# Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions 

## Project No. $091058 \quad$ Sale Date - 6/24/2009

Question Submitted: 6/10/2009
Question Number: 1
Please review the reinforcing schedule for the Utility/Pedestrian Bridge on sheets 412-414/469. The bar weights do not total correctly.

## Question Submitted: 6/10/2009 Question Number: 2

The quantity for Bid item 667 Reinforced Concrete Approach Slabs ( $\mathrm{T}=13$ "), APP seems to be in square feet rather than square yards. Please revise the quantity in an addendum.

## Question Submitted: 6/10/2009 <br> Question Number: 3

The Pedestrian Railing and Railing with Concrete Parapet on the Fairchild Ave Bridge are measured by the entire length of rail. The Pedestrian Railing on the Utility/Pedestrian Bridge seems to be measured from end post to end post not including the transition plates. What are the pay limits of the railing items?

## Question Submitted: 6/11/2009 <br> Question Number: 4

Proposal Utility Note sheet 3 of 5; paragraph 3 indicates "Quantities have been included for the State's Highway contractor to...install new split duct conduits" (on the exposed AT\&T Cables). Is this note refering to Reference Number 671 Misc AT\&T Utility work? If yes, is it possible to define the limits of the proposed split duct conduit supply and installation? Plan sheet 2 of 35 (or 381 of 469); Note: Item Special - Misc AT\&T Utility work:...reconstruction of utility conduit and support structures and facilities.... across the structure and in-ground conduit beyond the approach slabs, as detailed in the plans. We have not located any details for this work (under, or) beyond the approach slabs. Please clarify the State's intent as to the scope of this AT\&T reconstructive work.

Yes, payment for the installation of the split duct conduit is included in Item Special - Misc.: AT\&T Utility Work. The limits of the split duct conduit installation is assumed to be 5 ' outside of each approach slab.

## Question Submitted: 6/11/2009

Question Number: 5
Plan Sheet 25 of 35 (or 404/469) indicates a 3" X 3" X 3/16" angles to organize the AT\&T conduits across the Utility/Pedestian bridge structure. Are these angles continuous pieces from abutment to abutment, or $3^{\prime \prime}$ pieces only at the hangar and crossframe locations?Same plan sheet seems to indicate the steel Intermediate Utility Hangars for the proposed Waterline conduit are not included with the steel weight in reference Number 656 Structural Steel members L-3; but the AT\&T Intermediate Utility Hangars are? Please confirm the method of payment for the material and installation of AT\&T intermediate hangars.
Q.1. Plan Sheet 25 of 35 (or $404 / 469$ ) indicates a $3^{\prime \prime} \times 3^{\prime \prime} \times 3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ angles to organize the AT\&T conduits across the Utility/Pedestian bridge structure. Are these angles continuous pieces from abutment to abutment, or $3^{\prime \prime}$ pieces only at the hangar and crossframe locations?A.1. The 3 " $x 3$ " $x 3 / 16$ " angles are not continuous. They are only at the crossframe and hangar locations.Q.2. Same plan sheet seems to indicate the steel Intermediate Utility Hangars for the proposed Waterline conduit are not included with the steel weight in reference Number 656 Structural Steel members L-3; but the AT\&T Intermediate Utility Hangars are? Please confirm the method of payment for the material and installation of AT\&T intermediate hangars.A.2. The weight of the 3"x3"x5/16" angles used for utility supports and their installation is included with Item 513. All other materials and installation such as threaded rods, rollers, 3 " $\times 3$ " $x 3 / 16$ " angles, etc. are to be included with the respective utility pay item.

## Question Submitted: 6/11/2009

Question Number: 6
ref 129 app the listed light pole manufacture is not listed as an approved supplier to odot system. (qpl) Nor is the nmanufacture listed as a certified pole supplier. Which will apply the odot requirements or the plan manufazctures cat number listed in the plans.ref 131 misc ornamental light pole does not have a classification in the Qpl system nor is there any section in the Construction and Materials Specification of ODOT. What does the pole manufactures need to provide to the project, drawing submittals, certification of material if it manufactured of steel or Iron? Ref $146,147,148,149$, and 151 list General Electric luminaire type $A, B, C F$, and $K$ these are not listed on QPL and can this luminaire be provided to the project if the manufacture is not on QPL? Ref150 and ref 152 list luninaire in the schedule post top and decorative app that do not have any sections in 725.11 as a classification as such how can they be on the QPL listing.

A1) There is no QPL for the supports.A2) The material description is shown in the Bike Path Luminaire Schedule on sheet 306, fiberglass reinforced composite pole, with fluted shaft and weather resistant coatingA3) As these items will be owned and maintained by either First Energy or the City of Kent, they do not need to be on the QPLA4) These items do not have material specifications under 725.11 because they are decorative and ornamental of which there are many different types and applications. As these items will be owned and maintained by the City of Kent, they do not need to be on the QPL.For all of these items, material descriptions have been provided in the plan.
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## Question Submitted: 6/15/2009

Question Number: 7
The quantity for pavement removed on sheet 70 for SR 43 (N. Mantua St.) from Sta. 635+99-643+24 is 286 SY. According to the typical sections on sheet 8 , the existing pavement is asphalt over brick base, $43^{\prime}$ wide, removed full-width within those station limits. Assuming a 43 ' existing pavement width, the removal quantity is 3463 SY from Sta. 635+99-643+24. Please clarify the correct pavement removed quantity in an addendum.

## Question Submitted: 6/15/2009

Question Number: 8
ref 637 \& 638 approach slab bars shown on sheet 379 Marks AS514 \& AS517 have shown incorrect bar lengths. Please verify correct lengths.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2009 Question Number: 9
please check ref 499 ref wall P shown on sheet 235. the total pounds given is 307,757 , but the individual weights given total up to $325,382 \mathrm{lbs}$. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2009
Question Number: 10
Plan Page 283 specifies that sign S3 and S4 are internally illuminates signs that are only activated on phase 3 . In order for these to not been viewed during other phases the signs need to be specified as blank out style signs in place of internally illuminated signs. Will an addendum be issued to address this matter?

## Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number:
Bid Item 59-8" Conduit, Type B: Plan sheet 86 calls out for the concrete pipe to be 706.02. Concrete pipe is not produced in diameters less than 12". Also note that this is not an "as per plan" bid item. Please remove requirement for 706.02 pipe.

## Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number:
For Bid Ref 150, Luminaire, Post Top, APP, we would like to have Sternberg's \#MS805B-LED/CA/3/4ARC45T3 reviewed and considered as an Approved Equal. The material specification can be found at the following web-
site:http://www.sternberglighting.com/product_details.asp?id=1271
In response to this prebid question, the Sternberg MS805B housing can be considered equal to the Nostalgia Series shown on the plans. However, it cannot be determined from available information if the LED lamp system meets the requirements listed in the "Luminaire, Post Top, As Per Plan" note on Sheet 306. The City of Kent approves the Sternberg's post top luminaire submitted as an 'approved equal' as long as the requirements are met as stated in the note on Sheet 306, including a 7 -year warranty for the LED light engine and a 5 -year warranty for the power supply.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2009 Question Number: 13
For Bid Ref 131, Light Pole, Misc.: Ornamental Light Pole, we would like to have Whatley a division of Valmont Structures product offering to be reviewed and considered as an Approved Equal. Whatley's \#XF45-D6M 12 AB BLK 30-30 material specifications can be found at the following web-site:http://www.whatley.com/products-decorativepostsdetail.php?post=XF45D6M

In response to this prebid question, the City of Kent will accept the Whatley ornamental light pole as an approved equal.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2009
Question Number: 14
Plan page 407/469, transverse section. Can a horizontal construction joint be utilized between the curb and the deck or will the deck and curb have to be poured together?The proposal indicates 2 policies are needed for CSX, one for MP BG-117.03 and one for MP BG-117.07. Can the proposal be modified to only require 1 policy for CSX?

A1) The deck and curb must be poured together. A horizontal construction joint is not permitted.A2) An addendum will be issued to combine the two seperate Special Clauses for CSX into one document.

## Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number: 15
Plan Sheet 389/469 (or 10/35 at pedestrian Bridge Structure)shows dowels used to pin the Class F concrete to the bedrock at the rear abutment footer. Are the dowel holes to be included with 511 Class F concrete for payment?
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## Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number:
16
Ref 612 - all the abutment varying sets of bent bar are incorrect.Please review the bar lengths.

## Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number: 17
Bid reference \# 224 is defined as a design 12 pole in the proposal. However, plan page \# 288 shows this pole (Pole \# P3-5) as a design 11 in the pole chart. Which is correct?

In response to this prebid question, Sheet \#288 was updated with Addendum 1 and shows pole (Pole \# P3-5) as a design 12 in the pole chart.

## Question Submitted: 6/17/2009

Question Number: 18
Ref. 76- Drainage Structure Misc., Extended Detention Wetland: Plan sheet 15 gives notes and estimated incidental quantities of excavation, embankment, and wetland vegetation. The 765 sy of wetland vegetation is significantly lower than the total area (including slopes) between surrounding walks, curbs, RR ROW, etc.Is slope seeding outside of vegetative area incidental to this item or is it paid for under respective erosion control (seeding) items?

In response to this prebid question, the area of wetland vegetation (estimated at 765 SY ) is bounded by the bike path to the east, the lowest terraced retaining wall to the west, the Fairchild Avenue bridge to the north, and the driveway at \#425 N. Mantua St. to the south. Outside of the wetland vegetated area, there is either landscape plantings or seeding and mulching, paid for by their respective pay items.

## Question Submitted: 6/17/2009

Question Number: 19
Reference \#'s 52-64 are listed in the Bid Letting Pamphlet as X" CONDUIT, TYPE X. However, the plan sheets list 706.02, please advise if 707.33 will be allowed. All other aspects of 603 are met (cover, backfill, installation, etc.).

## Question Submitted: 6/17/2009

Question Number: 20
Project 091058 Portage City of Kent Refs 247 AA1, 248AA1 and 249AA1 specify optical preemption equipment. Refs 252AA 253AA2, 254AA2 specify optical preemption equipment Tomar Electronics. The City of Kent's existing priority control system installed throughout the city (exceeds $50 \%$ ) is Opticom brand 700 series security encoded optical preemption equipment including Opticom 700 series phase selectors, detectors and emitters. The Opticom 700 series emitters separate precisely timed pulses of high intensity light in the infrared and visible wavelengths at the base flash rate of approximately 10,12 or 14 Hz . The emitter also interleaves programmed encoded pulses that carry the vehicle class and ID number information. Opticom model 700 series phase selectors recognize and discriminate among three distinct Opticom emitter frequency rates via Opticom detectors: high priority, low priority and probe frequency. Within each of these three frequency rates, the 700 series phase selectors further discriminate among 10 classes of vehicle identification codes, with 1,000 individual vehicle codes per class. The information is logged in the phase selector. For compatibility continuity and consistency should the specified preemption equipment be specified as Opticom 700 series?

In response to this prebid question, the City of Kent has decided to use TOMAR based upon their testing of the TOMARemitters with their existing OPTICOM system detectors. They have had no issues with compatibility between the two systems and want to keep theTOMAR alternate bid item.

Question Submitted: 6/17/2009
Question Number: 21
These questions pertain to retaining walls " $T$ " thru " $Y$ ". Is there a common "length" dimension to the sandstone block listed in the sandstone block size table on sheet $243 / 469$ ? Can multiple blocks be used to create the "width" dimension or must this be one block?

A1( There is no length dimension. The length along the face of the walls may vary. A2) The width is measured perpendicular to the wall face and is required to be comprised of a single block. This shall not be comprised by using multiple blocks.

Question Submitted: 6/17/2009
Question Number:
Please add a bid item for the sanitary sewer bypass pumping that is detailed on page 383/469. Please provide the specifics on the 12" waterline expansion joint detailed on page 406/469. We need an acceptable brand and model number with an "or equal" designation.Clarify the type of "boltless restrained joint" that is acceptable to the City of Kent.Plan page 109/469, please add a bid item for the 2" air release.Please provide a watermain joint layout to confirm there isn't a conflict between the pipe joints and the pipe supports on the utility/pedestrian bridge. On future revised plan pages issued by addenda please cloud the revisions.
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## Question Submitted: 6/17/2009

Are the cross sections available for Bike Path Grading plan shown on plan pages 151-155 and the excavation and embankment quantities?

Cross sections are not available for the Bike Path.

## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number:
Addendum 1 changed the completion date to December 1, 2012. Original plans give construction timeline. Is ODOT going to revise this plan sheet as to the revised completion date? Are there any interim completion dates for particular phases of work given the completion date change?

Addendum 1 deleted the Construction Timeline (sheet \#18) from the plan set. The interim completion date for the opening of the Fairchild Bridge to vehicular traffic was revised to December 1, 2011. Plan sheets were revised accordingly.

## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number: 25
there is a type A pressure relief joint shown on sheet 374 at the rear approach slab for the Fairchild Ave bridge. I do not see a reference number for this item. Can you please verify?

## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number:
For Bid Ref 90-6" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement: The plans call for 452 Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement. The quantity is 485 sy of driveway paving and 1947 sy of bike path pavement. Will dowel bars at all transverse contraction joints be required for the bike path pavement?

Dowel bars at all transverse contraction joints are required for the bike path pavement.

## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number: 27
Plan sheet 215/469 states that no increase in load is permitted on the existing wall between CSXT and ABC RC. It requires a submittal comparing the following:existing conditions - an engine on mainline tracks with railroad cars on siding tracks.
construction conditions - construction equiment adjacent to wall with engine on siding. In order to make sure of what type of equipment will be able to work in this area, we will need to know what the existing loading is with an engine on the mainline tracks with railroad cars on siding tracks. Can you provide this information?

Sheet 215 of 469 requires the contractor to provide a submittal which shows that he is not increasing the existing load on the existing wall between CSXT and ABC RC. In order to evaluate this, contractors should contact ABC RC directly to obtain their existing car weights and loading on the tracks.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2009 Question Number: 28
Plan sheet $382 / 469$ states that the protection shield shall be designed for a minimum of 50 pounds per square foot plus the weight of the equipment, debris, personnel, and other loads to be carried. Is this correct or should the weight of the equipment be removed from this note?

The referenced note on sheet 382 of 469 is part of the CSXT Transportation Criteria for Overhead Bridges Note. The note is correct as it is currently shown in the plans. This wording comes directly from CSXT and should not be changed.

## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number: 29
Plan sheet 98 shows a relocation of an 8 " waterline on North Water Street. The phase line for construction is at centerline of the road per plan sheet 27. The existing line is right of the phase line (Phase $2 A$ ) and the new line is left of the phase line (Phase 2B). Will installation of the new line be permitted in an earlier phase? Will the contractor be permitted to shut down the road given that the relocation runs down the middle of the street?

Waterline work is considered part of the utilities which are independent of the phasing sequence. The Trench for Widening and Utility work on Sheet 20 is titled as such so the contractor can do the utility work as a pre-phase operation if he elects. This stretch of Water Street is detoured during pavement widening/reconstruction, as per Sheet 23, but access to adjacent properties must be maintained at all times.
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## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number:
30
It seems at Reference 615 Class C Concrete Footing is understated by approx. 100cy and Reference 679 Class C Concrete Footing is overstated by approx. 100cy. Are the drawings correct in detailing the limits of the Fairchild Bridge rear abutment and the Bike Path east footing? Please advise.

It was determined since the footing for the Bike Path Tunnel and Fairchild Bridge was one pour, payment for the concrete would be kept together. This was reflected in the Fairchild Avenue Bridge plans on sheet \#343, Note 5. As per the note the footing concrete and reinforcing would be included in 'The Bike Path Tunnel' . Therefore, all the footing concrete and reinforcing as seen on sheet \#418 is included with Bike Path Tunnel for payment.

## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number: 31
Due to the changes made in Addendum 1 to the Railroad schedule and change in completion date, the overall schedule of the project will change. Could the Department please revise the chart on Sheet 18 to reflect those changes?

Addendum 1 deleted the Construction Timeline (sheet \#18) from the plan set. A revised Sheet 18 will not be provided.

## Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number: 32
Please clarify the required coating for the 26 " OD steel pipe encasement that is detailed on page $245 / 469$. Note 1 indicates all components get one coat of coal tar primer and two coats of coal tar epoxy on interior and exterior. Conversely, Note 4 indicates the pipe is galvanized after fabrication. Other components are stainless steel. The details for Phase 2-1 removal, Phase 2-1 construction, and Phase 2-2 construction and maintenance of traffic on plan page 217/469 indicate the temporary shoring is directly over and will be in conflict with Qwest fiber optic line. Please have Qwest relocate this line.

A1) Galvanizing refers to the 1" drain pipe only. A2) Qwest has reviewed the plans and does not anticipate a conflict with the sheeting.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2009 Question Number: 33
Reference Numbers 518 and 810 both provide for 170 CY of porous backfill material at Retaining Wall R. Please advise as to the Department's intent for the use of these reference numbers.

## Question Submitted: 6/19/2009

Question Number: 34
Ref. 107: Hydrant extended and adjusted to grade- appears to be duplicated in one spot and quantity should be 2, not 3. Please verify in an addendum. Ref. 124 and 125: Quantities are each off by 1 each as on plan sheet 98 , there is an adjustment called out that should be a reconstruct (San. MH). Please verify in an addendum.

The contractor should bid the quantity shown in the plan. The contractor will be paid for the actual number of fire hydrants extended and adjusted to grade. The contractor should bid the quantities shown in the plan. The contractor will be paid for the actual number of manholes adjusted or reconstructed to grade.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2009
Question Number: 35
What size plants are to be planted for bid item \# 76, Extended Detention Wetland? Item 604 on sheet 15 of plans, only says if nursery stock is used. This does not give a container size, B\&B, or bare root size. Please advise.Thank youMeggan

As per the note on sheet 15 , no sizes are indicated. It is anticipated that whatever the contractor elects to use, he will space the plantings according to their size, in accordance with the nursery recommendations which are typically given to the contractor at the time of purchase.

## Question Submitted: 6/19/2009

Question Number: 36
The drainage pipe bid items for $12,15,18,24$ and 36 inch are for type $B$, however in various places in the plan \& profile, cross sections and storm sections the pipe is called out as type B 706.02 Please clarify if $706.02(\mathrm{RCP})$ is required or if the pipe can be any type B.

This issue was addressed in Addendum.

## Question Submitted: 6/19/2009

Question Number: 37
Ref. 107- Hydrant extended and adjusted to grade: detail on plan sheet 246 calls for watch valve and valve box. There is already a bid item (ref. 103) for a 6" gate valve and valve box. Is the gate valve incidental to ref. 107 or should it be paid for separately under ref. 103?

The contractor should bid the quantities shown in the plan. The contractor will be paid for the actual number of gate valves and valve boxes installed.
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## Question Submitted: 6/22/2009

Ref. 101-12" DIP Waterline, As Per Plan: plan sheet 15 the APP is for providing 2" PVC jacket insulation. Plan sheet 109 calls for the entire quantity of 340 ' to go from station $200+62$ to $203+36$, which includes 177 ' mounted on the bridge.Ref. 673- Misc. Waterline Utility Work: Plan sheet 381 has a note that says "The work shall include but not necessarily be limited to, conduit and supports across the structure and in-ground conduit beyond the approach slabs as detailed in the plans". Plan sheet 404 also has details that indicate that the 12 " waterline and $2^{\prime \prime}$ insulation wrap are to be included with this item. There appears to be a duplication between these two items. Please clarify in addendum which bid items include what incidentals.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2009
Question Number: 39
Please provide further clarification on the following question submitted $6 / 18 / 2009$ Please clarify the required coating for the 26 " OD steel pipe encasement that is detailed on page 245/469. Note 1 indicates allcomponents get one coat of coal tar primer and two coats of coal tar epoxy on interior and exterior. Conversely, Note 4 indicatesthe pipe is galvanized after fabrication. Other components are stainless steel.Question Submitted: 6/18/2009A1) Galvanizing refers to the 1" drain pipe only.Per note \#4 the "drilling of the holes and welding of the pipe shall be done prior to galvanizing" My understanding is that compliance with this note would result in the entire assembly, ( $26^{\prime \prime}$ casing pipe with 1 " drain pipes welded in place) to be galvanized. Is this correct? If it is not correct please modify note \#4 to comply with the project intent.

In Note \#4, galvanizing refers to the $\mathbf{1}^{\prime \prime}$ drain pipe only. Note \#4 refers to the 26 " encasement pipe only to establish the location of the 1 " drain pipe. Note \#1 refers to the coal tar epoxy coating of the 26 " steel encasement pipe and appurtenances.

## Question Submitted: 6/22/2009

Question Number: 40
There is currently no quantity for 304 aggregate base set up under the approach slabs for the proposed Fairchild and Crain Ave structures. Is it ODOT's intent to include 304 under the approach slabs?

Section A-A on Sheets 374 and 410 show Item 304 -Aggregate Base under the approach slabs for both the Fairchild Ave and the Utility/Pedesrtian Bridges. The plans state that payment is included in the roadway quantities. The contractor should bid the quantity that is shown in the plans for Item 304-Aggregate Base.

## Question Submitted: 6/23/2009

Question Number: 41
The detail on Item Special, Misc.: Decorative Stone Banding on page 344 of 469 states the dimensions are 4"x9". After calling each manufacturer listed on page 416 of 469 , none of them make a $4 " x 9$ " ledgestone. The only dimensions that are manufactured for the Pro-fit Ledgestone (or approved equal) are $4^{\prime \prime}$ in height, and vary from $.5^{\prime \prime}-1.5^{\prime \prime}$ in thickness. Please advise.

All three manufacturers provide a type of stone with the height that can be stacked to fill the stone banding void. Depending on the manufacturer used, the depth of the inlay may vary.

## Question Submitted: 6/23/2009

Question Number: 42
Sheet 232/469 indicates that the portion of the existing commercial drive to be removed and replaced is included with the railroad quantities for payment. There does not appear to be an reference item for this work. Where should this work be included?

The quantities for the proposed commercial drive pavement are included in the Driveway Sub-Summary, Sheet \#55, under the sub-heading 'ABC RC RAILROAD'. Quantities for the removal of the existing asphalt pavement are included under excavation, found on the ABC RC Cross Sections.

The SP401 spirals and P1004 straight rebar are included in the quantity for item 509 Reinforcing Steel. Per CMS 524.17 this rebar is incidental to the drilled shafts. Please specify where this rebar will be paid in an addendum.

## Question Submitted: 6/8/2009

Question Number: 44
Page 246/469 details the removal of existing rock channel protection and the filling of the ledge overhang void with Class C Concrete anchored into the underlying rock. The Plan notes require this cost to be included in Item 603 for payment. Will ODOT add an additional per cy pay item for this work?

## Question Submitted: 6/9/2009

Question Number:
45
Could the existing structure drawings be put on ODOT's ftp site?
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/POR-18466/

Question Submitted: 6/9/2009
Question Number: 46
The quantity for Bid Item 615 Class C Concrete, Footing seems substantially overstated. Please verify this quantity is correct.
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Question Submitted: 6/9/2009
The forward and rear abutments of the Fairchild Ave Bridge have type 2 waterproofing. Please add a bid item for this work.

Per plan page 215/469 Retaining Wall "P" constructed in Phase 1, is to start on July 1 and complete on Sept. 30. This won't be possible with a letting date of June 24th. The Liquidated Damages note on page 111/469 indicates both Phase 1 Retaining wall "P" and Phase 2-1 Retaining Wall "R"\&"S" are to start on 7/1/2009. These retaining walls cannot be done at the same time if $A B C$ railway traffic is to be maintained.
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