



LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Document No. TTA-0099

To: Alabama Department of
Transportation

Date: 08/10/17 **Job No.** 15-1101-0300

Attention: Edwin Perry, PE

Re: MRB: West Side Alignment Constructability
Review from Armeni Consulting

WE ARE SENDING YOU: ☒ Attached ☐ Under separate cover via _____ the following items:
☐ Change Order ☐ Prints ☐ RFI ☐ Drawings ☐ Specifications ☐ Copy of letter ☐ Contract
☐ Work Authorization Order

Copies	Date	No.	Description
1	08/10/17	TTA-0099	MRB: West Side Alignment Constructability Review from Armeni Consulting

THESE ARE TRANSMITTED as checked below:

<input type="checkbox"/> For approval	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved as submitted	<input type="checkbox"/> Resubmit _____ copies for approval	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved as noted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For your use	<input type="checkbox"/> Returned for corrections	<input type="checkbox"/> Submit _____ copies for distribution	<input type="checkbox"/> For review and comment
<input type="checkbox"/> As requested	<input type="checkbox"/> For bids due	<input type="checkbox"/> Return _____ corrected prints	<input type="checkbox"/> Prints returned after loan to us

Remarks:

FROM: Patrick Hickox, PE

COPY TO: File.../contracts/HDR

Brian Aaron, PE
Andrew Wood, PE
Steve Flukinger, PE
Kendall Kilpatrick, PE
Katie Parker, PE
Greg Lowe, PE
Tom Harjung, PE
Manuel Carballo, PE
Missi Shumer

If enclosures are not as noted above, please notify sender immediately

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ENCLOSURES IS PROPRIETARY AND INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PROFESSIONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE RECIPIENT DESIGNATED ABOVE. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or a duly authorized agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that this document has been received in error. Furthermore, any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited, except as authorized by the sender to the intended recipient.

2970 Cottage Hill Road, Suite 190
Mobile, AL 36606
251-666-2443 ph. / 251-666-6422 fax
www.thompsonengineering.com

A THOMPSON HOLDINGS, INC. COMPANY

Mobile River Bridge West Side Alignment Alternates

Constructability and Schedule Opinion

To: Thompson Engineering and HDR

From: Armeni Consulting Services, LLC

September 29, 2016

Armeni Consulting Services, LLC (ACS) was tasked with evaluating the two bridge layout alternates for the West Approach High Level portion of the bridge structure for the Mobile River bridge Project. The two alternatives that are being reviewed are: Alternative 1 - West Side High Level Approach – Split Alignment and Alternative 2: West Side High Level Approach – Adjacent Alignment.

While reviewing the drawings that depict the two alternatives separately and side by side several obvious differences immediately come to mind for both cost and schedule. It is apparent that the Split Level Alternate has a high level crossover of the existing traffic in order to be able to combine the structures prior to reaching the main span portion of the project. This no doubt will require major interruption of traffic during the construction of the middle pier between the two existing traffic lanes along with the fact that there will probably need to construct some type of a “straddle bent” which is very expensive and time consuming to construct along with the interruption to the exiting traffic for the formwork and/or temporary supports.

One of the other apparent comparisons to be noted is that the Adjacent Alternate is very attractive in terms of the contractors cost and scheduling for the project as they would be able to share key resources such as formwork, equipment, personnel, etc. in one local area to construct the foundations, substructure and superstructure portions of the project. In addition, the contractor will be able to construct the westbound lanes of the structure first and utilize the recently constructed deck area as material laydown areas and access. Whereas the split alternative will require additional resources such as equipment, personnel and formwork the work area is separated by existing traffic. Another observation is that it appears that the Adjacent Alternate requires additional bridge widening area than the Split Alternative. Yes, this is additional cost to the alternate but in our opinion is a minimal affect in cost and is superseded by the advantages of this alternate mentioned above.

In closing it is this reviewers’ opinion that the Adjacent West Approach Alternative will be more cost effective and will have a shorter construction schedule than the Split Alternative and most importantly will be safer and less interruptive for the traveling public. Therefore, we would recommend considering the Adjacent West Approach Alternate as a preferred alternate going forward.