

TITLE (policies, standards and specifications)

Comments received by TCP			
Comment ID	Organization	Comment	Response
413		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MTOD 911.146 says to read in conjunction with MTOD 911.245; this should be 911.145 - MTOD 911.148 says to read in conjunction with MTODs 911.145; should be MTOD (singular) - MTOD 911.630 says this is concrete barrier, while MTOD 911.631 says this is steel barrier - MTOD 911.631 shows the outline of a ZoneGuard Barrier - OPSS 741 requires formatting to be improved for line spacing between sections (741.07.06, 740.09.02) - New Section 741.07.02.01 should be renumbered to be 741.07.02.02 - Reference to guiderail in 741.07.07.02 should be "guide rail" (two words) - 741.07.08.01 - revise to include "and" in the following location: "...according to the manufacturer's specifications and according to OPSS 	<p>To be corrected in final document</p> <p>To be corrected in final document</p> <p>To be corrected in final document</p> <p>To be corrected in final document</p> <p>To be corrected in final document</p> <p>To be corrected in final documents</p> <p>To be corrected in final documents</p> <p>To be corrected in final documents</p>

		<p>723."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does 741.07.09 apply to Movable Barriers, too? Concrete TCB would include Movable Barriers - Does 741.07.15 apply to Movable Barriers, too? Concrete TCB would include Movable Barriers - In Table 4, why are Type T, X and Z barriers identified as only Category I? 	<p>-Not feasible to use drainage gaps with movable barrier. CDED to be updated to clarify this.</p> <p>-Will exclude movable TCB's and develop separate delineation guidance</p> <p>-End restraints only item was set up to allow for only Category I deflections as this allows for the greatest number of barriers to be included as options.</p>
414		<p>MTOD 911.630 and 911.631 each show a different TCB. is this correct usually these would be the same barrier.</p>	<p>Yes, this will be corrected in final drawings.</p>
417		<p>Other OPS Longitudinal Concrete Barrier Systems that have been previously implemented by the MTO were crash tested to crash test 3-10 and 3-11 under AASHTO MASH 2016 guidelines. Was the Type H Concrete Barrier full scale crash tested according to both AASHTO MASH 2016 tests 3-10 and 3-11?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
419		<p>Did the small car and pickup truck used to crash test the Type H and TALL42 Barrier meet the guidelines specified in Chapter 4, Table 4-1 of AASHTO MASH 2016? Small Car (1100kg, front wheel drive) Pickup Truck (2270kg, 2 Wheel Drive, 4</p>	<p>Testing was performed according to MASH and was considered satisfactory to MTO</p>

		Door, with Center of Gravity between 710-750mm)?	
421		Two items of clarification: 1. For clarification, the Type H Barrier is a category I freestanding Barrier that does not currently have the option to be anchored. 2. The current TALL42 MTOD 911.631 depicts the Zone Guard Steel Barrier. Should the drawing show the profile of the TALL42 instead?	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. To be corrected in final drawing</p>
422		In OPSS PROV 741, July 2024 on Table 4 you have added the TALL42 Barrier as a Category II system. Should this table be updated to reflect other Temporary Concrete Barrier Systems at their freestanding categorical/performance equivalent. Should Type T Barrier be listed as Category II (Per its freestanding performance) and Type X & Z Barriers listed as Category III (Per their freestanding performance)?	To be corrected to Category I. See response to Comment 413 on performance categories in Table 4
423		Other OPS Longitudinal Concrete Barrier Systems that have been previously implemented by the MTO were crash tested to AASHTO MASH 2016. Was the TALL42 Concrete Barrier full scale crash tested according to both AASHTO MASH 2016 tests 3-10 and 3-11?	Yes