

Comment Report: All Comments

Project: Fargo Moorhead Metro - Reach 4 Design by MVK

Review: DTR - Consistency Review

Displaying 116 comments for the criteria specified in this report.

Id	Discipline	DocType	Spec	Sheet	Detail
5114984	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS101, CS102, CS201 Right Bank Ditch	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

([Document Reference: Volume 1](#))

The 90% Reach 3 documents prepared by the Local Sponsor (FMMDR3B_90% 1 Plan Set 12-21-2012 Channel.pdf) show a permanent right side drainage ditch to be constructed prior to Reach 4 under the Reach 3 construction contract and extending to the Rush River. Reach 4, Volume 1 also shows a right bank drainage ditch alignment however it is outside of this proposed ditch alignment and shows the permanent ditch to be filled to construct the right bank excavated material berm (EMB) with undulations. Coordinate the permanent right bank ditch location with the Local Sponsor to avoid duplicate construction efforts and additional costs with excavating and constructing the right bank drainage ditch multiple times.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The permanent right side drainage ditch has been coordinated with the reach 3 team to minimize duplicative construction efforts.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5124555	Specifications	Specifications	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	----------------	----------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU)**

([Document Reference: Bid Schedule & TOC](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Specifications

The DTR bid schedule and Table of Contents appear to be reasonable for this level of review. Minor comments have been provided.

Submitted By: [Jeffrey Hansen](#) (651-290-5649). Submitted On: Apr 09 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The bidding schedule has been updated for the FTR.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Jul 15 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed. Updated Bid schedule and specs provided.

Submitted By: [Jeffrey Hansen](#) (651-290-5649) Submitted On: Aug 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5128903	Civil	Plans	n/a	S-100	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

(Document Reference: [Volume 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Structural

72" RCP appears to have a bend in the pipe upstream of the flap gate and downstream of the trash rack. Add detail or notes for the type of bend that is proposed.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Apr 11 2013

Revised Apr 11 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

A callout of the bend in the pipe, and a note has been added to describe the type of bend.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: May 06 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

S-100 identifies the pipe bend at 4.31 degrees which satisfies this comment to include information on the bend proposed. Pipe bend may need to be special order as the typical size bends I have seen on 72" RCP are 7 1/4 degrees.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025) Submitted On: Sep 16 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5129280	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS201	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Volume 2](#))

The embedded levee top at Station 413+47 is shown as 895.36 on CS201 for Reach 4, Volume 2 whereas the embedded levee top at Station 413+47 is shown as 894.47 on C-202 for the 90% CR32 Diversion Reach 4 Bridge Channel prepared by the Local Sponsor, HMG. Coordinate transition areas with the Local Sponsor.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Apr 11 2013

Revised Apr 11 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

I made a comment regarding the above on the CR32 90% review. See attached Dr. Check's comment and the HMG response indicating that they will add a transition within their reach to meet our levee profile.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jun 13 2013
(Attachment: [5008640.pdf](#))

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The embedded levee top on the Sponsor's FMMDR4B_90% 1 Plan Set 08-30-2013-Channel.pdf is still indicating a embedded levee top of 894.47 at Sta. 413+47. The Local Sponsor has not included a transition within the CR32 bridge plans.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025) Submitted On: Sep 16 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

I discussed this issue with Lyndon Pease on 11/8/13. He indicated that omission of the levee transition was an oversight and that it would be incorporated into the CR32 plans. As of this comment response, I have not seen the revised drawing.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 13 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5129622	Civil	Plans	n/a	FMMDR4_VOL1, VOL2, VOL3 PLANS	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

FMMDR4_DTR_ATR_VOL1_PLANS.pdf-Volume 1 , FMMDR4_DTR_ATR_VOL2_PLANS.pdf-Volume 2, and FMMDR4_DTR_ATR_VOL3_PLANS.pdf-Volume 3 were reviewed and courtesy comments will be provided for incorporation in the FTR documents. Courtesy comments were issued via. email to Jonathon Boone, Colby Bankston, Dennis Gilmore, and Mike Hanks

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Apr 11 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Consistency comments were received and will be incorporated as suggested.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Plans were reviewed for considerations with the courtesy comments provided and were addressed.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025) Submitted On: Sep 16 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131000 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [DDR](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section 6.3.4 , pg 18

Please include the values of estimated settlement and rebound.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Estimated settlement and rebound values were added to the DDR.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Jun 28 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Values have been added.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131004 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [DDR](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section 6.4 , pg 18

A supplemental ESA been completed as of March 2013. Please update this section with the findings.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

This is now section 5.4 and includes the March 2013 Supplemental ESA results for reach 4.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Jun 28 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The ESA writeup has been updated.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131006 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.2.3 , pg D-2

The geology description in the paragraph does not match the formation contact elevations in Table D-1. There is a pretty large discrepancy that begs the question of what is correct. Please verify the contact elevations and explain why there are discrepancies.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The table has the correct contact elevations. The discrepancy is due to the write-up not being updated after the change in stratigraphy at the 35% level. Text will be updated to reflect the elevations and thicknesses shown in the table.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Apr 24 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Revisions have been made and the write-up and table match.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131009 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.2.5 , pg D-3

This section needs to be updated as additional instrumentation has been installed and readings have been collected. Please coordinate with MVP.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Once MVP provides the updated instrumentation information, this section will be updated.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: May 03 2013

Backcheck not conducted

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

MVP has provided updated instrumentation information and this section has been updated to include it.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Jun 03 2013

2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The instrumenation section has been updated with the information provided.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131011	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

([Document Reference: Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.3.1 , pg D-3

In discussing things completed recently, a date should be used, otherwise that statement will become confusion in later versions.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

July 2012 will be added to the hand augers rather than "recently"

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Apr 24 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Data of the topsoil augers has been added.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131014	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

([Document Reference: Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.4.1.2 , pg D-6

Please indicate where the low-flow channel configurations change.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The low flow channel changes size at the Rush River Structure. It is 100ft downstream of the Rush and 90 ft upstream. has been added to the end of the first paragraph under 2).

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Apr 24 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Location of the low-flow channel size change is indicated.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

		Design			
5131018	Geotechnical	Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.4.1.2 , pg D-7

The requirements of how the EMBS are to be designed and constructed are known. The only thing unknown is what the left bank EMB final end-use will be. Please revised accordingly.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The last paragraph under 3) has been replaced with:

The ultimate use of the EMBs has been discussed with the non-Federal Sponsor and draft grading guidelines have been developed. The concept selected by the non-Federal Sponsor will incorporate recreational features on the right bank EMB. On the left bank, the EMB will be constructed so as to maximize the volume of material that can be placed within a given footprint. The left bank EMB will not be graded to facilitate farming activities.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Apr 24 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The EMB end use discussion has been updated.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

		Design			
5131022	Geotechnical	Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.7.3 , pg D-15

It is unclear if the 896 elevation takes into account the required overbuild. Please clarify if the 896 is the calculated HEC-RAS water surface elevation, plus 1 foot for uncertainty, and overbuild.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Elevation 896 takes into account overbuild. It is the Settlement + Design Water Elevation + 1ft for Uncertainty. $0.7\text{ft} + 895.3 + 1\text{ft} = 896\text{ft}$. This will be clarified in the report.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The requirement for the elevation has been clarified.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131024	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.7.3 , pg D-16

Please include a discussion if the settlement of the pipe is acceptable or if chamber is required.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

At the time of this review, the settlement of the pipe was still being analyzed. In the next submittal a more thorough discussion of the pipe settlement will be included, whether or not pipe camber is required will be in the discussion.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: May 03 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

A discussion has been included to discuss the settlement profile of the pipe. The estimated settlement indicates that cambering is not required and is stated.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131027 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.10 , pg D-18

R200 riprap at the local drainage structures should be R20. Please verify this.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

R200 is correct. See Attached Standard Riprap Gradation Chart.

Submitted By: [Raymond Wilson](#) (601-631-5738) Submitted On: May 09 2013

(Attachment: [Standard Riprap Gradation Chart.pptx](#))

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The riprap designation of R45 is being used, which is St. Paul's standard gradation.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131029 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D12.1 , pg D-20

Please include the following sentence at the end of the paragraph: "This material will be controlled by liquid limit less than 90% (LL < 90%)."

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Based on email from Kurt, the following sentence has been added at the end of the paragraph. "This material will be controlled by liquid limit less than or equal to 90% (LL ≤ 90%)." has been added to the report.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Apr 24 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The levee material requirement has been changed to be based on LL

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131033 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.13 , pg D-20

A supplemental ESA been completed as of March 2013. Please update this section with the findings.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The supplemental ESA has been received. Section D.13 will be updated for the reach 4 findings for the next submittal.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: May 03 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The ESA section has been updated to include discussion on the supplemental ESA.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131036 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D2](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.2.2 , pg D-1

Please describe the stratigraphy for the Rush River Structure in the appendix, similar as what was completed for Appendix D1 and Reach 5.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Section D.2.2 was amended for consistency with Appendix D1.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Jul 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The stratigraphy section has been revised and is consistent with Appendix D1.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131037 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D2](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.2.4 , pg D-2

This section needs to be updated as additional instrumentation has been installed and readings have been collected. Please coordinate with MVP.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The additional instrumentation data was added to the report similar to what was done in Reach 1.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Jul 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The instrumentation section has been updated with the info provided by MVP.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131040 Geotechnical Design
Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D2](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.6.2 , pg D-11

Why was a EMB height of 21 feet used when max initial EMB is 13 and max height 17? If the actual heights are used, is the settlement reduced enough that 18 or 20 inches of overbuild could be used? If 18 inches work, this would keep overbuild consistent within Reach 4 .

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The EMB height was changed from 17 ft to 20 ft to better account for the undulation design. The settlement analysis were updated to reflect the 20ft design height.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Jul 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

A 20 foot EMB height was used which is consistent with the max grading extents.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131042	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D2](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.6.3 , pg D-12

Please state what diversion invert is being used. It should be the centerline invert of the diversion channel without the low-flow channel. Please verify.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The diversion invert el. was added to the writeup. The centerline invert without the low-flow channel was used in the analysis.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Jul 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The section has been revised to clarify what the elevation is referring to.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131043	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D2](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.8.1 , pg D-12

The excavation types needs to be updated for Reach 5 and Rush River.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Section D.8.1 was updated to be more consistent with the Reach 1 appendix.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Jul 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Excavation types have been updated.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131045	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Geotech Appendix D2](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section D.10 , pg D-15

A supplemental ESA been completed as of March 2013. Please update this section with the findings.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Section D.10 was updated with the supplemental ESA findings and is setup similar to the Reach 1 appendix.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Jul 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The ESA discussion has been updated.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Sep 09 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5131049	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	CS102	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

(Document Reference: [Plans - Volume 1](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Is the term "spoil bank" should not be used. Please coordinate with PDT and MVP to revise term.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Apr 12 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Please clarify. The term "spoil bank" does not appear on CS102 of Volume 1. Could this comment have been meant for a different reach, document, or volume?

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 15 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The term is in volume two. This will be discussed with team but is acceptable to close out.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Oct 25 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133315	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Inlet headwall design. For computing lateral pressure, the boyant (effective) soil weight should be used and multplied by the horizontal soil coefficient, k, and the water added separately. The computations for load case i multiply the saturated unit weight by k.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Computations have been updated to account for bouyant and saturated conditions appropriately.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

computations were corrected

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133387	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Inlet wall calculations, Load case 3. The creep calculations of water pressure don't seem quite right. The seepage length, Ls should be from B to E which is 37.2 feet. The pressures at points on the foundation are mostly computed as hydrostatic, which isn't correct as the creep affect isn't accounted for. I can provide detail on this more easily in a phone call.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Creep calculations have been corrected.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment
computations were corrected

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133456	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Inlet headwall, Page 3 of 24 Please provide a reference for the equations used to compute K1. Note that the results are the same as the Coulomb equation, which would be simpler.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The reference has been added for the equations used to compute K1.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment
reference added

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133462	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Inlet headwall computations. Page 13 of 24. The water load computed here don't make sense to me. These are lateral loads at points? The load acts over lengths. The computation of load at C for instance, doesn't represent any water load that I recognize.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Water load computations have been corrected and updated.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment
computations were corrected

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133468 Design Team Plans n/a n/a n/a
Leader

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Coordinate "trail" bench transition with CR 32 Bridge Reach with Reach 4 Volume 1 and 2.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

A preliminary design for the bench transition was provided to the AE designing the undulations. As discussed in one of the weekly PDT meetings, the sponsor will be completing the design for the recreational bench and providing the design with the finished undulation surfaces. It will be incorporated into the next submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 15 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The bench design was completed and successfully incorporated into the Vol 1 and 2 designs.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133476 Design Team Plans n/a n/a n/a
Leader

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Coordinate undulations in CR 32 Bridge reach with undulation design in Reach 4 Volume 1 and 2.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The local sponsor's AE is designing the undulations, and the Reach 4 PDT is incorporating their design into the final submittal; undulation coordination will be verified upon the sponsor's submittal of the undulation design.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Please show undulations for CR 32 Bridge reach in Volume 1. I am not able to check the contours at the transition point. However for Volume 2, the bridge reach undulations and Volume 2 undulations appear to have have a seamless transition.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133481 Design Team Plans n/a n/a n/a
Leader

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Coordinate Reach 4 Volume 1 undulations with undulations in Reach 3.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The local sponsor's AE is designing the undulations, and the Reach 4 PDT is incorporating their design into the final submittal; undulation coordination will be verified upon the sponsor's submittal of the undulation design.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The transition between Reach 3 and Reach 4 volume 4 appears to work well. The undulation contours have been coordinated.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133547 Civil Plans n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Suggest add a note similar to the following paragraph to the project general notes to provide clarification regarding demolition of utilities.

"The Contractor shall be responsible for removal of all abandoned utilities within the project limits as indicated on the project plans and specifications. Abandoned utilities include water lines, underground communication lines (copper and fiber), underground electric lines and associated appurtenances. Above ground electric service/transmission lines and poles will be relocated by the utility owner prior to construction. The Diversion Authority's demolition contractor(s) will remove all structures, foundations, septic systems, wells (abandoned), etc. from within the project limits prior to construction."

Submitted By: [Russell Fischer](#) (651-290-5464). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The note will be added to the general notes located on the sheet with the drawing index and legend.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Thank you. Comment closed.

Submitted By: [Russell Fischer](#) (651-290-5464) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133576 Construction Specifications n/a n/a n/a
Management

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Bid Schedule](#))

Consider making the removal of draitile per LF rather than Lump Sum.

Submitted By: [Jane Flewellen](#) (651-290-5554). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

An investigation was performed by the Houston-Moore Group and it was determined that Reach 4 would not be impacted by drain tile features. The bid item for drain tile has been deleted.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Jul 15 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

It was verified that the drain tile bid item was deleted from the bid schedule and the spec was changed accordingly. Comment resolved.

Submitted By: [Jane Flewellen](#) (651-290-5554) Submitted On: Oct 30 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133622 Structural Design Memorandum or n/a n/a n/a
Report

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Inlet headwall computations. An effective unit weight accounting for seepage, gamma prime, is computed on the resisting side. An equivalent should be computed on the driving side as well.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

An effective unit weight accounting for seepage has been computed for the driving side and is now included in computations.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 30 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

the computations were corrected

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133685 Structural Design Memorandum or Report n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Inlet Reinforcement Computations, page 3. The inlet is being designed according to EM 1110-2-2104. The minimum temperature and shrinkage reinforcement ratio is 0.0028. Half of the temp and shrinkage is provided in each face (even in ACI), which is not accounted for in the calcs.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The minimum temperature and shrinkage reinforcement ratio is now designed in accordance with EM 1110-2-2104.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Computations were revised

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133731 Structural Design Memorandum or Report n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Inlet headwall footing design. It's not clear why the footing for the inlet is 3' thick. 2' should be plenty. Also, the footing and heel reinforcement design is usually determined by the load cases with the highest moment and eccentricity. The reasoning provided in the calcs for picking load case 1 may not be valid. Neglecting the uplift and surcharge forces under the heel is excessively conservative.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Updated calculations confirms that a 2' base will be acceptable; the next submittal will reflect this change.

The heel and toe reinforcement design will be updated to address the concern of being too conservative.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 30 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Design was revised

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133763	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Trash rack design, pg 2. The pressure is multiplied by the angle of the trash rack. Pressure is pressure acting equally in all directions and therefore would not be corrected for direction. However, the weight of the trash rack beam would be converted to a load normal to the beam.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Design computations have been corrected.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

In the 95% DDR this is still incorrect. The water pressure should not be multiplied by the trash rack slope to compute PD_45. Also note that the water pressure at the top of the rack is not the difference in water level. Since the top of the rack is two feet below the water surface the water pressure cannot be greater than that.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Design was corrected.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Oct 28 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

Design computations have been updated and sent to the commenter for review.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Oct 10 2013

2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The design was corrected.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Oct 28 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133964	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	filenaming	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Filename: Since many of the Sheet files have duplicate filenames between the Volumes, V1, V2, & V3 should be added to the user defined variables (or any unique characters). (eg FMMDR4_C-101---.dgn shall be FMMDR4_C-101-V1.dgn, FMMDR4_C-101-V2.dgn, FMMDR4_C-101-V3.dgn)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The filenames will be revised as suggested.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

volume 3 - structural filenames are incorrect. Remaining sheet files have been revised.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 3 - structural filenames are incorrect. Remaining sheet files have been revised.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

Structural sheet filenames have been revised as suggested.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Nov 13 2013

2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Structural sheet filenames have been revised.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133966	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	datum note	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

There are several sheets that the datum note is not populated.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

All title blocks/tags have been updated, including datum notes.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 3 - structural sheets and CS406 and CS407 are missing datum note.
Volume 3 - CD101, CD102, CS101, CS102, CS402, CS403, CS421-CS424, CS503, Cs504

Volume 2 - datum notes are populated.

Volume 1 - G-002, CS101, CS421-CS423
B-201 - the values are shifted.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 3 - structural sheets and CS406 and CS407 are missing datum note.

Volume 3 - CD101, CD102, CS101, CS102, CS402, CS403, CS421-CS424, CS503, CS504

Volume 1 - G-002, CS101, CS421-CS423
B-201 - the values are shifted.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133968 CAD-BIM Plans n/a alignments n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

All alignments shall have prefix letters to differentiate themselves. These prefix letters shall be used in tables also. (V1: CS601 & CS602), (V2: Lower Rush Structure), (V3: cs601 & CS602)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Prefix letters will be added to the tables on the CS600 sheets.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

volume 1 - tables show E for embedded levee and P for two different excavated material piles. These alignments/points are not shown in a plan view. The excavated material piles should have different prefix letters.

volume 2 - embedded levee does not have a prefix letter. embedded PIs shown on plan view - no stationing.

volume 3 - tables show E for embedded levee and P for excavated material piles. These alignments/points are not shown in a plan view.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

volume 1 - tables show E for embedded levee and P for two different excavated material piles. These alignments/points are not shown in a plan view. The excavated material piles should have different prefix letters.

volume 2 - embedded levee does not have a prefix letter. embedded PIs shown on plan view - no stationing.

volume 3 - tables show E for embedded levee and P for excavated material piles. These alignments/points are not shown in a plan view.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133969	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Control Point Tables	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	----------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Control Table information: The bearing and distance information should be between the points in the table. MVP has an Inroads style sheet that will produce this table format (CONTROL_LINE_DATA.xml). Also, our survey department has suggested the following regarding precision: Northing/Easting .12, Elevation .12, Distance .12, Angular/Distance- seconds.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Bearing and distance information will be moved to the line between the points in the tables on the CS600 sheets. The recommended precisions will be incorporated as well.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The control table information is using the predefined format.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133971	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Boring Log Plans	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

The use of a boring log plan is optional according to the standards. The boring log locations may be presented in the civil plan sheets. For consistency purposes, within a reach, it should be consistent between the volumes.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

A boring log plan does not make sense for volumes 1 and 3, which only have 1 boring each. The addition of a boring plan would increase the file size and the number of pages in the plan set without adding any value to the plans.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 3 has 3 logs shown in profile(B-200 series)and 1 log shown in plan view (I believe). Volume 1 has 4 logs showing in profile (B-200 series) and 1 log shown in plan view (I believe).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133972	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Profiles	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	----------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Indicate beginning and ending elevations along the profile. If the existing ground and design grade do not meet at the beginning/end, add note to clarify. (eg, see volume 2, see culvert profile sheet ID x-xxx, etc).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

As discussed by phone, for Sheet ID CS404, a 1:5 slope label was added on the upstream end of the 2-24" culvert. No further note was added to the right side of the Y section profile as the design grade shown in this area is cut on a skew that is not representative of typical design grade values.

For Sheet ID CS201, a callout was added to the beginning of the Rush River profile that provides the equivalent Diversion Channel centerline station.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jun 17 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Note added to Rush River profile clarifies the profile.

Suggested note for ditch profiles: Transition bottom of {profile} to existing ground.

Where {profile} is what is being shown such as right bank drainage ditch. This is applicable for most of the ditch profiles. The existing ground line and the design line do not meet. This was used in Reach 1.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

Ditch profiles on CS202 have been updated to daylight existing ground.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 13 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133973 CAD-BIM Plans n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Define the horizontal location of the embedded levee.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

An alignment tabulation for the control line of embedded levee will be added to the CS600 sheets.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

the control line is not shown in plan view.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The control line is not shown in plan view. (for any volume. volume 2 shows PIS in plan view only).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133976 CAD-BIM Plans n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

There are no reference drawings listed. The real estate drawings are not part of the construction set but are stand alones.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Reference drawings are now listed on applicable sheets. The real estate drawings will be printed to a separate PDF for the next submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The reference drawings have been included. Real Estate maps have been separated to their own set.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133978	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

If the real estate is going to be separate volumes, there needs to be some indication how many volumes there are. This needs to be discussed how we want this done.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Guidance has been provided to submit as separate volumes.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volumes 1 and 3 indicate that there are other volumes. Volume 2 does not.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133981	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 2 - G-001	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

there should be no district identified in the upper left corner beneath the castle.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

St. Paul District identifier has been removed from the upper left corner beneath the castle.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: May 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

the district has been removed.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5133982	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - G-001	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Missing the Solicitation, Contract & Date information in the lower left corner. Even if the information is not known yet, the place holders shall remain.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The Solicitation, Contract, and Date information was present, it just was not printing. The assistance you provided regarding the managed workspace resolved this issue. The next submittal will include the solicitation, contract, and date information on the main cover sheet.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The solicitation, contract and date information did not print. IN addition, there is an updated signature block.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The solicitation, contract and date information did not print. IN addition, there is an updated signature block.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5133992	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - G series	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

The second G-001 (Volume 1 only cover) should not be located here.

G-002 (vicinity map) should not be labeled as Volume 1 in the sheet title lines.

Following should be the Volume 1 only cover sheet (the second G-001 relabeled to be G-003). then the indexes and general plan sheet. (sheet ids need to shift accordingly.)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Volume 1 only cover has been moved behind vicinity map. Volume 1 has been removed from vicinity map title block. Drawing index will be updated to reflect these changes.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The cover sheet and vicinity map should be part of Volume 1. (Otherwise you would need to add a drawing index for the 2 sheets which doesn't make sense. Then renumber G-001 through G-004 of Volume 1 to be G-003 through G-006. Update this on the index also.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The cover sheet and vicinity map should be part of Volume 1. (Otherwise you would need to add a drawing index for the 2 sheets which doesn't make sense. Then renumber G-001 through G-004 of Volume 1 to be G-003 through G-006. Update this on the index also.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

2-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The cover sheet and the index to drawings apply to all 3 volumes though, not just Volume 1. When volume 2 and 3 get issued under separate contracts, will they just not have a cover sheet with a signature block and an index to drawings? It seems like we would either need to include a separate cover sheet for each volume with its own signature block or have one cover sheet that isn't a part of any volume that encompasses all 3 (I was under the impression that the latter is what we were going for).

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Nov 08 2013

2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The cover sheet and vicinity map should be part of Volume 1. Volume 2 & Volume 3 are still part of the set. If they get issued under a separate contract, they will need a new cover sheet with signatures at that time. We are proceeding as if they will be awarded under one contract, but have them packaged as volumes in case they do not.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134000	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - G-003	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

first of the index sheets - the description of each sheet shall fit within the space allocated. If it does not fit, abbreviate as needed to fit (and - &; control - cntrl, etc).

CS601 - volume 1

S-500 - volume 3

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The index sheets will be revised such that all sheet descriptions fit within the space provided.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The descriptions match the sheet titles.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134005 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 1 & 3 - B series n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

The fill is turned off.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Fill has been turned on for B-series sheets in Volumes 1 and 3.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

fill has been turned on for B series

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134006 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 1, 2, & 3 - General plans (C-101) n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

The view title shall be below the view per MVD standards.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The view title will be moved below the view on C-101. However, it should be noted that this will be inconsistent with what has been submitted by other reaches, including the Reach 1 97% Post FTR submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The view title was corrected.

note - that the reach 1 has been updated after the 97% FTR.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134010 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 1 & 3- C-101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

the general plan does not show such detail as the slope symbols or stationing text at the incorrect size.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Slope symbols and stationing have been turned off on C-101 in volumes 1 and 3.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Slope symbols and stationing have been turned off.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134011 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 1, 2, & 3- C-101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Where is control point 1407 AD located in plan view? If it is off of the sheet, locate the symbol near the edge of the plan and add an arrow indicating the general direction and not the approximated distance.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Christine Moss has indicated that control point 1407 AD should not be used for this reach. A different set of control points will be listed in the 95% ATR submittal.

However, if any fall outside the limits of the view shown on C-101, and arrow will be added indicating the general direction and the approximated distance will be noted.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

1407 AD has been added. FMM23, FMM24, and FMM25 are not shown in plan view. for Volume 1 & 3. Volume 2 has the control points shown, but approximate distances should be added for those outside of the plan box.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

FMM23, FMM24, and FMM25 are not shown in plan view. for Volume 1 & 3. Volume 2 has the control points shown, but approximate distances should be added for those outside of the plan box.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134015	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - CD101	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

what type of material is the road to be removed? Add additional information if it is known.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The road is gravel. This information will be added to the callout on CD101.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The material to be removed has been identified.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134016	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - CD102	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Call-out near drawing coordinate C-4: Will they be removing the county road in preparation of the realignment?

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Yes.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

note was clarified.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134020 CAD-BIM Plans n/a work limit lines n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

All points will need to be labeled for the next review. Some of the sheets have the work limits go off of the sheets. The sheet will need to be shifted to show all work limit lines. or those points that do not show up on the plan sheets will need to be labeled on the general plan. See reach 1 - 95% as an example.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The sheets have been shifted to include all righ-of-way points in the plan view.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 2 shows work limit points and labels.

Volumes 1 & 3 do not show work limit points and labels.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volumes 1 & 3 do not show work limit points and labels.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134023 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 1 - CS102 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Boring log text shall be horizontal.

the text of the section cut is difficutl to read with the contours lines behind it.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Boring text has been rotated to horizonatal. Background has been added to section cut annotation.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Boring log text is horizontal. Section cut text is easily readable.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134025	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - CS201	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

overlapping text along profile stationing. Please clarify.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Overlapping text has been rearranged such that it no longer overlaps.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

overlapping text has been corrected.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134028	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - CS301	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

the sheet id indicates that this is sections, but they are labeled as details. This should be a 500 series sheet.

Either add the appropriate scale sizes and scale bars or add NOT TO SCALE.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

This sheet identification was improperly labeled. It has been corrected to read "CS501". Also, "NOT TO SCALE" has been added to all details.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Now CS501:

All details have Not to scale added except one.

There are duplicate detail 2's and 3's.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Now CS501 - detail 3 doesn't indicate a scale or not to scale. There are duplicate details 2 and 3.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

"NOT TO SCALE" has been added to the detail that was missing it. Duplicate details 2 and 3 have been corrected.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Nov 08 2013

2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

According to the set that I am reviewing (95% ATR submittal), this has not been updated. I will review this at the next submittal.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134031	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 - CS504 & CS502 & CS502	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	-------------------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

There are 2 sets of notes that seem to be floating. Sometimes the label NOTES is different text sizes.

There are call-outs that are crossing the existing ground line and the incorrect text size.

CS502: there is no view title for the bottom detail.

there are 2 - CS502 (should be CS503 according to the filename)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

1) The set of of notes which states that intercept culvert locations will be added to the plans prior to the 95% submittal will be removed from the drawings when the intercept culvert locations are determined (prior to the 95% submittal). 2)The content of all three sheets is directly referenced from the typical sheets that MVP developed for all reaches of the FMM project. It should be fixed on those sheets which the Reach 4 team cannot edit. 3) Sheet identifications have been updated: they now read "CS502", "CS503", and "CS504".

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Extra note removed from CS504.

When I check the details, they are reach 4 files. There doesn't seem to be a reference to the overall project file.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

When I check the details, they are reach 4 files so the reach 4 team could edit them.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134035	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	volume 2	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	----------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

work limit linestyles are incorrect.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Line style scale has been changed to "Annotation Scale" and work limits now display properly on plans.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jun 26 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

work limit linestyle is plotting correctly.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134036	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 2 - CD101	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Please clarify the dashed box near the start of the volume.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Dashed box was existing ROW level that was inadvertently left on in drawing. Level has been turned off.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: May 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment
dashed box has been removed.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134039 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 - CD101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

call-out near drawing coordinate A-5 is pointing to overhead electric outside of the work limit area. The call-out should be pointing to elements within the work limit. Mmove the call-out arrows for clarification.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Call-out arrow has been moved to point to elements within the work limit.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: May 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Call-out is pointing to elements within the work limits.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134042 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 - CS101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

a.Recommend adding a note at the end of Volume 2, that this ties into Volume 3.
b. there are floating lines - they may be section lines. These are not needed on these design plates and add too much linework and not enough benefit.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

a. Note indicating "See Volume 3 for Reach 4 Project Continuation" has been added.

b. Cadastre reference containing property lines has been removed.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jun 26 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Note added for clarity. floating lines removed.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134043 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

minimize call-outs crossing design work. Or add the masking. When the text and lines cross, it is very confusing. examples: CS101, CS102

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

All text with masking has been brought above the design work. Call-outs crossing design work has been minimized.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

masking added to call-outs to clarify.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134045 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 - CS102 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

- a. Detail bubbles should be called out for the detail drawings.
- b. Add a reference note to refer to the riprap detail drawing.
- c. How does the lower rush river tie into existing? Any warping? Or is the existing channel 40' bottom width with 1V on 4H side slopes with berms?

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

a. References were added to the following drawings CS201, CS203, CS403, CS404, CS502, and CS503.

b. A reference note to the riprap detail drawings has been added.

c. The upstream design channel dimensions were chosen to closely match the existing channel; however, I'm sure some warping will need to occur. The following note has been added to CS102 and CS303: "TRANSITION RUSH RIVER GRADING TO MEET LINES AND GRADES OF EXISTING RUSH RIVER CHANNEL AND ADJACENT SPOIL BANKS BETWEEN STA R 23+00 AND STA R 24+14.43."

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

List of references were added. Note added for clarification.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134046 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 - CS201 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Incorrect linestyles for embedded levee top and main channel.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Linestyles corrected to match those used for Reach 1 97% submittal.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Linestyles were updated.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134047 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 - CS301 - CS303 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

- a. Elevations are missing from the frames.
- b. Incorrect text sizes on slope labels.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

a. Elevations have been added to the typical section frames.

b. All slope labels utilized proportional normal size text.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Elevations have been added to the frame. text size corrected.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134049 CAD-BIM

Plans

n/a

Volume 2 - CS304 - CS327

n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Grids are typically 1" grids at full size.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

100' intervals along the x-axis in lieu of 50' intervals have been incorporated on all cross sections to produce 1"x1" grids.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

1" grid utilized except CS304.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

1" grid utilized except CS304.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

The section on CS304 has been corrected to provide a 1"x1" grid.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 01 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134051 CAD-BIM

Plans

n/a

Volume 2 - CS403

n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

- a. The detail plan views shall have a title view bubble/letter and be called out from the main plan view.
- b. Detail plan views should be at the same direction/angle as the main plan that it is being called out from. If it is at a different angle, it shall be noted.
- c. Where is the information regarding the culvert located near station 21+00?
- d. Reference the drawings with the culvert information.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

- a. A reference note to CS403 has been added to the Rush River plan sheet - CS102.
- b. The riprap plan view is in the same direction/orientation as the Rush River plan sheet - CS102.
- c. There isn't a culvert at sta 21+00. But I did add a reference to culvert detail sheet - CS404 for the culverts near sta 23+00.
- d. Reference to culvert detail sheet - CS404 has been added.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Reference information added for plan sheets and culverts.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134052	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 2 - CS404	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Please clarify that there are 2 sections in plan view. These could be culvert profiles and have 2 since they don't really connect.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

As discussed, the Y section identifier has been changed to X and a solid line has been added that shows the slight jog in alignment where the two alignments intercept the Rush River centerline.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

The section line shows the jog.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134053	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 2 - CS501	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

- a. Call-outs shall not cross dimension lines.
- b. Verify that detail 6 is called out on CS301 and CS303.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

- a. Call-out crossing dimension line has been corrected.

- b. Sheet ID referenced by detail 6 has been changed to CS201 (Main Channel and Rush River profiles) to be consistent with how Reach 1 handled.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Call-outs updated.

detail 6 is not called out on CS201.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Detail 6 is not called out on CS201.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

Call out for detail 6/CS501 has been added to CS201.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 01 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134055	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 2 - CS504 & CS505	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	--------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

- a. Riprap symbol in plan view did not plot correctly.
- b. Detail 1: a few call-outs are incorrect text size and cross linework.
- c. detail on CS505 refers to CS610 which doesn't exist.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

CS504 and CS505 from the 65% submittal have been removed as they will not be needed.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

the sheets were removed.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134056 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 - CS506 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Drawings that are part of the construction set shall meet CAD standards. If the image wants to be used as is, it could be a reference drawing.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

NDDOT culvert detail has been removed from the drawing set and has instead been included as a reference drawing.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

CS506 is now a reference drawing.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134057 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 2 - CS601 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Add prefix for rus river drop structure control line.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

A prefix has been added to the Rush River control line and all referenced stations.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jun 18 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Prefix added.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134058 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 3 - G-002 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Do not include a vicinity map in Volume 3.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The vicinity map from has been removed from volume 3.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

vicinity map was removed from volume 3 set.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134061	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 3 - CD101	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Turn off incorrect text size from utility file.

Boring log text shall be horizontal to the border.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

1) Incorrect text size from utility file has been turned off. 2) The boring log is not supposed to show up on this drawing. It has been turned off as well. However, on sheet CS101 where it is now visible, it has been rotated to be horizontal with the border.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

utility text and boring log text turned off.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134063	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 3 - CS101 & CS102	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	--------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

- a. The 2% slopes on the west side of the channel do not have any direction to them. Please clarify.
- b. existing utility line text is shown (too small).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The 2% slopes on the crown of the left EMB will be indicated in the 95% ATR submittal. The text in the utility reference has been turned off.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

2% slopes direction have been added. utility text turned off.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134065 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 3 - CS201 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

the different lines are not labeled (eg main channel, embedded levee, etc)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The lines were labeled; however, the labels were failing to print. The guidance you provided on using a locally exported workspace resolved this issue. The profiles will be labeled in the next submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

labels have been added.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134067 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Volume 3 - CS308 & CS309 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

According to the sheet id this is a civil drawing, but it has an architectural drawing scale. Please clarify. These sections are not called out on CS405. Also, sections are not back referenced. REcommend that these be 4 series after the plan view. REmove the station label were the section was actually cut at (4+41).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Revised Apr 15 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

These sheets have been renumbered. Section cut symbols will be added to the plan view on CS405.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

new CS406 & CS407:

The sections are not called out on CS405.

Architectural drawing scale was removed.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Now CS406 & CS407:

The sections are not called out on CS405.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134068	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volmne 3 - CS302	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

this is labeled Volume 1. If this is a duplicate sheet, see comments for this duplicate drawing.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Sheet label has been changed from volume 1 to "VOLUME 3". See response to comment ID 5134028 for duplicate sheet comment response (same changes incorporated).

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

sheet title updated to volume 3

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134070	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volmne 3 - CS504 & CS502	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	--------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Missing bar scale and scale indicated or NOT TO SCALE.

CS502: Missing view title for bottom detail.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Reference clip was improperly masking scale and view title. The reference clip has been corrected, and both are now visible.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

view title is updated. Not to scale added.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134074 CAD-BIM Plans n/a All Volumes n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

The detail bubbles in section view and some plan views are incorrect size. The text in the bubble should be the same text size as the call-out/notes. This is also true for some of the view titles.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Detail bubbles have been revised. All text sizes now print at the same size.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Detail bubbles have been updated.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134077 CAD-BIM Plans n/a Real Estate - all volumes n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Where is control point 1407 AD located in plan view? If it is off of the sheet, locate the symbol near the edge of the plan and add an arrow indicating the general direction and not the approximated distance.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Christine Moss has indicated that control point 1407 AD should not be used for this reach. A different set of control points will be listed in the 95% ATR submittal.

However, if any fall outside the limits of the view shown on C-101, and arrow will be added indicating the general direction and the approximated distance will be noted.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 1 & 3 - LCPC 05 and LPCP 06 are shown in plan view. The remaining control points are not. Please clarify.

Volume 2 - All control points shown in plan view. The ones outside of the plan box should have approximate distances added.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 1 & 3 - LCPC 05 and LPCP 06 are shown in plan view. The remaining control points are not. Please clarify.

Volume 2 - All control points shown in plan view. The ones outside of the plan box should have approximate distances added.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134086	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Real Estate - all volumes General Plans	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	--	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

the general plan shall show the construction easement and limit lines. do not show stationing or footprint. The linestyles are incorrect (probably incorrect scale). the view title shall be below the plan view (per MVD standards). Volumes 1 & 3 are missing the drawing index.No need to label beginning and end of reaches.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The real estate general plan shown the construction and easement lines. stationing and footprint have been removed. The view title has been moved below the view. Drawing indexes have been added. Beginning and end of reaches has been removed.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

footprints have been removed. linestyles are plotting correctly. view titles have been updated. Drawings indexes have been added.

Volume 3 - looks like two sets of lines are plotting because the linestyles are difficult to read.

volume 2 - no need to label the beginning and end of reaches. See volume 1 general plan.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Volume 3 - looks like two sets of lines are plotting because the linstyles are difficult to read.

volume 2 - no need to label the beginning and end of reaches. See volume 1 general plan.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134091	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 1 & 3 plan views	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	-------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

legend should have a title. The lines are defined as construction limits and construction easement limits and design footprint. Label the extents of the type of easement (eg fee title, temporary work area easement, etc). The design footprint shall be a solid line. do not show boring logs. Do not label lines as work limits. small text from existing utility model file is plotting. Please clarify. All text shall be uppercase (property ownership).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Evaluation not conducted

5134093	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a	Volume 2 plan views	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**

Coordinating Discipline(s): CAD-BIM

Is it necessary to show county road 32 right of way?
the fee title shall be a closed loop.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The fee title has been made a closed loop.

In light of the recent revision to the County Road 32 easement (as determined by the Local Sponsor) that includes a portion of the right bank drainage ditch within Volume 2, I believe the County Road 32 easement should be shown for clarity of adjoining boundaries.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The fee title was updated.

County Road 32 easement are shown. The real estate maps are to show the permanent and temporary easement for our project.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

County Road 32 easement are shown. The real estate maps are to show the permanent and temporary easement for our project.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Nov 05 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

The County Road 32 easement boundary has been removed as requested.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 01 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134096	Civil	Plans	n/a	G-003	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

Update legend so that linestayles match plans.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Updated legends will be provided in the 95% ATR submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified legend has been updated.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134098	Civil	Plans	n/a	All	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

Add Reach 5 CSF to datum note on each sheet. CSF is in Appendix A of the Design Guidelines.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

I am answering this comment assuming you meant to say "Reach 4 CSF". The reach 4 CSF will be added to the datum note in the 95% ATR submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Apologize for the error. Veriified that proper CSF is on the plans.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134099 Civil Plans n/a B-201 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

I don't see boring 10-75M on the plan view or the profiles. Should it be deleted from B-201?

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Concur. Boring 10-75M falls within the station limits of Reach 4, but it is offsett over 4000 ft from the centerline. This boring will be removed from B-201 and boring 12-137M will be added. Boring 12-137M is technically in reach 3, but it is very close to reach 4 and MVP recommended including it on the logs.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: May 03 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified boring 10-75 has been removed.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134101 Civil Plans n/a CD101 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

1. Call out Reach 3 work by others. Should the Reach 4 contractor "Protect in place" the existing right bank drainage ditch?

2. Since 168th is under the EMB, we only need to remove gravel, not the entire road embankment. The exception to this would be within the outer 1/3 of the EMB. Aggregate will likely be allowed in the outer 1/3 of the EMB.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Reach 3 work by others will be called out in the 95% ATR submittal. The following note has been added to the demolition sheets: "UNDER THE LEVEE FOOTPRINT, GRAVEL AND ROAD EMBANKMENTS MUST BE REMOVED TO MATCH ADJACENT GROUND ELEVATION OR DITCH BOTTOM, THEN ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SHALL BE REMOVED TO MATCH THE LEVEE STRIPPING DEPTH INDICATED ON THE PLANS. UNDER THE EMB FOOTPRINT, GRAVEL MUST BE REMOVED IN ALL AREAS EXCEPT FOR THE OUTWARD THRID OF THE EMB. GRAVEL REMOVED FROM EXISTING ROADS MAY BE PLACED IN TEH OUTWARD THRID OF THE EMB's."

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified note has been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134102 Civil Plans n/a CD102 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

The Diversion Authority will let a demo contracts prior to Reach 4 construction. Demo contract will include removal of structures, foundations, septic systems, abandoning/sealing of wells, etc. Holes will be addressed (temporarily filled) so they do not create a safety hazard. The Reach 4 contractor will not be responsible for this. Add a note stating that will be removed prior to construction by others.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The annotation on CD102 now reads "EXISTING BUILDING AND STORAGE TANKS TO BE REMOVED BY OTHERS."

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: May 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified note has been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134103 Civil Plans n/a CD102 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Vol 1)

Verify if CR 32 will be abandoned in place. If so, the reach 4 contractor will have to remove the entire road embankment under the levee (to 1' below adjacent ditches). Outside of the levee, aggregate will likely be acceptable in the outer 1/3 of the emb. Everywhere else under the EMB, the gravel will have to be removed.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The following note has been added to the demolition sheets: "UNDER THE LEVEE FOOTPRINT, GRAVEL AND ROAD EMBANKMENTS MUST BE REMOVED TO MATCH ADJACENT GROUND ELEVATION OR DITCH BOTTOM, THEN ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SHALL BE REMOVED TO MATCH THE LEVEE STRIPPING DEPTH INDICATED ON THE PLANS. UNDER THE EMB FOOTPRINT, GRAVEL MUST BE REMOVED IN ALL AREAS EXCEPT FOR THE OUTWARD THRID OF THE EMB. GRAVEL REMOVED FROM EXISTING ROADS MAY BE PLACED IN TEH OUTWARD THRID OF THE EMB's."

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified note has been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134104	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Vol 1)

1. Call out Reach 3 work by others.
2. Call out 2% slope on bench between EMB and channel.
3. Include elevation labels on existing contours.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

1.) Concur. Reach 3 work by others will be called out. 2.) Concur. The 2% slope on the bench between the EMB and channel will be called out. 3.) Non-concur. The elevation labels are already turned on for the existing contours. The ground is so flat and the DTM data is so dense that the same minor contour appears numerous times on each of the sheets. If the labeling is turned on for minor contours, the page becomes too cluttered.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified changes made. Agree with evaluation of #3.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134121 Civil Plans n/a CS102 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

Call out CR 32 work by others.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

CR 32 work by others will be called out.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified callout added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134122 Civil Plans n/a CS201 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

1. There are 3 CS201's.
2. Label the channel transition slope by others.
3. Include the EMB transition slope and verify levee/EMB tie-in stationing and elevations.
4. Label all features and existing ground line.
5. Include elevations at end of each profile.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Evaluation not conducted

5134124 Civil Plans n/a CS301 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Vol 1)

Include the minimum left bank EMB construction limit and add note. See GM 002.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The minimum left bank EMB construction limit and note has been added to CS301 in Volume 1.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

The left bank EMB limit and note has been added. However, the left EMB minimum construction height is shown too low. The channel side edge needs to be 1' above the embedded levee.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134128	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS301	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Vol 1)

It was decided we will eliminate the stripping line in the channel. The only required stripping shown will be under the embedded levee. Add note:

"STRIPPING IS REQUIRED UNDER THE EMBEDDED LEVEE AS SHOWN. ADDITIONAL TOPSOIL REQUIRED SHALL BE OBTAINED WITHIN THE PROJECT FOOTPRINT, WITH EXACT LOCATIONS TO BE DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR. SEE EXISTING TOPSOIL DEPTH CHART BELOW TO DEFINE ANTICIPATED TOPSOIL DEPTHS WITHIN THE GIVEN STATION RANGES."

Include "EXISTING TOPSOIL DEPTH" table, if stripping depths change throughout the reach.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Stripping has been eliminated in the channel. The note has been added. Topsoil depths were included in the notes, as they are constant throughout the reach.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified note has been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134131	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS301	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Vol 1)

Include the main channel invert line as a dashed line.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Main channel invert line has been added.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified main channel invert has been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134134	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS301	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Vol 1)

Eliminate topsoil in bottom of low flow channel, and define topsoil depths.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Topsoil bottom has been removed from low flow channel.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified topsoil has been removed from the bottom of the low flow channel.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 12 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134137	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS327	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Vol 1)

Show levee extending below existing road embankment. Within the levee prism, the road embankment should be removed to 1' below the adjacent ditch bottom.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The levee has been shown extending below the road embankment.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

No levees are shown on the 100' sections. The levee should be shown.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134144 Civil Plans n/a CS301 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 1](#))

1. Use "Control line" instead of "Centerline".
2. Label 2% slope on Exterior Ditch Detail. No containment berm on right bank.
- 3 Include stripping on Embedded Levee Detail.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

Evaluation not conducted

5134147 Civil Plans n/a CD101 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

The temp ditches will have to be filled and compacted to 90% of standard proctor beneath levee. All other areas, 85%.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Section 3.12 of 31 00 00.00 13 provides requirements for subgrade preparation for embedded levees, embankments across existing drainage features (this would include CR 32 temp ditches) and the abandoned Rush River. Paragraph 3.15.2 provides requirements for placement and compaction. Embedded levees require a compaction of 90% of standard proctor, EMBs require a compaction of 85% of standard proctor. These specs should cover the cases where the levee crosses an existing temp ditch or the abandoned Rush River as the grading limits for the levee would daylight into the bottom of these drainage features.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

The comment was made with consistency in mind. In Reach 1, we included Sheet CG101 that specifically calls out the compaction requirements for temp ditch fill. We felt it was important to call this out. I will leave the comment open for now and we can discuss.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

2-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Similar to Reach 1, callouts for the temp left ditch and Rush River were added to CD101 and the following note was added:

4. ...IN ADDITION, BACKFILLING OF EXISTING DRAINAGE FEATURES WILL REQUIRE STEPPING BENEATH EMBs AND EMBEDDED LEVEE. THE BACKFILL WILL BE COMPACTED TO 85% EXCEPT BENEATH THE EMBEDDED LEVEE, WHERE COMPACTION TO 90% SHALL BE REQUIRED.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 07 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134149	Civil	Plans	n/a	CD101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

Will have to remove muck from levee footprint within existing Rush River. The subgrade shall be stripped and soft or otherwise unsatisfactory material removed. The subgrade shall be proof rolled prior to placement of any material. The sloped ground surface shall be stepped such that the fill material will bond with the existing surface. The existing surface shall also be scarified prior to placement of the first left of fill to enhance the bonding between the two materials.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Spec section 31 00 00 00.00 13, paragraphs 3.12.3 (Subgrade of Abandoned Rush River) and 3.12.3.1 (Subgrade Correction of Abandoned Rush River) incorporates the issues discussed above.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

I made this comment with consistency in mind. Reach 1 included Sheet CD106 which specifically calls out the muck removal requirements in the abandoned Sheyenne Meander and Existing Drain 30. I will leave the comment open for now and we can discuss.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

Similar to Reach 1, hatching and callouts for the temp left ditch and Rush River were added to CD101 and the following note was added:

4. WHERE FILLS AND EMBANKMENTS ARE CONSTRUCTED ACROSS EXISTING DRAINAGE FEATURES (COUNTY ROAD 32 TEMPORARY LEFT DITCH BY OTHERS AND EXISTING RUSH RIVER), THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE ALL MUCK MATERIAL BEFORE FILL PLACEMENT HAS BEGUN.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 04 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5134151	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

1. Provide station equation where Rush River Stationing and Diversion Stationing intersect.
2. Consider adding a detail bubble for the Rush River Structure that references CS102.
3. Add a prefix to the Rush River stationing.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

1. Station equation has been added.
2. Reference to CS102 has been added to bottom of CS101.
3. Prefix has been added to Rush River stationing.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified changes have been made.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134152	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

Consider adding detail bubbles that reference CS403 and CS404.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The following references have been added to bottom of CS102: Profile - Rush River (CS201), Profile - Rush River Drop Structure (CS203), Detail Plan - Riprap (CS403), Detail Plan - Rush River Culverts (CS404), Drop Structure Details (CS502), Stone Dike Details (CS503)

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified changes have been made.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134154 Civil Plans n/a CS301 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

Shouldnt the typical section station range start at 416+00 (end of transition)?

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Typical section station range has been changed to begin at 416+00 as suggested.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 09 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified change has been made.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134157 Civil Plans n/a CS301 n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

Consider adding a note that states that the Rush River inlet is not shown on the Diversion Channel Typical Section, and that the left bank layout varies from 428+00-446+00. See Rush River typical sections for details.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The following note has been added: "RUSH RIVER DROP STRUCTURE IS NOT SHOWN ON THE DIVERSION CHANNEL TYPICAL SECTION. LEFT BANK LAYOUT VARIES BETWEEN STA 428+00 AND STA 449+00 DUE TO THE INTERSECTION WITH DROP STRUCTURE. SEE PLAN VIEWS AND RUSH RIVER TYPICAL SECTIONS FOR DETAILS IN THIS AREA."

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified note has been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134158	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS302	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

1. Section C: Shouldn't the fill slope be 1:10?
2. Define the difference between solid and dashed lines on the typicals.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

1. Section C: 1:8 fill slope is correct as shown.

2. The following note has been added: "PROPOSED GRADING SHOWN WITH A SOLID LINE IS CONSIDERED TYPICAL FOR THE INDICATED STATION RANGE. PROPOSED GRADING SHOWN WITH A BROKEN LINE IS SKEWED AND CONSIDERED NON-TYPICAL DUE TO SECTIONS ORIENTED PERPENDICULAR TO THE RUSH RIVER CONTROL LINE."

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Agree with evaluation. Verified that note has been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134159	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS404	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
([Document Reference: Vol 2](#))

Add coordinates for culvert inlets and outlets.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Apr 15 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Coordinates have been added to culvert inlets and outlets.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Jul 13 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Verified coordinates have been added.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288) Submitted On: Sep 13 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5134650	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Equations from EMs, AISC, etc need to be referenced in calculations.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 16 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

References for all equations have been added.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

some references were added

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5135057	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Impact basis pipe box design. The assumptions used for the pipe box design are extremely conservative - soil plus water to the top of the box plus surcharge load with full 2104 load factors. This is basically an extreme load condition. The resulting design may not be completely unreasonable but this is not efficient design assumptions.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 16 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The surcharge loading, water to the top of the box and soil to the top of the box is no longer being considered as a load case. The new design load case considers water and soil to the top of the box and no surcharge loading.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

the design was revised

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5138439	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Impact basin STAAD model. Maximum moment in the model for Reach 1 was found in the horizontal direction in the side walls at the intersection of the baffle wall and the side wall. In the information provided in the computations, it's impossible to tell magnitude of force and the bending moment in the side walls is not provided.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 17 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The DDR will be updated to show more information about the design moments and forces.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Apr 29 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

additional results were provided. However, moment in the horizontal direction that would be affected by the baffles was not shown.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

The moment in the horizontal direction has been added to the DDR. An updated version of the DDR was sent to the commenter for review.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Oct 10 2013

2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Additional calculations were provided.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Oct 28 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5138442	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Impact basin sliding analysis. The horizontal forces aren't computed correctly – there is no lateral soil pressure coefficient.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 17 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The lateral soil pressure coefficient is now included in the computation of the horizontal soil forces.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: May 01 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

lateral coefficient was added

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5138444	Structural	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

Impact basin sliding analysis. A case should be run with water in the basin and soil around the wall. See the latest reach 1 calcs for cases.

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584). Submitted On: Apr 17 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Reach 1 calculations will be referenced so that consistent load cases can be considered. The stability analysis will be updated.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: May 06 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

computations were updated

Submitted By: [Kent Hokens](#) (651-290-5584) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**
