Design Exception Request

DEL-229-0.21

PID: 107754; Request 03

Letting Type: ODOT-Let	
Design Designation	

00229; 0.14-3.5				
3,600	Td	0.05		
4,700	Design Speed	60		
400	Legal Speed	55		
0.50	Design Functional Class	5 - Major Collector Roads		
0.16	Functional Class Area Type	Rural		
	NHS Project	No		
	4,700 400 0.50	3,600 Td 4,700 Design Speed 400 Legal Speed 0.50 Design Functional Class 0.16 Functional Class Area Type		



Submitted By:	
Ravinder Gupta	
(Engineer of Record)	
Approved by:	Engineer of Record Seal

Sean Meddles Approval Date: 11/7/2024

Design Exception Request

DEL-229-0.21

PID: 107754; Request 03

	Controll	ing Criteria Identification	
	Se	ection: 00229; 0.14-3.5	
Controlling Criteria	Standard	Existing (a.)	Proposed
Lane Width			
Shoulder Width			
Horizontal Curve Radius			
Maximum Grade			
SSD (Horizontal & Crest Vertical)			
Pavement Cross Slope			
Superelevation Rate			
Vertical Clearance			
Design Loading Structural Capacity	SFN 2102854: HL 93 + 60 FWS	SFN 2102854: H 20 (120% Ohio Legal Load)	SFN 2102854: HL 93 + 0 FWS (Inventory Rating = 0.775, Operating Rating = 1.005) (Controlling Legal Load RF = 145% Ohio Legal Load)
	(a) "Evicting" may	he N/A (i.e. New alignment or new	

Project Description

REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE AT THE DEL-00229-00.200, REHABILITATION OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURES AT 00.930, 01.490, AND 03.480 AND GUARDRAIL UPGRADES AT THE DEL-00229-00.360 LOCATION. REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING CULVERTS AT 01.560 AND 02.298 AND EXTENDING THE EXISTING CULVERT AT THE 03.250 LOCATION.

Section Description

REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE AT THE DEL-00229-00.200, REHABILITATION OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURES AT 00.930, 01.490, AND 03.480 AND GUARDRAIL UPGRADES AT THE DEL-00229-00.360 LOCATION.

REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING CULVERTS AT 01.560 AND 02.298 AND EXTENDING THE EXISTING CULVERT AT THE 03.250 LOCATION.

Proposed Mitigation (if any):	
None	
Support for Deviation (Benefit-cost, R	/W, Environmental, Constructability, Coordination with Other Projects, Relationship between any crash
patterns and proposed design except	ion, etc.):
A cost comparison was completed for	two sceanrios for the 3.48 bridge (SFN 2102854):
L.) Bridge rehabilitation work (deck ov	erlay, new fascia beams, and deck edge repair) - \$1,093,145
2.) Full superstructure replacement - \$	1,333,145
Due to the cost difference between th	e two options (\$240,000), the Bridge Rehabiliation option was selected which requires a design exception for th
design load rating.	

Does the crash analysis (GCAT and CAM Tool) show any patterns that would be adversely impacted by the proposed Design Exception?

No

No