



South Carolina
Department of Transportation

August 14, 2015

INSTRUCTIONAL BULLETIN NO. 2015-5

SUBJECT: Revised Design Field Review Title Sheet

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 14, 2015

SUPERSEDES: Instructional Bulletin 2013-5

RE: Project Development Process

The attached sample design field review (DFR) title sheet is included as a reference to the revisions below. The numbered items shown on the DFR title sheet correspond to the numbers below.

The file name of the revised DFR title sheet is dfrts7.dgn. This title sheet should be used for all design field reviews. If needed, additional information can be added by the designer to satisfy the needs of the project.

The changes to the title sheet are as follows:

1. Revised language of the purpose/scope cell;
2. Labeled traffic data and added truck percentages for current and design year;
3. Added project description just above the location map;
4. Added additional space for notes and/or comments;
5. Removed charge code and project directory information;
6. Provided a single line item pertaining to slopes. Added line item to document units of obtains/remainers;
7. Removed line items for typical section footprint and intersection throat/radii measurements. Added line items to document an acceptable scale and show functional classification;
8. Added "Traffic Engineering" section;
9. Added "Work Zone Traffic Control" section;
10. Revised section heading from "Bridge Replacement" to "Structural." Removed line items for "Bridge Access Lines" and "Additional Geotechnical Work". Added three line items to document an acceptable detour, salvaged bridge portions and existing culverts to be retained, extended or replaced;
11. Added "Geotechnical" section;
12. Added "Environmental" section;
13. Removed "Video/Photos" Information;
14. Removed duplicated "Railroad Involvement" information;
15. Added "Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations" section.





James W. Kendall, Jr.
Preconstruction Support Engineer

GRB

Attachment

ec:

Randall Young, Acting Director of Preconstruction

Todd Steagall, Director of Construction

Chris Johnston, Acting Director of Rights of Way

John Boylston, RP Engineer – Lowcountry

Heather Robbins, Acting Dir. of Environmental Services

Mike Barbee, RP Engineer - Pee Dee

Randall Young, RP Engineer - Midlands

Wilson Elgin, RP Engineer - Upstate

Tony Fallaw, Dir. of Traffic Engineering



REVIEW OF THE 13 CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

(ELIMINATE ALL DESIGN EXCEPTIONS WHERE PRACTICAL)

	OK (Please Check One)	FURTHER REVIEW NEEDED (Check One)
1. DESIGN SPEED _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. VERTICAL ALIGNMENT _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. VERTICAL CLEARANCE _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. GRADE _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. SUPERELEVATION _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. CROSS SLOPE _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. LANE WIDTH _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. SHOULDER WIDTH _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. HORIZONTAL CLEARANCE _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. BRIDGE WIDTH _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. STRUCTURAL CAPACITY _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REQUESTED TO ATTEND	ORG.	PHONE	VERIFICATION OF ATTENDANCE (INITIALS)
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

1 THE PURPOSE OF THE DESIGN FIELD REVIEW IS TO DETERMINE IF THE VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT AS INDICATED ON THE PLANS MEETS THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT.

WITHIN CITY / TOWN LIMITS ?
YES / NO
CPM SCHEDULE REQUIRED?
YES / NO

2

TRAFFIC DATA			
_____	_____	_____	_____ %
CURRENT YEAR	ADT	TRUCKS	
_____	_____	_____	_____ %
DESIGN YEAR	ADT	TRUCKS	

DESIGN FIELD REVIEW

_____ COUNTY

PROJECT ID _____

RTE./RD. _____

3 FROM: _____ TO: _____

DESCRIPTION _____

NOTES AND/OR COMMENTS:

4 _____

5 DESIGN FIELD REVIEW PLANS READY: _/ _/ _

RPG GROUP: _____

SURVEY LENGTH: _____ MI.

DESIGN FIELD REVIEW PERFORMED: _/ _/ _

6 RIGHT OF WAY RECOMMENDATIONS:

NEW R/W WIDTH: _____ TOTAL SEE PLANS: Y / N

SLOPES OBTAINED WITH: _____ RW / PERMISSIONS

CONTROL OF ACCESS _____ Y / N

SHOW OBTAINS/REMAINDERS IN: _____ SF / ACRE

COMMENTS: _____

7 DESIGN CRITERIA:

PAVEMENT DESIGN TO BE DETERMINED BY: (CIRCLE ONE)

OFFICE OF MATERIALS AND RESEARCH

SCDOT PAVEMENT DESIGN CALCULATOR

FIELD REVIEW

DESIGN SPEED: _____ MPH

TEAM CONCUR SCALE ACCEPTABLE Y / N

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION _____

8 TRAFFIC ENGINEERING:

CRASH HISTORY PROVIDED Y / N

9 WORK ZONE TRAFFIC CONTROL:

GRADE CHANGES REQUIRING PAVEMENT REMOVAL OR BUILD-UP > 4 IN? Y / N

IF YES, DETOUR OR STAGED? (CIRCLE ONE)

10 STRUCTURAL:

SKETCH ON THE PLANS THE LOCATION OF THE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

FOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, ROAD TO BE: CLOSED OR STAGED (CIRCLE ONE)

FOR CLOSED/DETOURED SITES, AN ACCEPTABLE DETOUR EXISTS Y / N

FOR BRIDGE REMOVALS, WILL PORTIONS BE SALVAGED? Y / N

IF EXISTING CULVERTS: RETAIN / EXTEND / REPLACE

11 GEOTECHNICAL:

IS THE FOLLOWING EXCAVATION ANTICIPATED? ROCK Y/N MUCK Y/N

ADDITIONAL GEOTECHNICAL EXPLORATION REQUIRED: Y / N

12 ENVIRONMENTAL:

NEPA CONCERNS Y / N

COMMENTS: _____

PERMITTING CONCERNS Y / N

COMMENTS: _____

13 WALLS

MARK ON PLANS THE LOCATION OF PROPOSED RETAINING/SOUND WALLS

14 RAILROAD

RAILROAD INVOLVEMENT Y / N

15 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ACCOMODATIONS

CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND/OR REGIONAL PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE PLAN Y/N

Holtzclaur
C:\Users\Holtzclaur\Desktop\dfrr187.dgn
27-JUL-2015

