Ontario

Structural Standard Drawings (SSDS) For Traffic Barriers

TCP#000-0308

Comments received by TCP			
Comment ID	Organization	Comment	Response
587	Individual	with respect to Packages #1 and #4, should there be standard detailing provided for reinforcing around "cutouts" in the slabs to accommodate drainage, electrical and ATMS manholes/catch basins/handholes? Also, is there any detailing required in Package #4 to accommodate any transition to-from HMLP or OHS footings?	The details regarding drainage, manholes catch basins, HMLP and OHS footing will be shown in their respective standard drawings
588-1	Individual	General: Some of these drawings are to be modified and drawn to scale based on project-specific geometries. It is requested that .DWG files also be uploaded to the MTO Technical Consultations Portal once these drawings are finalized and posted	The MTO Technical Consultations Portal is intended solely for public consultation on draft MTO standards. CAD files for all standard drawings are available through MTO's Contract Preparation System (CPS).
588-2	Individual	MTOD 3960.200: 1. Under "Extent of Control Joint" at bottom left, the vertical dimension of 40mm is shown on both interior and exterior face of the barrier. Should the interior vertical dimension not be 50mm (matching the two details to the right)? 2. The use of the three sections at the bottom is confusing. The left shows a full height parapet on a wingwall where to the face of the wall, but the title is very generic: "Extent of Control Joint". The middle shows a short parapet wall on a paved deck and is specifically titled as "Extent of Control Joint in Parapet Wall". The rightmost shows a full height barrier wall on a paved deck and is specifically titled as "Extent of Control Joint in Barrier Wall". e.g. why is full height parapet on wingwall shown but not the full height barrier on wingwall? Why is full height parapet on wingwall titled generically but shows only one type of wall on, specifically, a wingwall? It is suggested that these be reviewed and consideration be provided to either add more sections encompassing different situations or making the sections more generic to universally apply to different types of walls at different locations. 3. The arrow cut "1" in plan is facing right, but the cut sections at the bottom of the drawing seem to be facing left. This is assuming that the long horizontal rectangle at the bottom of the plan view is intended to show the sloped vertical interior face of a jersey style barrier. 4. The "Extent of Control Joint in Barrier Wall" does not show the angle of the sloped cut at the deck interface. Both other details to the left show 30 degrees. 5. Chase detail "B" is called up on the "Extent of Control Joint in Barrier Wall" detail, but is not called up on the detail to the left where a chase is also shown.	**1.** Agree, correction will be made. **2.** As the MTO standard covers multiple barrier types, this detail is currently shown for all existing barrier configurations. We agree that a consistent approach should be applied across all barrier types, since the control joint extent is independent of its location. The drawing will be modified to address this. **3.** It is not necessary to mark section 1, it will be deleted from the drawing. **4**. Drawing will be modified. **5.** Drawing will be modified.
588-3	Individual	**SS110-4720**:	1.The intent of construction joints at 12 m maximum spacing is to control cracking.

Comments received by TCP			
Comment ID	Organization	Comment	Response
		1. Note 14 seems to prohibit the contractor from casting the moment slab in one single pour if it is longer then 12m. What is the intent behind this requirement? 2. A drip channel is shown at the underside of the concrete component overhanging the RSS panels, but no geometry is provided. It is suggested that the geometry from OPSD 3390.100 is included on this drawing as a typical detail. 3. The typical section "1" showing reinforcement details has the top transverse bars of the slab called up as "G15"; should be "15M". 4. On Note 4, there seems to be a period missing between "..each reinforcement strip" and "For barriers shorter than…". 5. "Detail depends on supplier of RSS wall system". Suggest changing RSS to MSE to ensure that the terminology is consistent. 6. On Notes to Designer #4, there seems to be a period missing between "... larger than 25mm" and "For such cases…". 7. Some of the above comments may also apply to other drawings in this package (e.g. SS110-4710).	2. Drawing will be modified 3. Correction will be made 4. Correction will be made 5. Correction will be made 6. Correction will be made 7. ok
588-4	Individual	SS110-5110: 1. The end walls without railing (Sections 1, 4, and 5) are of uniform width and have truly vertical inside and outside faces. When railings are present (Sections 2 and 3) the walls have a truly vertical outside face and a sloped inside face (25mm wider at asphalt elevation than at the top of the wall). From this, it is understood that the outside face of all walls (Sections 1 through 5) will be perfectly aligned along the full length in plan view, whereas the inside face alignment will transition at the end walls (over 380mm in a triangular shape) from Section 1 to Section 2. Sections 1, 4 and 5 show the wingwall inside face in the same vertical plane as the inside face of the end wall. Section 2 also shows the inside face of the wingwall in the same vertical plane as the inside face of the end wall. Sections 1, 4, and 5 should be revised to show the inside face of wingwall 25mm wider than the inside face of end wall (similar to how it is shown in Section 3 of SS110-4410).	Correction will be made. The wingwalls width will have to be adjusted on a project-specific basis.
588-5	Individual	SS110-5120: 1. Is this intended to replace SS110-95? 2. A previous draft version of SS110-510 appears to have been accidentally uploaded instead of the intended stainless steel SS110-5120. SS110-5510: 1. Is this intended to replace SS110-96? 2. The CJ on Section 1 is show to meet the top of asphalt. This is not consistent with the CJs shown on SS110-5110 which show the CJ brought to the top of deck / underside of asphalt. 3. The "Applicable Standard Drawings" should be revised to include SS110-5120 (stainless steel).	1. Yes 2. It has been replaced with correct version 1. Yes 2. oK. 3. SS110-5120 will be included
588-6	Individual	SS110-4410: 1. Are there plans to include a two-tube TL-4 barrier for stainless rebar or will this detail only be for GFRP bar? 2. There is a missing word in Note 10: "…hardware not TO be left in place". 3. Note 12 should reference MTOD 3960.200 not OPSD.	1. MTO does not see a need to use Stainless steel rebar for two-tube TL-4 barrier. 2. Ok 3. Ok , correction will be made.

Comments received by TCP			
Comment ID	Organization	Comment	Response
		4. Section 1 should reference OPSD 3390.100 not MTOD. 5. The "Applicable Standard Drawings" should be revised to include OPSD 3390.100.	4. Correction will be made 4. Correction will be made
588-7	individual	SS110-5810: 1. The "Applicable Standard Drawings" should be revised to include OPSD 911.381 and OPSD 911.382.	Reference to these drawings is provided on the “Plan”. Drawing will be modified to list them as well.
588-8	Individual	SS110-6210: 1. The "Applicable Standard Drawings" should be revised to include OPSD 911.382. 2. Suggest adding a leader and calling up OPSD 3390.100 for the drip channel. 3. Section 1 (reinforcing), suggest adding a tolerance (+/-) to the 40mm cover.	1. Refer to response to comment # 588-7 2. Drawing will be modified to add the reference. 3. +/- 10 mm will be added given that it’s installed to the bottom mat.
591	Individual	Does anything change in terms of approval status of precast MASH TL-4 Traffic Barriers that have previously been approved by the MTO for use on the RSS Wall/Slope DSM List 9.70.56 and have demonstrated full crash test results? Will this continue to be an approved product, if it is currently approved?	The MTO does not have standards for *precast* barriers on bridges. The existing structural standard drawings of TL 4 The barrier on MSE wall (S110-64,65,6,69 & 75) will be replaced by the new standard drawings. The MSE Wall Suppliers listed on MTO’s DSM List# 9.70.56 will be required to follow the new standards and design the MSE wall to resists the load transferred from the barrier to the wall.