**PID / CRS:** **122901**
**Project:** **PRE IR 70 WB Truck Parking**

**Reviewers:** ODOT Ohio Department of Transportation District 8

Designer Response:
A - Agree / Acknowledged
B - Agree and Comment
C - Disagree
D - Resolution Required

**Submitted:** Stage 1 Submission 6/4/2025
**Comments Sent:** Comments received 6/18/2025

**Review**

| REVIEWER | | | | | DESIGNER | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comment No. | Item Ref. | Sheet No. | Comment By | Comment | | Disposition / Response | Response By |
| 1 | Construction Plans | 1 | tmazza | SS804 SS809 SS904 | A | Supplemental Specifications have been added. | |
| 2 | Construction Plans | 1 | jotis | Provide mainline 70 design designation information since rebuilding the ramps. | A | Design Designation information has been added. | |
| 3 | Construction Plans | 1 | jotis | Add the MOT endorsement note. | A | MOT note has been added. | |
| 4 | Construction Plans | 1 | jotis | I believe it's more than 100. List the actual number. | B | Actual parking space number has been updated to 112. | |
| 5 | Construction Plans | 1 | jotis | This map should be "zoomed in" much closer to the site. | A | We concur. Plans are updated. | |
| 6 | Construction Plans | 1 | tbrehm1 | The following drainage calculations are needed: BMP calculations Storm Sewer Calculations | A | We concur, we have provided computations in the Stage 3 submission | |
| 7 | Construction Plans | 1 | tbrehm1 | BMP are going to be required for the project. BMP should be designed following L&D Vol. 2. Detention is typically utilized for Site Development, but it is not required for this project since it is considered "roadway improvement" | A | We concur, we have provided design and computations in the Stage 3 submission | |
| 8 | Construction Plans | 2 | jelston | change to 10" | B | We concur. We have provided 10" of concrete pavement. | |
| 9 | Construction Plans | 2 | jelston | Change to 10" | B | We concur. We have provided 10" of concrete pavement. | |
| 10 | Construction Plans | 2 | jelston | change to 446 | B | We concur. We have provided to 446. | |
| 11 | Construction Plans | 2 | jelston | The accel/decel lanes for the ramps and ramp up to the physical gore shall match the full depth asphalt composition from the mainline PRE-70 selection. This is currently shown on the typicals - no change. Also the location is shown on shts 58-59. The only change is the 447 acceptance on the surface to change to 446. The ramp and parking area pavement shall be: 10" Item 452 Non Reinforced Concrete Pavement Class QC1P with QC/QA 6" Item 304 - Aggregate Base | A | We concur. Plans are updated. | |
| 12 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | Provide a step detail. | A | We concur. Plans are updated. | |
| 13 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | The concrete longitudinal joint should be shown on the typical sections. | A | We concur. Plans are updated. | |
| 14 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | the ramp cross section depict cut conditions. show that on the typical section. | A | Typical Section is now updated. | |
| 15 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | show the fill scenario per the cross sections and label the 6:1 foreslope | A | Typical Section is now updated. | |
| 16 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | grade break maximum? | A | Grade break maximum is now labeled. | |
| 17 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | provide a cross reference to the superelevation tables. | A | Cross reference is now shown. | |
| 18 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | what is the range? Can't a standard cross slope be provided? | B | Standard slope is now shown | |
| 19 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | See Ramp T comments as several apply to this ramp and terminal as well. | B | We concur and have applied comments to Ramp S. | |
| 20 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | 6' graded shoulder per 303-1 | D | 3' treated shoulder is provided. The existing mainline elevation and ditch elevation puts constraints on the graded shoulder width available. This is at a near stop condition in the parking lot, being just beyond a sharp turn and yield. This topic may need more discussion. | |
| 21 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | label the max grade break allowed | A | Grade breaks on the ramp terminals are shown on the ramp terminal sheets. | |
| 22 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | Label the profile grade line. Typical comment. | A | We concur. Plans are now updated to show PGL. | |
| 23 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | Label the sawcut and state to sawcut to sound pavement. | A | We concur. Plans are now updated to show sawcut line. | |
| 24 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | Label the existing pavement buildup. | A | We concur. Plans are now updated to show the existing pavement buildup. | |
| 25 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | Ramp Terminal | A | The text is now updated. | |
| 26 | Construction Plans | 2 | jotis | IR 70 stationing | B | Stationing is now updated. | |
| 27 | Construction Plans | 2 | jelston | 2 | A | Balloons are now updated on the Tyical Sections. | |
| 28 | Construction Plans | 2 | jelston | 1 | A | Balloons are now updated on the Tyical Sections. | |
| 29 | Construction Plans | 2 | tbrehm1 | an underdrain may be needed here depending on where the IR70 underdrains are located | B | Underdrain is now provided. | |

**Review**

| REVIEWER | | | | | DESIGNER | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comment No. | Item Ref. | Sheet No. | Comment By | Comment | | Disposition / Response | Response By |
| 30 | Construction Plans | 2 | ccarriere | 3 | A | Balloons are now updated on the Tyical Sections. | |
| 31 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | Are underdrains needed for the parking lot? | A | We now show parking lot underdrain locations. | |
| 32 | Construction Plans | 3 | jelston | change to 10" | A | We are now showing 10" concrete for the pavement buildup. | |
| 33 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | missing a vertical line which i commented on | A | We concur. Plans are updated. | |
| 34 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | I'd say the service drive does not need the tall curbs as they are being used to keep the semi trucks in their "lane". | A | Concur. We are now showing Curb, Type 6 on these service drives. | |
| 35 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | This is not a typical roadway project. Schematic is required unless the entire project can be shown on less than 4 plan/profile sheets. | A | Schematic Plan is provided in this submission | |
| 36 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | Provide typical section for the concrete drives within the parking lot as we need to ensure they are wide enough for trucks. | A | We concur. Drives are added and widths are now labeled. | |
| 37 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | ODOT standard is 1.56% which allows for some construction tolerance while still meeting ADA compliance. | B | We have updated to 1.56% | |
| 38 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | 23 | A | We have updated the section. | |
| 39 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | this would be under the aggregate base | B | We have updated the label. | |
| 40 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | Scope said to provide cement stabilization throughout. | A | Cement stabilization is now provided throughout the project. | |
| 41 | Construction Plans | 3 | jotis | missing vertical line | A | The line is now added. | |
| 42 | Construction Plans | 3 | jelston | Why 2 Bubbles for the same thing? | B | We have now provided one comprehensive legend so there is no redundancy | |
| 43 | Construction Plans | 3 | jelston | Verify correct call out.  Sht 2 shows Bubble 2 = Underdrains. | A | We have updated. | |
| 44 | Construction Plans | 4 | jotis | This note won't be needed as ODOT forces will be cutting down the trees. | A | We have updated the clearing and endangered bat notes. | |
| 45 | Construction Plans | 4 | jotis | ODOT forces will be cutting down the trees during the winter to avoid bat restriction limitations. The expectation is that the dropped trees and stumps will still need removed by the contractor so the note will need to reflect this. | A | We have updated the clearing and endangered bat notes. | |
| 46 | Construction Plans | 5 | jotis | Provide a fence sheet(s) for the entire site. | A | Fence Plan sheets have been added to the plan set. | |
| 47 | Construction Plans | 5 | jotis | label the sawcut line. typical comment | B | Sawcut line has been labeled on the sheets. | |
| 48 | Construction Plans | 5 | jotis | label the shoulder width were tapers occur. It's 8' at 122+97.33 | B | We have added station labesl and moved the  dimension | |
| 49 | Construction Plans | 5 | tbrehm1 | confirm underdrain flow directions. Do the underdrains drain into the catch basin? If so, show the connection to the catch basin | | Underdrain outlets and connections are shown in the Stage 3 plans. Please review and we'll provide additional detail if anything is unclear. | |
| 50 | Construction Plans | 5 | tbrehm1 | Underdrain outlets should be provided at a desirable interval of 500' with a maximum interval of 1000' | A | Underdrain outlets are provided in the Stage 3 plans. | |
| 51 | Construction Plans | 5 | tbrehm1 | Proposed underdrain outlets needs to outlet onto the slope/ditch or into a catch basin. The length of pipe will be dependent on the depth of underdrain and the ditch. Show the outlet and the Tied Concrete Block Mat | A | Underdrain outlets are provided in the Stage 3 plans. | |
| 52 | Construction Plans | 6 | jotis | Was a steeper ramp slope considered to reduce the amount of excavation at the site? | B | A steeper slope was considered. A straighter slope was the safer geometrically considering the elevation and slope constraint at the ramp gore and the parking lot. | |
| 53 | Construction Plans | 6 | jotis | Show the profile to the end of the new work where the acceleration lane ends. | B | Profile information is now shown on terminal detail sheets. References to the terminal details are made on the profiel sheets | |
| 54 | Construction Plans | 6 | jotis | label the profile information beyond the ramp. | B | Profile information is now shown on terminal detail sheets. References to the terminal details are made on the profiel sheets | |
| 55 | Construction Plans | 7 | jotis | culvert? would need extended | D | Agree that a culvert would need to be extended if it exists. That section is under around 2-3' of fill. We do not have survey information on any pipe. Does the headwall truly exist? | |
| 56 | Construction Plans | 8 | jotis | Was a steeper slope considered to reduce the amount of excavation? | B | A steeper slope was considered. A straighter slope was the safer geometrically considering the elevation and slope constraint at the ramp gore and the parking lot. | |

**Review**

| REVIEWER | | | | | DESIGNER | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comment No. | Item Ref. | Sheet No. | Comment By | Comment | | Disposition / Response | Response By |
| 57 | Construction Plans | 8 | jotis | Provide profile information to the end of the deceleration taper. | B | Profile information is now shown on terminal detail sheets. References to the terminal details are made on the profiel sheets | |
| 58 | Construction Plans | 10 | tbrehm1 | a cross section sheet is missing - STA 121+50 and 122+00 | A | This cross section is now included in the plan set. | |
| 59 | Construction Plans | 11 | tbrehm1 | It does not appear the underdrains can outlet in this area, please confirm and adjust design as needed. Are there currently underdrains? May need to extend and outlet to a catch basin | B | An underdrain outlet is now provided at STA 122+00. The outlet is extended into an area feasible for drainage. | |
| 60 | Construction Plans | 22 | tscanlon | Does this service drive need more lighting? Probably not used much and night, but could be a security issue? | A | More has been added to the service drive for security purposes. | |
| 61 | Construction Plans | 27 | tbrehm1 | This is a location where we can outlet the underdrain. | A | An underdrain outlet is now provided at STA 139+50. | |
| 62 | Construction Plans | 31 | jotis | i'd start this on a new sheet to separate the work locations (entrance and exit ramps) | A | Concur. Plans are updated to show a new sheet for the change in ramp | |
| 63 | Construction Plans | 39 | jotis | some sheets are 11x17 and others are 22x34. have them all 22x34. | A | Cross sections are updated to be 22x34. | |
| 64 | Construction Plans | 40 | jotis | this ditch is inside the clear zone of mainline. should meet safety grading requirements | D | This location is at the ramp/mainline physical gore. A ditch is required and provided in this location. The ditch will be rounded to provide a recoverabe slope. Please advise if this is acceptable. | |
| 65 | Construction Plans | 47 | jotis | I'd be okay with a steeper backslope (4:1 or 3:1 max) to reduce some of the excavation. | D | Highway safety grading was provided. Please review with that context in mind and advise if revisions to the ditches and slopes are required. The original grading is carried forward to the Stage 3 plans. | |
| 66 | Construction Plans | 51 | jotis | I'd be fine reducing the ditch width on the ramp to reduce some of the excavation. The ramp should follow mainline grading (safety grading), but there is some flexibility. | D | Highway safety grading was provided. Please review with that context in mind and advise if revisions to the ditches and slopes are required. The original grading is carried forward to the Stage 3 plans. | |
| 67 | Construction Plans | 51 | tbrehm1 | Why is the ditch so wide? Can we avoid the excavation with a narrower ditch? | D | Highway safety grading was provided. Please review with that context in mind and advise if revisions to the ditches and slopes are required. The original grading is carried forward to the Stage 3 plans. | |
| 68 | Construction Plans | 57 | jotis | what design speed is this rate for? | B | The SE rate used was 25 MPH on the ramp on the last curve before entering the truck parking area since there is a reasonable expectation of slow travel speeds and the length constaint for additional SE rate. | |
| 69 | Construction Plans | 58 | jelston | Label Asphalt/ Concrete joint  Similar to Sht 59 It adds clarity | A | We concur. We have included labels for clarity. | |
| 70 | Construction Plans | 58 | jotis | what is this line? | B | The line was showing the sawcut line. We have hidden that level on the pavement marking sheets in the Stage 3 submission. | |
| 71 | Construction Plans | 58 | tscanlon | I assume a signing plan for I-70 and the parking area will be done at later stages? | B | The signing plan for the truck parking has been developed and is included with the Stage 3 submission. | |
| 72 | Construction Plans | 58 | tscanlon | What does the * mean?  Different marking material? | B | A note has been added to clarify the intend of the asteric on pavement markings. | |
| 73 | Construction Plans | 58 | tscanlon | Is there an existing white edge line that will need to be removed? I believe these were painted when the rest area shut down.  There may also be one on the entrance too | B | The position of the sawcut should obliterate the existing white marking. | |
| 74 | Construction Plans | 59 | tscanlon | * | A | Will update for pavement markings on concrete. | |
| 75 | Construction Plans | 60 | tmazza | John Otis: Should this general notes sheet be combined with the other general notes sheet (SH 4)? | A | Notes have been combined on the front end of the plan set. | |
| 76 | Construction Plans | 61 | jotis | ODOT forces will be cutting down the trees separately. Stumps will likely remain though. | B | A note has been added to clarify the clearing on site. Pelase review and advise any needed revisions. | |
| 77 | Construction Plans | 64 | tbrehm1 | This project will require BMP. Please submit calculations for BMP as BMP could impact ROW | B | BMP computations are included with the Stage 3 submission. BMPs have also been detailed in the plans. | |

**Review**

| REVIEWER | | | | | DESIGNER | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comment No. | Item Ref. | Sheet No. | Comment By | Comment | | Disposition / Response | Response By |
| 78 | Construction Plans | 66 | tbrehm1 | This Project will require NOI and a SWPPP. The contractor is required to develop the SWPPP. We will have 832 pay items for Erosion Control, SWPPP, SWPPP Inspections, SWPPP Software which is how the erosion control is addressed for the project. Instead of the Erosion Control Notes, the project will follow SS832 | B | Erosion Control is now detailed in the plans and quantified in the estimated quantities. | |
| 79 | Construction Plans | 67 | tbrehm1 | This Project will require NOI and a SWPPP. The contractor is required to develop the SWPPP. We will have 832 pay items for Erosion Control, SWPPP, SWPPP Inspections, SWPPP Software which is how the erosion control is addressed for the project. Instead of the Erosion Control Details, the project will follow SCD DM-4.3 and DM-4.4 | B | Erosion Control is now detailed in the plans and quantified in the estimated quantities. Please advise if additional erosion control is required. | |
| 80 | Construction Plans | 68 | Bryan Comer | See comments on Utility Plan overall sheet (P.74) about ITS camera poles for TPIMS and providing service access drives to them as well. | A | Concur. Drives are now included in the site design for ITS pole access. | |
| 81 | Construction Plans | 68 | jotis | facility department requested the loose stone | A | Loose stone will be used. | |
| 82 | Construction Plans | 68 | jotis | Truck parked here can turn left to exit and stay on pavement? | B | Truck turning templates were run and updates have been made to accommodate trucks. | |
| 83 | Construction Plans | 68 | jotis | Label the pavement width for the drives. | A | Drive widths are now labeled. | |
| 84 | Construction Plans | 68 | jotis | check the sheet scale as this should measure at 25' | A | Sheet scale has been updated. | |
| 85 | Construction Plans | 68 | jotis | Can a truck parked in this spot maneuver into the drive out of this section? Looks like it would be tight. The rock islands shaped might need modified to address the movements. | B | Truck turning templates were run and updates have been made to accommodate trucks. | |
| 86 | Construction Plans | 68 | jotis | Provide truck turning templates (WB-67) at critical locations (edge parking spots for example) to ensure sufficient pavement is provided. ODOT experienced multiple offtracking locations on the WAR-71 rest area project and do not want that to occur again. Per scope a minimum 2' offset from the wheel path to face of curb or edge of pavement. | B | Truck turning template exhibits are included with the Stage 3 submittal. Updates have been made to accommodate trucks. | |
| 87 | Construction Plans | 68 | Cory | was the turning radius study performed for this island? movement of truck traffic to back lot seems impacted by this island make these islands HARDSCAPES, no loose stone | B | PC and PT coordinates data is now provided along with the curve radius | |
| 88 | Construction Plans | 69 | jotis | Will the various curve data be provided? | B | PC and PT coordinates data is now provided along with the curve radius | |
| 89 | Construction Plans | 69 | tscanlon | Recommend arrows on the pavement in strategic areas to denote the correct circulation of vehicles. Signing to supplement the markings would be beneficial (ONE WAY, etc.) | A | Concur. Signing has been provided in the Stage 3 plans for site circulation and driver clarity. | |
| 90 | Construction Plans | 69 | tscanlon | What is the width of each space? | A | Parking stall width is now labeled in the plans. | |
| 91 | Construction Plans | 69 | tscanlon | This can be thermo on asphalt | A | Concur. Pavement markings have been updated in the Stage 3 plans to identify type. | |
| 92 | Construction Plans | 69 | tscanlon | This will need to be epoxy on concrete surface | A | Concur. Pavement markings have been updated in the Stage 3 plans to identify type. | |
| 93 | Construction Plans | 70 | jotis | curb ramps to be provided at all? | B | Curb ramps are intended to be provided. We have updated plan callouts. | |
| 94 | Construction Plans | 70 | jotis | the varying pavement width needs labeled (on this sheet or somewhere). | A | Concur. Comprehensive labeling is now provided. | |
| 95 | Construction Plans | 71 | tbrehm1 | Label existing contours | A | Concur. Existing contours are now labeled. | |
| 96 | Construction Plans | 72 | jotis | based on the ramp cross sections, a grading plan in this area would be beneficial | B | The intention of this area is to grade up to existing. We will coordinate showing the ramp grading on our plans as well to demonstrate this, as well as adding grading limits boundary to show where we intend to match existing grades. | |
| 97 | Construction Plans | 74 | Bryan Comer | Assuming no network connections are needed for anything to this building but could make connections in this area if needed. | B | Agree. No apparent need for connections at this time but can be incorporated later if desired. | |
| 98 | Construction Plans | 74 | Bryan Comer | Potential ITS Fiber line to connect new camera sites and continue over to the EB rest area building where telecom network circuit is located | A | Concur. Plans are updated to show the utility crossing. | |
| 99 | Construction Plans | 74 | Bryan Comer | Future ITS camera pole location in this area I believe. Extend access drive to here somehow as well, maybe like shown. | A | Concur. Access drives are extended. | |
| 100 | Construction Plans | 74 | Bryan Comer | Future ITS camera pole location in this area I believe. Extend access drive to here somehow as well, maybe like shown. | A | Concur. Access drives are extended. | |
| 101 | Construction Plans | 74 | Bryan Comer | Believe there will be ITS poles for truck parking (TPIMS) system coming in a future plan submittal. Made comments on this sheet but should have own detailed design sheets. | A | ITS discipline sheets are included in the Stage 3 plans. | |
| 102 | Construction Plans | 74 | jotis | please confirm | A | "By others" removed from Light Poles. Plans are updated. | |
| 103 | Construction Plans | 74 | tbrehm1 | ODOT deals mainly with linear transportation projects, are there design standards that are being followed for the site drainage? Is this enough catch basins? | B | Catch basins have been designed to handle the flow going to the structures at this time. We are following City of Columbus standards for the storm sewer sizing, while utilizing ODOT zone D rainfall data | |

**Review**

| REVIEWER | | | | | DESIGNER | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comment No. | Item Ref. | Sheet No. | Comment By | Comment | | Disposition / Response | Response By |
| 104 | Construction Plans | 74 | tbrehm1 | Are there underdrains or finger drains for the parking lot? | B | Underdrains are provided in the parking lot. Details are included in the Stage 3 plans. | |
| 105 | Construction Plans | 77 | tbrehm1 | instead of STM, label as Conduit, Type B/C (Type B if under pavement, Type C if not under pavement) | A | Concur. Plans are updated. | |
| 106 | Construction Plans | 77 | tbrehm1 | It appears this system can be raised several feet. Why is the storm set so low? | B | Storm sewer depth is adjusted in Stage 3 submission | |
| 107 | Cost Estimate | 4 | jotis | 9" per plans | A | Cost estimate is updated with proper pavement depths | |
| 108 | Photometric Calcs | 22 | tscanlon | Does this service drive need more lighting? Probably not used much at night, but could be a security issue? | A | Additional accomodations have been made to light the service drives. | |