



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

Date: June 24, 2005

Clarification #: 4

Clarification No.	Volume & Section	Question or Comment	Mn/DOT Response
4-1	Book 2B, Section 12.3.1.2	This section states “the drainage areas shall be modeled to include future development and increased runoff associated with development.” Please clarify this requirement. To our knowledge, we do not have future development plans available to us. We are assuming that the City of Oronoco will construct the extension of the West Frontage Road, however. Also, the NPDES Permit would be required for future development and thus, the developer would be responsible for addressing increased runoff at that time.	<p>Drainage areas shall be modeled as stated by this section.</p> <p>Future development shall be limited to the West Frontage Road Project to be constructed by the City of Oronoco.</p> <p>This will be further clarified in an addendum.</p>
4-2	Book 2B, Section 12.3.3.2.5	This section states “Bridge deck drainage shall be routed through a pond before discharge to the natural waters of the State.” The Environmental Assessment, Exhibit B of Book 2A, Section 4, states the drainage from this area would flow to Lake Shady with “limited water quality treatment”. We assume the EA takes precedence over Book 2B. Is this correct? Note that the southerly mainline bridges drain to the south, to a low point approximately 200 ft from the bridges. The highway is in fill at this location with Lake Shady on either side. It is not possible to build a pond at this location without placing fill in Lake Shady nor can the drainage be routed southerly to the proposed ponds due to the profile and topography.	<p>The contractor will be required to maximize water quality treatment by means/methods and Best Management Practices to the extent possible.</p>

4-3	RDM Section 3-4.02.02	Does section 3-4.02.02 Minimum Grades of the Design-Build Modifications to the Mn/DOT Roadway Design Manual apply to this project? The preliminary mainline profiles do not meet these criteria.	Yes, section 3-4.02.02 applies.
4-4	RDM Section 9-2.01.02	Does section 9-2.01.02 Grade Line at Bridges of the Design-Build Modifications to the Mn/DOT Roadway Design Manual apply to this project? The preliminary mainline profiles do not meet these criteria.	Yes, section 9-2.01.02 applies.
4-5	ITP Sec 4.3.2	On page 13 of the ITP it states that charts, design plans, and other illustrative and graphical information may be included on 11 x 17 paper, but must be folder to 8.5 x 11. Will Mn/DOT accept design plans that are on 11 x 17 paper, but not folded?	Plans included in appendices do not have to be folded.
4-6	Book 2A, Exh. A and Sec. 15.4.5	Reference is made to Bridges 55053, 55069 and 55070 of the ROC 52 project as reference standards for the Type 1 bridges on this project. However the concrete barrier on the ROC 52 bridges is different than that shown in Exhibit A of this section for the Type 1 bridges. The concrete barrier for bridges 55053, 55069, & 55070 is a modified P-2 with a structural steel tube railing, Exhibit A however shows a modified F-Rail. Is it Mn/DOT's intention to use the mod. P-2 barrier and keep corridor continuity or change to a F-Rail for the Oronoco overpass bridges ?	The modified F-rail shown in exhibit A is correct. Mn/DOT does not intend to incorporate the modified P-2 rail into this project for the type 1 bridges.