CHS.
36	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H04-C:H05	New sidewalk being installed on west side of Ingra between 3rd & 4th. No illumination between intersections and the existing luminaire on SW quadrant of 3rd & Ingra is being relocated about 40' to the west.	The luminaire on the SW quadrant is being moved 28' to the south. The new luminaire will not bring the intersection into uniformity conformance. Upgrades to lighting was not included in the scope of this project, however the design aims to bring impacted intersections into conformance with MOA lighting standards when feasible. Meeting lighting standards at 3rd and Ingra is not feasible.
42	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H05	On pole radial index, what is the "3A" mean? Also, the luminaire orientation is not shown and should be.	"3A" refers to 3rd Ave alignment. Luminaire orientation is now shown.
43	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H05	Remove the chevrons at the end of the median around sta. "3A "18+00 as they are not required.	Chevrons are now removed.
44	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	C:H05	Need to address the Luminaire Schedule and Lamp Schedule as this is not what is to be used on a signal pole over an intersection. The selection you have shown is for a wall mount used on a wall or tunnel, not for roadway lighting.	Luminaire schedule is now updated.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
44	C. Larson (DOT HD)	C:H05	1. Add the 4" W SKIP line at the end of the gore striping on E 3rd. 2. Won't the lane stripe along the north edge of the new pavement on E 3rd need to be replaced?	1. 4" W dotted has been added per MOA as a transition back to existing standard 4" W skip. 2. Striping at the north edge of pavement is now shown.
4	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	C:H05	a. Show existing striping, verify whether the west bound through lanes on 3rd will require new markings. b. Provide Pedestrian warning signs for the approach to the free left pedestrian crossing. c. 2' / 6' dashed striping cycle should be provided on 3rd Ave west of the median markings and transition to the standard 10'/30' cycle. d. Remove the through arrow marking for northbound Ingra. e. Post 7; provide back to back one way sign (north facing R6-1R).	a. West bound striping is now shown. b. Pedestrian warning signs have been added. c. 4" white dotted (2'/6") has been added as a transition to existing standard skip stripe. d. Through arrow has been removed. e. Two signs back to back now shown on sign summary table.
8	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	C:H05	1. SW corner (E-1, E-2, E-3, E-4) have been acquired, show the correct linetype and location for existing ROW 2. SE corner use correct linetype for existing ROW 3. Mask signs and text	1. Proposed ROW changed to ROW. 2. Existing ROW is now shown correctly. 3. Signs are now masked.
15	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:H05	E.3rd & Ingra - Luminaire & Lamp Schedules - 150W HPS scheduled. Should the wattage be higher for this type of intersection? Has an illumination study been done to determine it meets MOA DCM Chapter 5 standards? All the existing MOA SLs are 250W.	Upgrades to lighting beyond the limit of disturbance is not included in the scope of this project. Luminaire and lamp schedule are now updated for pole No 5 in the SW quadrant. Intersection lighting performance table now shown for this intersection.
16	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:H05	E.3rd & Ingra - Plan view, The existing light pole in the NW corner is not shown. Will this remain?	The light pole in the NW corner is to remain. No work is planned for NW corner.
3	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	C:H05	It looks like street sign post 7 is on the SOUTH side of 3rd. If that is the case, Ingra St should be 300 block (not 200)	Block number changed to 300.
4	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	C:H05	It looks like the street sign post 7 is on the EAST side of Ingra. IF that is the case, E 3rd Ave is 900 block (not 800)	Block number changed to 900.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
37	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H05	Work pertaining to new lighting Pole #5 is incomplete. 1. Need wiring diagram showing existing conduits intercept/extension to new j-box on SW quadrant. 2. Need to show new lighting cable(s). 3. J-box type and location not shown. 4. Pole height not indicated.	1. Wiring diagram added to plans. 2. New lighting cable is now shown. 3. J-box 5 is now shown. 4. Pole height is now shown.
8	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	C:H05	H5 Are the widths between island at plowable widths? 16'?	The distance between the island and SW corner face-of-curb to face-of-curb is 17.5' at the tightest point. The distance between the island and the SE corner face-of-curb is 15.4' at the tightest point.
5	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	C:H06	a. W1-6R correct sign size is 48 X 24. b. Ingra Street D3-101 signs shall be 12" height on signs 7 and 8.	a. This sign has been deleted. b. Sign heights have been changed to 12" .
5	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	C:H06	It looks like street sign post 7 is on the SOUTH side of 3rd. If that is the case, Ingra St should be 300 block (not 200)	Block number changed to 300.
6	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	C:H06	It looks like the street sign post 7 is on the EAST side of Ingra. IF that is the case, E 3rd Ave is 900 block (not 800)	Block number changed to 900.
38	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	C:H07	Add R10-3E "Modified" meaning pedestrian signal sign to sign schedule.	Sign added.
51	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	C:H5, A3	Plan -- NE corner of 36th & LaTouche -- symbols shown are not on the legend sheet, A3. Rectangle with lines each end and square with double lines.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
9	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:A02	Correct Legend for Property Line and Project Alignment & Stationing	Legend corrected.
10	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:A03	Correct alignment of Point 606 within the Vertical Control table	Alignment corrected.
11	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:A05	Remove 7TH AVENUE text near match line	Text removed.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
45	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:B01	1. Topsoil and seed is shown as typical at the edge of the sidewalk, when most sites either end against existing walls or are next to landscaped or paved areas with gravel, mulch, or asphalt surfacing. Can we add a note that says replace existing surfacing material as directed, and make this subsidiary to other items? 2. Show the crown separate from the centerline, with "Varies" as the dimensioning between.	Requested changes have been made
6	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:F	Provide red curb markings for all curb bulb areas and tapers. The downtown curbs are typically painted red in areas that parking is prohibited.	Red curb paint added to all tapers and curb bulb areas on D:H sheets.
12	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:F	Vicinity Map ROW of lines are too heavy and are not complete	Line weights are now lighter, but full property map to fill entire view is not developed for clarity.
12	E. Desentis (DOT)	D:F sheets	Grading table remarks i.e. "b facing", "+/- ME/E facing" What do these mean?	Begin and end steel face curb. Terms have been added to table of acronyms on sheet A3
1	Paul Janke (DOT HYD)	D:F Sheets	General: M&O prefers 18" diameter minimum storm drain pipes.	MOA standard size pipes are being used. 12" diameter storm drain pipes are typical on catch basin lead-ins in MOA.
2	Paul Janke (DOT HYD)	D:F Sheets	General: Consider rerouting some of the storm drain pipes so they do not all end in the manhole near the center of the intersection.	Has been reviewed.
3	Paul Janke (DOT HYD)	D:F Sheets	General: Ensure the manhole near the center of the intersection is large enough for all the penetrations.	Has been reviewed and revised.
45	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	D:F01	Appears that an electrical pole will be sitting in the pedestrian ramp, in the Northeast quadrant.	Pole location was surveyed. Pole will not be moved considering it is located outside of the ramp flare and outside of the ADA compliant path.
7	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:F01	Provide ADA ramps for the east / west crossing on the north leg of F Street.	Due to the steep slopes on the north leg, ADA ramps farther north than what is shown is not possible without major road reconstruction and ROW acquisitions.
13	E. Desentis (DOT)	D:F01	Most of the downtown curb bulbs do not have steel facing. Was this requested? See next...	Steel facing was required by MOA street maintenance.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
11	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F01	Valve boxes at 16+95, 33' right, and 16+92, 30' left, are natural gas valves. ENSTAR will adjust all gas valves. Contractor to participate in pre and post inspections.	Thank you for pointing this out. Per DOT legend water valves and gas valves share the same symbol.
12	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F01	There is potential conflict between the 4-inch steel gas main and the storm drain structures and pipes in the SW and SE quadrants. If contractor potholes the gas main and find conflicts, can the storm drain facilities be field adjusted to fit?	Curb ramps adjusted and catch basin relocated to avoid gas main. Storm drain facilities can be field adjusted provided the low point in the flow line is adjusted as well.
17	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F01	Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
18	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F01	W 3rd & F St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
19	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F01	W 3rd & F St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P pole and OH conductor in NE corner.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
53	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F01	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection – Arterial/Collector and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
54	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F01	Is an easement being acquired for the SE corner based on proposed improvements?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
55	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F01	SE and NE signal/SL poles and NW SL pole may be in conflict with the proposed improvements.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
14	E. Desentis (DOT)	D:F01, D:F03, D:F05	These intersections could be more like the recently constructed styles at 7th and Fst, 6th and Est, etc where the curb is depressed thru the pedestrian area. This is part of the same “core downtown” are and should be as consistent as possible with the other nearby intersections.	Per S. Rzepka, this comment pertains to raised intersections, and this project is not scoped to implement this type of improvement. Bulb designs not modified to match style at 7th and F St. and 6th and E St.
15	E. Desentis (DOT)	D:F01, DH01	Why are we deleting the existing crosswalk on the north leg of the intersection? Also, prefer to have 2 ramps on each corner rather than a shared ramp so that peds are not encouraged to stand in traffic.	Due to the steep slopes on the north leg, ADA ramps farther north than what is shown is not possible without major road reconstruction and ROW acquisitions.
16	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:F02	Correct Title Block: single line “W. 7TH AVE & D ST”	Title Block corrected.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
56	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F02	Is an easement being acquired for the SW corner based on proposed improvements?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
57	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F02	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
58	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F02	OH Electric not shown on the north side of the intersection including the existing pole in the NW corner.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
46	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:F03	Add a depressed curb symbol <4> in front of the driveway curb cut shown along 7th Av at about Sta SA 54+25 LT. Show the grade break lines for the driveway in the sidewalk.	Curb symbol and grade break lines added to drawing
8	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:F03	Plans indicate removal of the existing driveway on 7th Ave in the northeast quadrant. The adjacent existing parking area appears to require access to 7th Ave at this location	Driveway added to plans.
13	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F03	Valve box to the fire hydrant at 'SA' 53+44, 35' left, is shown on the plans but not on the summary table on Sheet D3. Confirm if the valve box is within the new curb.	Valve box confirmed to not conflict with new curb, but will need to be adjusted to grade. Valve adjustment added to summary table.
39	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	D:F03	Incorrect symbol used for Type 2 j-box located at STA "SA" 53+90.28, 21.65 RT.	Correct symbol added.
40	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	D:F03	Shallow traffic signal interconnect conduit along the south side of 7th Ave. isn't shown. Recommend that warning note be added to sheet.	Conduit and warning callout added.
20	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F03 (D:F05)	W 7th & D St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
21	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F03 (D:F05)	W 7th & D St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P pole and OH conductor in the SE corner.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
22	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F04 (D:F06?)	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
48	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:F05	NW corner. What is the intent here? We don't want backing curb in the middle of a sidewalk.	Sidewalk behind curb is intended to removed.
9	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:F05	Verify the status of the ADA ramp in the northeast quadrant of this intersection. Pavement removal and replacement triggers the requirement to construct compliant ramps in all quadrants.	This quadrant was removed from the project scope due to impacts to the bus loading zone.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
13	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:F05	Delete TCE-6	TCE-6 deleted.
14	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F05	Manhole cover at 'SA' station 41+30, 12' right, shown within the new curb. Confirm location and evaluate whether cone rotation or other action is required.	Manhole location confirmed. Cone rotation of indicated on plans. Field-verified feasibility of rotating cone.
15	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F05	Only a portion of the 8-inch steel gas main is shown on the plans in the SE quadrant. Extend the main across 7th Avenue.	Gas main extended per request.
16	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F05	GCI underground facilities along the west side H Street, including 156 and 36 count fiber optic cables, are not shown on the plans.	GCI facilities added to plans based on GIS map information.
41	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	D:F05	Incorrect symbols have been used to identify traffic signal Type 2 & Type 3 j-boxes at 7th & H intersection.	Correct symbols added.
42	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	D:F05	Intersection is "piped" for a future traffic signal installation. Conduit system isn't shown.	Conduit system added.
23	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F05 (D:F07)	W 7th & H St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt. This is a very busy pedestrian area.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
24	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F05 (D:F07)	W 7th & H St. – Please remove the existing pole stub and foundation in the SW corner if no longer needed.	Pole is outside of ROW and not part of the scope of this project.
47	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:F05, D:F13	Some F sheets show grade points at the edge pavement where it is matching existing curb, and some don't. Be consistent.	Match existing grade points are now consistent.
16	E. Desentis (DOT)	D:F05, DH03	Prefer 2 ramps on the NW corner, see above.	Two separate perpendicular curb ramps did not fit at this location.
25	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F06	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
49	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:F07	What is happening with S7-3?	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
17	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F07	Valve box at 'SA' station 88+78, 27' right, is not included in table on sheet D3.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
26	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F07	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
27	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F07	W 8th & C St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic that crosses C Street at this intersection to access the Social Security Administration.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
28	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F07	W 8th & C St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P poles and OH conductor in the NW corner.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
29	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F07	W 8th & C St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P pole in the NE corner.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
43	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	D:F07	Incorrect symbols have been used to identify Type 2 j-boxes on all four quadrants at 8th & C intersection.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
44	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	D:F07	Existing Type 2 j-boxes on various corners at 8th & C are in poor shape. 1. NE & SE j-boxes had a grout finish placed on top of the deteriorating j-boxes. Sidewalk demolition work will likely result in these temporary repairs failing. Replace both j-boxes. 2. NW j-box is in very poor condition. Edges of lid ring are exposed. Replace j-box.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
45	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	D:F07	Intersection is “piped” for a future traffic signal installation. There is also an interconnect conduit routing along the east side of C St. Conduit systems aren’t shown.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
9	S. Thomas; J. Knowles (DOT Traffic)	D:F07	In the CBD, let's review E-W crossing continuity along all of 8th Ave, and our options at C St.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
14	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:F09 (D:F7)	Delete TCP-15	TCP-15 deleted.
30	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F09 (D:F7)	W 8th & D St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
31	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F09 (D:F7)	W 8th & D St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P mast arm and HPS head in the NW corner.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
50	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:F09, D:F11, D:F13 (D:F7, D:F9, D:F11)	Use dashed linetype for existing curb ramps.	Existing ramps shown as dashed.
32	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F10 (D:F8)	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
51	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:F11 (D:F9)	Show P11-12	Existing pipe is now shown.
10	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:F11 (D:F9)	Ensure ADA accessibility is provided across the driveway on 8th Ave in the northwest corner. Sidewalk shall not be tipped beyond 2%	Driveway ramp revised to provide ADA access.
33	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F11 (D:F9)	W 8th & E St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
34	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F11 (D:F9)	W 8th & E St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P mast arms and HPS heads in the NW corner.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
35	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F12 (D:F10)	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
52	C. Larson (DOT HD)	D:F13 (D:F11)	1. NE quadrant: Judging by the drainage arrows, need an inlet near DF13-17. 2. What happens to the crown to the east and north of DF13-40?	Drainage matches existing condition and flows across street to catch basin on east side of leg. Drainage arrow added for clarity. Crown will be maintained where connecting to existing.
15	E. Anderson (DOT ROW)	D:F13 (D:F11)	Delete TCE-12	TCE-12 Deleted.
18	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F13 (D:F11)	Why are the valve boxes at 'EA' stations 74+57, and 74+58, left, called out for adjustment on Summary Sheet D3?	Valves removed from table.
19	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F13 (D:F11)	The 4-inch plastic gas main along the north side of W. 8th Avenue is not shown on the plans.	Gas main added to plans.
36	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F13 (D:F11)	W 8th & G St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt. This is a very busy pedestrian location.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
37	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F13 (D:F11)	W 8th & G St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P wooden pole, mast arm, OH conductor and HPS head in the SE corner.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
38	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F14 (D:F12)	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
20	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F15 (D:F13)	There are 8-inch steel and 4-inch plastic gas mains along H Street in the NE quadrant. Only a portion of the 8-inch main is shown on the plans. The 4-inch main is not shown at all.	Gas mains added to plans.
39	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F15 (D:F13)	W 8th & H St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt. This is a very busy pedestrian location.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
40	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F15 (D:F13)	W 8th & H St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P poles, mast arms, and HPS heads in the NW and SE corners. Do not see symbology for the ML&P light on the wooden pole in the NW corner.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
41	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F16 (D:F14)	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
21	J. Shapiro (DOT Utilities)	D:F17 (D:F15)	There is a potential conflict between the 4-inch steel gas main and storm drain catch basin S17-2 and pipe P17-2. Can the storm drain facilities be field adjusted to fit if we pothole the gas main and there are conflicts?	Intersection has been regraded and catch basins relocated to avoid conflict with gas main.
42	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F17 (D:F15)	W 8th & K St. – The existing illumination does not meet MOA DCM standards. Please include illumination for this intersection since it is being completely rebuilt.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
43	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F17 (D:F15)	W 8th & K St. – Please have ML&P remove the existing ML&P mast arm and HPS head in the NW corner. Do not see symbology for the ML&P SL pole in the SE corner.	Upgrades to lighting is not included in the scope of this project.
44	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:F18 (D:F16)	Pipe Summary. Please change the storm pipe type from CSP to CPEP Type S.	Pipe material changed to CPEP.
11	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:H01	This project is improving pedestrian visibility and reducing pedestrian exposure with shorter crossing distances; per the MOA Traffic Engineer, delete the crosswalk markings shown on all legs and provide stop bars on the northbound approach of F Street.	Crosswalks deleted and stop bars provided as directed.
46	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	D:H03	A signal/beacon pole exists in the SE corner of the intersection, please show it on these sheets.	Pole is now shown.
47	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	D:H04 (Removed)	Suggest changing the 4" w to a 4" y on southbound C Street (Left side of roadway).	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
12	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:H04 (Removed)	This project is improving pedestrian visibility and reducing pedestrian exposure with shorter crossing distances; per the MOA Traffic Engineer, delete the crosswalk markings shown and provide stop bars for the 8th Ave approaches to C Street.	This intersection has been removed from the scope of this project.
48	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	D:H05, H07- H09 (D:H4, H06- H08)	Why are there no crosswalk being striped at these locations? All other intersections in these plans that have pedestrian ramps are also receiving marked crossings of one form or another, why not these locations?	S. Thomas stated ATM requires parallel bars at stop signs. MOA traffic says to use stop bars at certain intersections. Rzepka recommends meeting ATM first then consider MOA traffic suggestions. Overall, Rzepka requested consideration of overall downtown striping for consistency. Final decision was to follow D. Boots direction.
13	D. Boots (MOA Traffic)	D:H06 (D:H5)	This project is improving pedestrian visibility and reducing pedestrian exposure with shorter crossing distances; per the MOA Traffic Engineer, delete the crosswalk markings shown and provide stop bars for the 8th Ave approaches to E Street.	Crosswalks deleted and stop bars provided as directed.
59	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	D:H07 (D:H6)	Ingra & Alley b/t 3rd and 4th Avenue – there is a power pole in the SW corner that could be in conflict with the proposed curb cut.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
7	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	D:H08 (D:H7)	Sign post 21 is on the WEST side of H St, which means W 8th Ave should be 800 block (not 700) please correct	Block number changed to 800.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
49	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	D:H09 (D:H08)	Appears that the Electrical pole in the northwest quad might be in the ped ramp.	Pole location was surveyed. Pole will not be moved considering it is located outside of the ramp flare and outside of the ADA compliant path.
8	K. Wilson (MOA Add.)	D:H14 (D:H13)	Sign post 21 is on the WEST side of H St, which means W 8th Ave should be 800 block (not 700) please correct	Block number changed to 800.
60	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F01	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
61	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F01	Only 1 existing street light owned by ML&P on a wooden pole. The mast arm and head are not shown on the pole in the NE corner. As part of safety upgrades, please incorporate illumination at this intersection in accordance with 2007 DCM standards.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
62	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F01	There is a double puck style area light within the ROW. Unsure who owns this facility? ML&P? Private? Could be in conflict with proposed improvements.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
63	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F02	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels? The existing lights do not meet current MOA standards. Please replace with new electrolliers.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
64	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F02	The existing wooden poles with mast arms, cobra heads and OH conductors do not appear to be shown on this drawing.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
65	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F02	The existing light poles appear to conflict with the proposed improvements.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
66	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F03	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
67	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F03	Existing illumination facilities are not shown on the drawings. There are existing pedestrian lights on the NW and NE corners of this intersection that appear to be within the project limits.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
68	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F04	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
69	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F04	There is an existing signal pole that was truncated and capped. What is proposed for removal of this existing pole and foundation?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
70	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F04	Are easements being acquired for the SW and SE corners based on proposed improvements?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
71	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F05	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
72	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F05	The existing poles are owned by ML&P. ML&P would be a great resource to ask about the age and the existing condition of these street lights. Are the existing conductors in compliance with the current MASS and NEC requirements?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
73	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F06	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
74	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F06	The existing light pole (SW corner) appears to conflict with the proposed pedestrian improvements. This light pole is also leaning.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
75	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F07	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels? Many peds cross the road at this location from the parking area in the SW corner to the SE corner (Federal Building).	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
76	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F07	The existing ML&P wooden light pole (NW corner) appears to conflict with the proposed pedestrian improvements. This light pole does not show the OH conductor feeding it.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
77	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F07	The existing ML&P light pole (NE corner) appears to conflict with the proposed pedestrian improvements.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
78	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F08	The existing ML&P wooden light pole (NW corner) appears to conflict with the proposed pedestrian improvements.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
79	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F08	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
80	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F12	Are easements being acquired for the locations where improvements extend outside of the ROW based on proposed improvements?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
81	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F12	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
82	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F13	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
83	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F13	The existing poles are owned by ML&P. ML&P would be a great resource to ask about the age and the existing condition of these street lights. Are the existing conductors in compliance with the current MASS and NEC standards?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
84	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F14	Are the current lighting levels being evaluated in conjunction with 2007 DCM Chap 5 lighting levels for this type of intersection and pedestrian levels?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
85	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F14	The existing ML&P wooden light pole (NW corner) appears to conflict with the proposed pedestrian improvements. This light pole does not show the OH conductor feeding it that crosses E to West paralleling 8th Avenue.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
86	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:F14	Will the existing parking meters be removed where the bulb outs take away the parking spaces?	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
87	K. Parker (MOA Street Maint.)	E:H2-9, E:H13-15	Title Block notes Signing, Striping & Illumination Plan. There are no proposed illumination improvements shown on these drawings.	Comment appears to be for previous (PIH) review package and not the current (PS&E) package.
3	B. Mahoney (DOT Environmental)	ESCP14	On page 14 (ESCP), section 9.0 – Historic Properties, the date that SHPO consultation was completed needs to be changed from May 19, 2011 to June 22, 2011.	SHPO consultation dates in Section 9.0 have been updated to the date the non-objection letter was processed. This date is June 22, 2011 for the Anchorage Area Safety Improvements and July 17, 2014 for the Lake Otis Parkway at 68th Ave Channelization.
4	B. Mahoney (DOT Environmental)	ESCP26	On page 26, section 14.1 Additional Documentation Required, please remove the bullet point stating that a “copy of ADEC Letter of Non-Objection” is required. This is only necessary for areas outside of the MOA.	The ADEC Letter of Non-Objection was removed from the list of additional documentation required.
15	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	MCL	The electrical items MCL is simply a printout of the Master. Make it project specific prior to submitting PS&E Review.	MCL is now project specific.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
5	F. Park (DOT Estimating and Specs)	X	Engineer Estimate and Estimate of Quantities: 202(2) consider 4-6 vs 1.5 multiple sites 202(3) consider 25+/- vs 44 202(9) consider 10 vs 12 301(1) consider 30 min vs 20 408(1H) consider 200+ vs 180 limited quantity, multiple locations, 408 is hard hand work 408(8) 5-5.5% of 408(1H) approx. 28000 408(15) always include this item. Amount is 0 dollars as CS 608(6) consider 3300-3500 vs 4000 609(2) consider 40-45 vs 50 618(1A) consider 2+ vs 1.1 you might combine this with something else... probably will not get watered unless you include a water item. 608(13) colored and no pattern? Be sure to put plenty of control joints in the slab work or you will end up with something like the medians on Jewel lake south of international. See the spec guide lines for the frequency of joints 643(23) Include the price modification pay item 670(10D) consider 6 vs 5 670(10E) consider 800 + vs 650 670(10F) consider 10 as high vs 35	1. Unit price was changed from \$1.5 to \$6. 2. Unit price was changed from \$44 to \$25. 3. Unit price was kept at \$12. 4. Unit price was changed from \$20 to \$45. 5. This item was eliminated from project. 401(1A) was added instead. 6. This item was eliminated from project. 401(8A) was added instead and is 5% of 401(1A). 7. 401(15) was added instead. 8. Unit price was changed to \$3,750. 9. Unit price was changed to \$35. 10. Water is subsidiary to this item under the 2015 blue book, section 618-5.01. 11. Specifications call for joint configuration with squares or rectangles where the long side is no more than 1.5 times the short side with a maximum spacing of 12 feet. 12. Item is now included. 13. Unit price was changed to \$6. 14. Unit price was changed to \$800. 15. Unit price was changed to \$10.
6	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	X, Y63, A02	Note 4 on A2 says to topsoil and seed disturbed areas. There does not appear to be an item or specification for topsoil, or anything to make it subsidiary to other work or items. Need to specify. Also, page 63 of the specifications has water to establish growth paid under item 618(3), but that item does not exist for this contract. Please revise these issues.	Topsoil for disturbed areas has been made subsidiary to sidewalk installation. Topsoil specifications are listed in Section 726. Item 618(3) has been removed from the specifications.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
3	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	Y	Are specifications needed to address and pay for work associated with the interconnect systems? Don't see language for who is to terminate or how it is to be paid. Typically the MOA will want to terminate the interconnect cable themselves.	Section 660 has been updated to indicate that the MOA will perform testing, connecting and splicing work for interconnect cables.
53	C. Larson (DOT HD)	Y	Section 202-3.02 Mail Boxes. Add appropriate language to describe the work to remove and relocate the mailboxes. 202-5.01 Basis of Payment. Add pay item 202(10A) Remove and Reinstall Mailbox Suggest coordinating with the Post Office to determine where they would like the boxes reinstalled. Consider sight distance when reinstalling.	Pay item and additional language added. Collection box removal and relocation will be coordinated with the United States Postal Service.
2	F. Park (DOT Estimating and Specs)	Y	Thirty-seven statewide special provisions have recently been published by headquarters. Thirteen more may be published in the next month or two. At the beginning of February the 2016 SSHC will be published incorporating the 37-50 provisions. Much will be changed between now and when this project advertises. Complete any project specific provisions you may need. Coordinate with the 2016 SSHC and new statewide provisions when republished by CR. Statewide provisions republished by CR are dependent on what is in the 2016 SSHC. I have very few review comments for your provisions at this time. Please submit final check set before advertising, thank you.	Specifications have been updated to the October 19, 2016 release.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
1	F. Park (DOT Estimating and Specs)	Y/X	General. Specials: Please review the update notifications to be sure the latest specials are being used. Do this before each submittal including the to-be-advertised documents. 1. Network Drive "hyd" on 'Aviation Ave File Server (hyperion)': \\dotavifs03\hyd\SPECIFICATIONS\PROVISIONS\Update_Notice_Past_To_Present 2. ADOT FTP Site: http://www.dot.state.ak.us/creg/design/highways/specs/Update_Notice_Past_To_Present/ Additional information is available in the Project Provision and Style Guides. Project Specific Edits – Identifying: make all project specific edits as outlined in the Guides. Quick Reference Appendix F. 1. Network Drive "hyd" on 'Aviation Ave File Server (hyperion)', \\dotavifs03\hyd\SPECIFICATIONS\PROVISIONS\Specification_Provision_Guides 2. ADOT FTP site: http://www.dot.state.ak.us/creg/design/highways/specs/Specification_Provision_Guides/ Estimate: Complete all estimates using Bidtab IV. Submit Bidtab IV estimates and not EXCEL spreadsheet estimates. Please review your Engineers' estimate; be sure to use the pay items from the SSHC and the Central Region Supplement. Where necessary change the name, pay item number, name or unit. Where nothing is similar, add the pay item. See the instructions previously sent out regarding Pay items and Bidtab IV. If you do not have a copy, refer to (hyd) S:\ESTIMATE\INSTRUCTIONS or see me. Lump Sum Pay Items: When using lump sum pay items please associate with, include, alternate pay units and quantities.	Specifications have been updated to the October 19, 2016 release.
17	E. Desentis (DOT)	Y04	105-1.03 – Is this the "final PS&E"?	Specifications have been updated to the October 19, 2016 release. This comment no longer applies.
4	F. Park (DOT Estimating and Specs)	Y04	106-1.09 Add the provision for covered loads published in November. Also the SNTB that goes with it.	This provision has been added.
5	B. Mahoney (DOT Environmental)	Y05	Please add provision 107-1.11 Protection and Restoration of Property and Landscape – specifically the Bald Eagle portion.	This provision has been added.
18	E. Desentis (DOT)	Y05	107-1.02 – Attach Noise permit	Noise Permit not used per DOT PM

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
3	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y120	Table 740-2. Preemption cable color code. Yellow conductor is not a spare, but the detector output conductor. The blue conductor isn't the "neutral". Blue conductor's termination is dependent on which model of detector is used. Orange conductor is power to conductor. In the Wire Color column, delete color identifier text.	Preemption cable color code color identifier text deleted.
4	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y120	Table 740-2. Preemption Confirmation cable color code Delete asterisk from Wire Color column.	Asterisk removed.
5	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y122	740-2.13 Special Auxiliary Equipment. Delete in its entirety.	740-2.13 has been removed from the Anchorage Area Safety Improvement project. Still in specifications for the Lake Otis/68th project.
6	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y129	740-2.14 Vehicular Signal Heads, item 1 Signal heads c. Housing. Sub-item 1. Replace first sentence with the following: Use die cast aluminum, meeting ASTM B85, for all parts of the housing, including the doors and end plates.	Sentence replaced as directed.
4	C. Bentz, G. Billinger (DOT Traffic)	Y130	Change 740-2.14.1.d to specify 5" backplates in order to agree with what is shown in the plans. MOA uses 5" and outside MOA the state uses 3" (thus the standard spec for 3").	5" backplates are now specified since this project is within MOA.
7	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y130	740-2.14 Vehicle Signal Heads, item 1 Signal Heads d. Backplates. 1. Change thickness to .063". 2. Change width to 5".	Thickness and width changed as directed.
8	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y131	740-2.15, item 2. Housing, a. Delete "Z-crate-type visor".	Verbiage added to modify 740-2.15.a in Standard Specifications.
19	E. Desentis (DOT)	Y19	Division Pages are not needed.	Division pages are removed.
54	C. Larson (DOT HD)	Y51	604-5.01 Basis of Payment. Fourth bullet: change "planing operation" to "pavement removal."	Bullet has been revised.
13	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	Y51	604-3.02 references MASS. The applicable content needs to be written into the Special Provisions.	Applicable content from MASS has been added to Special Provisions.

Item No.	Reviewer	Sheet No. / Page No.	Comment	Response
14	R. Norkoli (DOT Contracts)	Y53-Y58	1. Suggest deleting all of the project specific special provisions and using the content I provide the PM. 2. Page 53 why did a code "CR608.2-102015" get inserted? These are not CR special provisions.	Code has been deleted. Special provisions have been updated to the latest DOT publication dated October 19, 2016.
20	E. Desentis (DOT)	Y56	We have colored slabs on this project. What color are we doing?	Color is now specified under 608-3.01 Slab Type III.
1	B. Nickeson (DOT M&O)	Y-60	Anchorage M&O is not interested in salvaged signs until 2017	Delivery of salvaged equipment stated in special provisions. MOA will be notified one week prior to delivery date. Delivery date will be in 2017.
55	C. Larson (DOT HD)	Y61	618-3.01 Surface Preparation. Finish the last paragraph, or delete the last sentence.	All paragraphs are now complete.
3	F. Park (DOT Estimating and Specs)	Y73	643-5.01 7. Flagging rate for 2016 is 55/hr	Rate has been revised.
1	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y83	660-3.03 Conduit Item #27. 1. This item calls for joining HDPE to RMC using an electrofusion type coupler. It is my understanding that various SOA projects have had problems with the electrofusion type coupler not adhering to the RMC. Have been told that a Shur-lock 2 coupler is being used. 2. Modify to require that a 5' section of RMC be installed on the horizontal orientated end of RMC conduit sweeps at junction boxes.	1. Coupler changed to Shur-lock II. 2. 5' section added to 660-3.03, Item 27.
2	M. Sickler; K. Woo (MOA Signals)	Y93-Y94	660-5.01 Basis Of Payment. 1. Work at 36th & Latouche and at 4th & Ingra is listed as 660(1x) Complete work. Isn't work at both intersections more 660(17x) Modifications related. 2. Looks like temporary signalization will be required at the 4th & Ingra intersection. No 660(7x) pay item for temporary signalization. 3. Work at 3rd & Ingra isn't actually traffic signal related. Work involves removing an old signal pole (mast arm & luminaire) and installing a new pole with a mast arm and a luminaire.	1. Work changed to 660(17) 2. Traffic control will be determined by contractor for Ingra & 4th. Note added to C:H1. 3. Considering signal pole components, this item will be paid under 660(17) for consistency.