

TCP Posting 000-0173 Temporary Concrete Barrier Drainage Gap Update

Comments received by TCP			
Comment ID	Organization	Comment	Response
385	Individual	The draft OPSD specifies that this applies to various barrier types and lists the various types on each side of the drainage gap. Is it correct to assume that ANY TYPE of TCB on ONE side of the gap can connect to ANY TYPE of TCB on the OTHER side of the gap? That is, is this an acceptable transition between different types of TCB in addition to being a drainage gap?	Correct. Any permitted barrier can be connected to any other permitted barrier.
385	Individual	Type Z is identified as one of the types of TCB that this detail applies to but given the difference in the width and shape of a Type Z TCB versus all of the other listed TCB, is it truly possible to connect between a Type Z and a different type of TCB?	Type Z has a standard transition to a safety-shaped terminal unit which can transition to the thrie-beam drainage gap. See MTOD 911.202
385	Individual	There is no indication of any restraint systems in this detail. Is it assumed that if one side of the gap has restraints, the other side of the gap must also have restraints? With the	Yes, this is a potential concern however the current detail allows for transitions between TCB's with varying rigidity such as Type M to Type X freestanding. No concerns have been noted with the performance of these transitions. CDED B741

		<p>potential of using different barrier types on either side of the gap, are there any difficulties with the differences in the restrained deflection distances of the different barriers?</p>	<p>directs designers to contact Highway Design Office when transitions are required between Category IV barrier and lower performance due to rigidity differences and lack of transition details available for temporary steel barriers.</p>
--	--	--	--