



Minnesota Department of Transportation
TH52 Oronoco Design-Build Project
S.P. 5508-84
Clarification #3

Date: 6/17/05

Clar.#: 3

Clarification No.	Volume & Section	Question or Comment	Mn/DOT Response
3-1	Book 2A, Section 8.3.10.2	This Section states that “Ramps, County roads and local streets shall have a minimum 2-foot subcut”. The table under Section 8.3.10.5 appears to list (under the heading “Pavement Layer Description”) where Mn/DOT is requiring Select Granular Borrow Modified to be provided, which indicates only some local streets get a subcut. Please clarify which local streets require a subcut.	The requirements for Local streets identified in Section 8.3.10.5 requiring a Select Granular Borrow Modified layer are correct as shown. Subcut requirements will be further clarified in a future Addendum.
3-2	Book 2A, Section 8.3.18	This Section states that ditch depths must be a minimum of 5.5 feet from the shoulder P.I. where 36” of sand subbase is specified. Book 2A, Section 11, page 11-2 requires TH-52 median inslopes to be no steeper than 1:6 (which agrees with the typical sections supplied by Mn/DOT). 1:6 inslopes and a 10’ bottom ditch width do not allow for a median ditch depth of 5.5’. Please clarify.	Mn/DOT is reviewing the requirements and potential alternatives for inslope and ditch width/depth criteria for the TH 52 median. This will be clarified in an Addendum.
3-3	Book 2A, 13.3.3.1.7 & RID-Br. Gen Plans & Elevation Folder	Brs. 55065 & 55066: Design Stage information provided in the hydraulic memo does not correspond to either dbr-65-77_sur.dgn, dbr-66-78-80_sur.dgn, br55065_dgn.pdf or br55066_dgn.pdf. Waterway opening area information provided in the hydraulic memo does not correspond to either dbr-65-77_sur.dgn, dbr-66-78-80_sur.dgn, br55065_dgn.pdf or br55066_dgn.pdf. Which information is correct?	Hydraulic requirements for bridges will be clarified in a future addendum. See also Book 1, Recitals and Book 1, Section 3, Information Supplied to Contractor; Responsibility for Design; Disclaimer

3-4	Book 2A, 13.3.3.1.7 & RID-Br. Gen Plans & Elevation Folder	Brs. 55077 & 55078: Design Stage information provided in the hydraulic memo does not correspond to dbr-65-77_sur.dgn or dbr-66-78-80_sur.dgn. Waterway opening area information provided in the hydraulic memo does not correspond to dbr-65-77_sur.dgn, dbr-66-78-80_sur.dgn, br55077_dgn.pdf or br55078_dgn.pdf. The Low member elevation provided in the hydraulic memo does not correspond to either dbr-65-77_sur.dgn, dbr-66-78-80_sur.dgn, br55077_dgn.pdf or br55078_dgn.pdf. Which information is correct?	Hydraulic requirements for bridges will be clarified in a future addendum. See also Book 1, Recitals and Book 1, Section 3, Information Supplied to Contractor; Responsibility for Design; Disclaimer
3-5	Book 2A, Section 4, Exhibit B & RID-Br. Gen Plans & Elevation Folder	Br 55080-CSAH 12/CR 112 interchange. The EA indicates this bridge will include a 14' turn lane and a 12' trail separated from traffic by a barrier on the North side of the bridge for bike/pedestrian traffic. The file dbr-66-78-80_sur.dgn in the RID also shows this configuration and includes a raised median. The file br55080_dgn.pdf in the RID does not show a separated bike trail nor a raised median. The VE study in the RID indicates that the bike trail should be eliminated and the layout file typical sections agree with this. What is the correct configuration for this bridge?	The correct configuration does not include a separated bike trail or a raised median. This will be clarified in an Addendum.
3-6	Book 2A, Section 4, Exhibit B & RID-Br. Gen Plans & Elevation Folder	Br 55079-CR 12 Overpass. The EA indicates this bridge will include a 12' trail separated from traffic by a barrier on the South side of the bridge for bike/pedestrian traffic. The file br55080_dgn.pdf in the RID does not show a separated bike trail. The VE study in the RID indicates that the bike trail should be eliminated and the layout file typical sections agree with this. What is the correct configuration for this bridge?	The correct configuration does not include a separated bike trail. This will be clarified in an Addendum.
3-7	Book 2A, Section 11	Several of the roadway horizontal and vertical alignments do not meet criteria for design speed at or near stop conditions. Please clarify the design speed criteria for East Frontage Road, West Frontage Road, CR 12 Overpass and 40th Avenue NW in these cases.	Mn/DOT intends for these alignments to remain essentially as shown. Deviations from design criteria for horizontal and vertical alignment elements at stop conditions off the trunk highway system will be documented and clarified in an Addendum.

3-8	Book 2A, Section 11	The east end of County Road 112 will tie into a concurrent county project. Please provide typical sections, horizontal and vertical alignments for the Olmstead County Road 112 project.	Pending reply from County.
3-9	Book 2A, Exhibit A	Hydraulic Memo dated 9/28/05 for Bridges 55065 & 55066. Br 55033 is rated Scour Critical. The memo further states "Pier protection and repair of damage to the riprap on the abutments is recommended at this structure." Are these repairs to be included in this contract?	Yes. The requirements will be clarified in an Addendum.
3-10	RID, VE Study Report	Cost Estimate (Section E), Question #4 regarding bridge length differences for Brs. 55065 & 55066. Has the disagreement between MnDOT CO and the district between required waterway opening been resolved and what was the result?	Yes. The result is essentially the waterway opening per hydraulic recommendation letter.