



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

**RFP Clarification**

Date: 7/22/05

Clar.#: 5

Clarification No.	Volume & Section	Question or Comment	Mn/DOT Response
5-1	Book 2A, Section 11, RID	For WFRC, the RID indicates 6' shoulders and a 1:3 inslope. Book 2A section 11 indicates that State Aid Standards apply which would seem to require 8' shoulders and 1:4 inslopes. Please Clarify.	WFRC is designed to remain within the given right-of-way limits and match the City's West Frontage Rd. project, which extends from 12 <sup>th</sup> St. to CSAH 12 (S).  This will be further clarified in an addendum.
5-2	Book 2A, Section 8.3.10.5, RID	For 40 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NW, South of CR 112, the RID indicates that roadway surfacing will be gravel with 8' shoulders. Book 2A section 8 indicates that there will be no shoulders. Please Clarify.	The gravel roadway surfacing will have a typical width of 40-ft., symmetric about the centerline. This width varies at the intersection approach to CR 112 and at the cul-de-sac location.
5-3	Book 2A, Section 8.3.10.5, RID	For WFRD, Approx. Stations 241+00 to 282+00, The RID indicates that roadway surfacing will be gravel with 8' shoulders. Book 2A section 8 indicates that there will be no shoulders. Please Clarify.	The gravel roadway surfacing will have a typical width of 40-ft., symmetric about the centerline. This width varies at the intersection approach to CSAH 12 (S) and at the cul-de-sac location.
5-4	Book 2A, Section 11, RID	For WFR, Book 2A section 11 indicates a 50 mph design. The horizontal curves in the RID drawings are 8 degree curves and only meet a 45 mph design. It appears that this is the best geometry available to stay within the available ROW and meet other physical site constraints. Will Mn/DOT issue an addendum to allow a lesser design speed for this frontage road?	A 45 mph design speed will be allowed.  This will be included in a future addendum.

5-5	RID	For Drive C, the RID drawings indicate an 11.28% grade on this drive. Any other grade would require extending the contract construction limits. Is this grade acceptable for a township road?	Pending further review
5-6	RID	What are the requirements for the existing southbound TH 52 (which is being converted to the WFR) regarding shoulders and inslopes? We are not doing any construction on this roadway, so it is unclear which standards apply. State Aid Standards would seem to require an 8' shoulder and 1:4 inslopes. The existing conditions appear to be a 4' shoulder and a 1:3 inslope. Please clarify.	The RFP does not require improvements to the shoulder or inslopes for this section of WFR.
5-7	Book 2A, Section 11	For Drive G, Book 2A, Section 11, states that the horizontal and vertical alignment shown in the preliminary design drawings must be maintained, however, there was no proposed vertical alignment drawn in the dprofile_pr1.dgn. The COGO output for this profile indicates an approximate 2.5 foot rise in grade across a major drainage swale which does not allow enough vertical clearance for a drainage structure. Will Mn/DOT issue an addendum allowing this profile to be raised as necessary to accommodate proper drainage of the existing swale?	Yes. The profile may be altered such that the hydraulic design requirements are met while staying within the right-of-way limits.  An addendum will be issued to further clarify this.
5-8	Book 2A, Section 2.5.2.2	The third bullet of requirements for Quality Manager allows the Quality Manager to “also serve as the Construction Quality Assurance Manager or Design Quality Assurance Manager”. However, the requirements for both the Construction Quality Assurance Manager and the Design Quality Assurance Manager require that they “not be assigned to any other duties or responsibilities on the Project”. These requirements appear to be conflicting. May the Quality Manager also serve as the Construction Quality Assurance Manager or Design Quality Assurance Manager?	The Quality Manager may also serve as the Construction Quality Assurance Manager <u>or</u> the Design Quality Assurance Manager.  This will be clarified in an addendum.
5-9	Book 2A, Section 13, Exhibit A	Book 2A contains a hydraulic memo. Is there a hydraulic model or report to supplement this memo? Also, can we obtain all Bridge Inspection Reports?	The hydraulic model and supporting information will be made available to the successful Contractor for permitting and agency coordination.  Bridge inspection records can be obtained at the Mn/DOT Bridge Office website ( <a href="http://www.dot.state.mn.us/bridge">http://www.dot.state.mn.us/bridge</a> ). Select Pontis Records and use the password <i>pontis123</i> .

<p>5-10</p>	<p>Book 2A Section 18.3.1.4.2</p>	<p>This section states that “The Contractor will not be allowed to perform any work on existing TH 52 that affects traffic, including temporary lane closures, restrictions, or bypasses, until the measures listed in this Section 18.3.1.4.2 have been completed.”... “Measures that must be completed include the following:” Bullet 1, The new East Frontage Rd., Bullets 2-4, (Traffic control during construction.) Bullet 5, “During the final phase, when the new East Frontage Road is open and the CSAH 12 (N) overpass is open...”</p> <p>The layout plans indicate that the center pier for the new bridge is in the middle of the existing NB pavement. It appears impossible to conform to Bullet 5, which requires the bridge to be open, while conforming to Bullet 1, which doesn’t allow the bridge to be built as shown.</p> <p>We surmise that “bypasses”, as used above, is not intended to preclude temporary mainline re-alignments that conform to the requirement for Temporary Mainline Crossovers, including a 60 MPH design speed. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Mainline work can be initiated prior to completion of Bullet 5.</p> <p>An addendum clarifying the requirements of this section will be issued.</p>
<p>5-11</p>	<p>Book 2A Section 18.3.1.6.5</p>	<p>The third box down, Minnesota Ave/12<sup>th</sup> St. SW, states that “No restriction of access will be allowed at this intersection until the modifications are made.”, referring to the modifications outlined in Section 18.3.1.4.2. That section includes 12 bullets and includes reference to modifications throughout the project. Is it the intention that all of the modifications mentioned in the 12 bullets must be complete before any restrictions of access are made at this intersection?</p>	<p>The requirement that <u>all</u> measures (12 bullet points) in this section be completed is incorrect. Further clarification and modification of this section will be issued in an addendum.</p>
<p>5-12</p>	<p>Book 2A Section 18.3.1.6.5</p>	<p>The 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> boxes require that right-in/right-out access be maintained until the frontage road connecting to CSAH 12 and the SB entrance and exit ramps are open to traffic.</p> <p>At this time the frontage road is not part of this project, and is to be let by the City of Oronoco sometime in 2006. In addition, there is existing access from 7<sup>th</sup> St. and 12<sup>th</sup> St. to CSAH 12, via 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave.</p> <p>Given the light traffic on these streets and the very light development along 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave., is this restriction necessary now that the frontage road is not part of this project? If it is necessary, when will the City have the frontage road completed and open to traffic and what flexibility is there if the City’s contractor does not meet their schedule?</p>	<p>The requirements in the 3rd, 4th, &amp; 5th boxes were not intended to mean that right-in/right-out access needed to be maintained at the given locations until the West Frontage Road from 12th St. SW to CSAH 12 (S) was constructed.</p> <p>The requirements were intended to mean that traffic to/from 12th St. SW , 7th St. SW, and Center St. should be able to access the CSAH 12 (S)/112 interchange and the southbound entrance and exit ramps via city streets to 3rd Ave. SW to CSAH 12 (S) prior to closing the right-in/right-out accesses on TH 52.</p> <p>This will be further clarified in an Addendum.</p>

5-13	Book 2A, Section 18.3.1.4.2	This paragraph states that no work affecting traffic on TH 52 may be performed until all of the measures listed in this Section have been completed. The measures (12 bullet points) discuss virtually all of the work along TH 52, much of which will affect traffic. Please clarify.	The requirement that <u>all</u> measures (12 bullet points) in this section be completed before any work affecting mainline traffic can be started is incorrect. Further clarification and modification of this section will be issued in an addendum.
5-14	Book 2A, Section 18.3.1.4.2	The last bullet point in this paragraph requires lengthening all remaining public road intersections on TH 52 to 500 feet. We assume this is all of the public road intersections remaining <u>at the end of the project</u> . Please clarify .	That is correct. Only the right turn lanes at the intersections remaining at the end of the project shall be extended or constructed to 500 feet full width plus a 1:15 taper in accordance with Mn/DOT Standard Plan Sheet 5-297-111.
5-15	Book 2B, Section 13.3.3.2.1	This section states, “The Contractor shall provide traffic barriers in addition to fence on the top of retaining walls when the walls are accessible to vehicles.” Is fencing required on walls accessible to vehicles only? Or, is it required only in pedestrian accessible areas?	<p>The Contractor shall provide traffic barriers on top of retaining walls under any of the following conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wall is within the roadway clear zone</li> <li>• wall is within 10 feet of the edge of roadway</li> <li>• wall constitutes a hazard to vehicles</li> </ul> <p>The Contractor shall consider design speed, traffic volume, roadway geometrics, and any other factors which may elevate the level of vehicular hazard.</p> <p>If a traffic barrier or guard rail is provided between the roadway and the top of retaining wall, a traffic barrier shall not be required on top of the retaining wall.</p> <p>Pedestrian fencing shall be provided on top of any retaining wall where the wall is accessible to pedestrians.</p> <p>Exact requirements will be further clarified by addendum.</p>

5-16	RID, Book 2B, Section 13.2.1.2	The Cross Sections for the West Frontage Road showing the retaining wall indicate use of a “Concrete Crashworthy Traffic Barrier. Moment Slab Required.” Book 2B-Retaining Walls refers to MnDOT’s Bridge Standard Plans Manual. It is our understanding the Standard MnDOT retaining walls do not include the LRFD crash force. Is the moment slab required for all retaining walls with a Type F barrier?	The Bridge Office has determined that the standard retaining wall with integral F-rail, as detailed in Mn/DOT’s Bridge Standard Plans Manual, is structurally adequate to resist the AASHTO LRFD Test Level 4 vehicle impact load.
5-17	ITP, Sec. 3.4	This section appears to prohibit all communications between the Proposer and the City or County. Please clarify.	<p>All requests for clarifications, ATC-related information, and communications regarding Project specific criteria set forth in the RFP shall be communicated to the Mn/DOT Project Manager.</p> <p>Requests for general information and questions that may otherwise be public in nature regarding the City of Oronoco (i.e. details about Oronoco Gold Rush Days) may be referred to the City Clerk at:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cheryl Nymann City of Oronoco PO Box 195 Oronoco, MN 55960 507-367-4405 507-367-4982(Fax)</p> <p>Olmsted County requests that all communications be transmitted through the Mn/DOT Project Manager.</p>