

Comment Report: All Comments

Project: Fargo Moorhead Metro - Reach 4 Design by MVK

Review: PER - Consistency Review

Displaying 70 comments for the criteria specified in this report.

<b>Id</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>DocType</b>	<b>Spec</b>	<b>Sheet</b>	<b>Detail</b>
4803086	Environmental	Preliminary Design Analysis	n/a'	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: Main Report](#))

Page 7 section 2.2.5 Environmental Considerations, change last sentence to read "In addition, monitoring for cultural resources, by a qualified professional archeologist, may be required during construction that occurs within 300 feet of the Rush River."

Submitted By: [Jonathan Sobiech](#) (651-290-5489). Submitted On: Aug 30 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Language has been changed.

Submitted By: [Ken Cook](#) (314-331-8498) Submitted On: Sep 24 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Sobiech](#) (651-290-5489) Submitted On: Nov 02 2012

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817086	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	cover sheets for voume sets	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	--------------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

This will be a 2 volume set of drawings: Volume 1 will include a cover sheet for the entire project identifying 2 volumes (the fifth line will say VOLUME 1 & VOLUME 2) with a signature block, a location and vicinity map sheet, and a second cover sheet for volume 1 only but no signature block or contract information in the lower left corner. Volume 2 will include a cover sheet for volume 2 only but no signature block or contract information in the lower left corner. Both volumes will have drawing indexes with duplicate information but they will have different sheet ids (and drawing numbers when it is as-built).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

### 1-0 Evaluation **Non-concurred**

Based on recent discussion with MVP, this will be a THREE volume set of drawings. The appropriate revisions will be made to the cover sheet and sheet title blocks to reflect the inclusion of all three volumes in a manner consistent with the other reaches that contain multi-volume plan sets.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 04 2012

### 1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

Volume 2 index sheets do not match Volume 1 & Volume 3 index sheets.

Also the cover sheets should say in order:

VOLUME 1, VOLUME 2, AND VOLUME 3

VOLUME 1 OF 3

VOLUME 2 OF 3

VOLUME 3 OF 3.

Without the "of 3", it's not know how many there are if you only have volume 2, let's say.

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

### 2-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Volume 1 and 3 index sheets have been updated to match volume 2. "Volume X of 3" has been added to each of the cover sheets, and the overall cover sheet says "VOLUME 1, VOLUME 2, AND VOLUME 3".

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

### 2-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

Volume x of 3 has been added. The main cover sheet indicates all three volumes.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4817112	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	directory structure	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Under \_Sheets, there shall not be a subfolder named Rush Drop Structure. Either all sheet files are in the \_Sheets folder or all sheet files are in subfolders. In this case, the subfolders would be named according to the Volume 1 and Volume 2. There should not be any subfolders under each discipline (eg Rush Drop Structure). All model files used in the drawing set shall be located directly in the discipline folder. If you want clarification as to which files are related to the Drop Structure, add V01 and V02 into the filename (or something like that). All other model files shall be located under Design\_Info under the respective discipline.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Under \_Sheets, subfolders for Volume 1 through 3 have been created. Under CAD\_BIM > Civil, subfolder has been removed and drop structure models have V2 added to file name.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 12 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

there are several files under \_Sheets. If subfolders are being used, then there should be no individual files under \_Sheets, they all should be in subfolders.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Non-concurred**

Unused sheets were removed from under the "sheets" directory. However, the title sheet and vicinity map that are to be used for all three volumes belongs in the sheets directory, as it doesn't apply to any one volume.

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

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Appropriate files were put into the appropriate subfolders.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817114	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	Missing model and sheet files	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-------------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Where are the structural sheet files, structural model files and the geotech sheet files in the directory structure? Please clarify.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

Revised Sep 10 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

structural and geotechnical sheets will be added to the CAD-BIM \_Sheets directory

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

The structural and geotech sheet files are located in the Volume subfolders. there are additional structural sheet files in the root of \_sheets and under the structural subfolder.

The structural sheet files seem to be referencing other sheet files located in the structural subfolder.

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

**2-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

The final sheet files are located in the Volume 3 folder located in the CAD-BIM\_Sheets folder. These sheet files reference model files in the structural folder.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Jun 26 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The structural & getotechnical sheet models and model files are in their correct subfolders.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817116	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Fill shall be turned on for all sheet files. (eg G-001, G-002)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Fill will be turned on for all sheet files in the 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 01 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

there are a few sheets that the fill is not turned on.

Volume 1 & Volume 3 - CS600 series, B series

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Fill has been turned on for all sheets. Previous error with saving settings and printing is hopefully resolved.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Jun 26 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Volume 1 & 3, CS600 series - fill not on.

Volume 1 & 3, B series - fill corrected.

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

**2-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Volume 1 & 3, CS600 series - fill not on.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4817135	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

There are several incorrect file names. There shall be no spaces in the file names. At a minimum, FMMDR4 shall be in all filenames related to CAD including InRoads. There shall be no more than 20 characters to the left of the AEC filename. The 20 characters includes all \_. There shall be exactly 8 characters are part of the AEC filename. (eg FMMDR4\_RUSH\_SITEPLAN\_C-SP0001.DGN, FMMDR4\_GEOTECH\_CROSS\_SECTIONS.DGN, FMMDR4\_MASTER.DGN to name a few).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

All file names have been revised to be consistent with the AEC CADD standard.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Under CAD-BIM, all files are using the project code except for one - North\_&\_South\_Ditch\_Profiles.dgn (if this is not being referenced into a sheet, it should be located under Design\_Info).

The no spaces in the file name is applicable to all filenames not just CAD files.

8 character AEC filename portion - there are several sheets under Volume 3 that are incorrect. there are a few model files (geotech, structural) that are missing the 8 character portion.

maximum 20 character portion - there are a few model files (civil, and some of those without the 8 character)

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

**1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Project Code is used on all files. There are no spaces in file names.

The 8 character AEC filename portion is not used on the structural sheets in Volume 3, geotech model file (FMMDR4\_geotech\_Cross\_Sections.dgn), civil model file (FMMDR4\_TYPICAL\_C-SC-02.dgn), and structural model files (FMMDR4\_S-100P&P\_revised.dgn & FMMDR4\_STRUCTURE MODEL.dgn).

The 20 maximum character portion is exceeded on civil model files (FMMDR4\_V2\_DRAINDETAILS\_C-SP0065.dgn and FMMDR4\_V2\_UNDULATION\_C-SP0095.dgn).

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4817140	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Missing information includes vicinity map, legend & abbreviations, datum note on all sheets (except the cover sheets), general plans, control data, and benchmarks.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

Revised Sep 10 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

A vicinity map, legend & abbreviations, datum note on all sheets (except the cover sheets), general plans, control data, and benchmarks will be included in the 65% submittal consistent with the corresponding sheets submitted with the Reach 1 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 01 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Vicinity map, legend, abbreviations, benchmark information, control data has been added.

Datum note is missing on G-002/Volume 1 and the structural sheets/volume 3.

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

**1-2 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Datum note is missing on G-002/Volume 1 and the structural sheets/volume 3.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4817144	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

The district doing the design shall have their district information in the AE block portion of the titleblock (below the St. paul District). This can be updated by populating the AE attribute information with the district information.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The district information will be filled out in the AE attribute information for all sheet files by the 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 01 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The district information was added to the titleblock.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817153 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' n/a n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

VOLUME 1 and VOLUME 2 shall be in the first line of the sheet title information on respective sheets. (The Volume 2 sheets have it shown correctly). The overall sheets (upfront cover sheet & location/vicinity map) would not indicate either volume.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

VOLUME 1, VOLUME 2, and VOLUME 3 shall be in the first line of the sheet title information on respective sheets. The volume information will be shown in a manner consistent with the other reaches that contain multi-volume plan sets.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 04 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

The specific Volume labels were added to most of the sheet title lines. The following are missing:

Volume 1 - CS300 series - cross sections

Volume 3 - CS300 series - cross sections, also there are some details that say Volume 1.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Title blocks were updated on the CS300 sheets in volume 1 and volume 3, and incorrect volume labels have been corrected.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Titleblocks have been updated for volume 1 and 3.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817171 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' G-002 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Incorrect text size. Missing Legend, notes, etc. According to the titleblock, the filename is FMMDR4\_G-002ind.dgn, but it does not exist. There is a different file. Please clarify. (It may have been that the files were reworked after the PDF was created for the submittal.)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

This file is being completely recreated to be consistent with the corresponding G-sheets shown in the Reach 1 65% submittal. It was included in this submittal simply as a reference, similar to the way the index to drawings was shown on the cover sheet of the Reach 1 35% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 01 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

the index sheet was updated to include the legend, notes, and abbreviations. The text size was corrected.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817189	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	Boring Logs	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Part of the titleblock is missing in the upper right corner. The Sheet IDs are missing the dash (eg B-201). The boring logs sheet files do not seem to have the weights turns on for plotting. The sheet files shall reference Reach 4 border file (and not reach 1). The references are not found (listed in red) and the logs have been copied into the sheet files. They shall be references. Please clarify.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

Revised Sep 10 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

All boring sheets will be re-done. Stick logs will be added as references and Reach 4 border will be used.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

the titleblock is complete. The sheet IDs have dashes. the weights have been turned on. the sheet files are referencing the reach 4 border. The boring logs are currently referenced in.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817194	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	B206	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	------	-----



Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Incorrect text size used on the logs.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Boring sheets are being revised to include referenced stick logs and reach 4 border. This should correct the incorrect text size issue as well.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

the text size is corrected by referencing the log files in.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817315	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	C-101 through C-105 plans	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	------------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Aerial is very dark on plots.

Plan sheets are missing slope symbols.

Section symbol is incorrect size. Also there shall not be a line through the entire section (jus the symbol and a tail on the opposite side).

The matchline is missing a label.

Incorrect North Arrow used.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

Revised Sep 10 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

On C-101 thru C-105, the following changes will be made before the 65% submittal: the aerial will be made lighter, slope symbols will be added, the correct section cut symbol will be used, the matchline will be labeled, and the correct north arrow will be used.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

slope symbols have been added. section symbol is the correct size. label has been added to the match line. correct north arrow used.

The 65% was lighter than the 35%. As far as the aerial, i created a PDF here, it was darker than the 65% (but lighter than the 35%). I have started using Print Organizer (same standard settings for the line widths, etc as Iplot. If there are specific settings used

for plotting, these should be noted.

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

**2-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

The color of the raster image is achieved using the print organizer with raster settings of contrast: -50  
brighness: 25

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

If there are specific settings for the printing other than the standard setting that is delivered in the workspace, then this needs to be documented in the folder structure as such. Also there needs to be a dgnlib defined (located under Support/Bentley/dgnlib)so that the same file can be produced. With this information, I can set up the workspace to look for that directory.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4817320	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	C-101 through C-105 profiles	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	---------------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Incorrect linestyle used for exsiting ground line.  
Profile does not have a profile title.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

the correct line style and a profile title will be added by the 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Linestyle was corrected.

there should be a profile view title under each profile.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Profile titles didn't print due to workspace issues. The local workspace you provided has corrected this issue. Profile titles are now shown under all profiles.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

profile titles have been added.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817361 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' C-301 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Incorrect text size used throughout (section labeling and title symbols).

The arrow heads are no plotting dark. They seem to have a gray tone to them. Please clarify.

Incorrect linestyle for existing ground line.

Labels are missing (eg Existing ground line, Control line, etc).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The typical section sheet is being completely revised. The sheet submitted with the 65% submittal will be consistent with the one shown in the reach 1 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Text size corrected. The arrow heads are plotting correctly. Linestyle corrected. Labels have been added.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817365 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' Structural sheets n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Do not include Vicksburg District in the upper right corner of the titleblock.

Scale Bars are missing on several sheets.

All callouts shall be left justified.

REACH 4 shall not be in the sheet title line 1 of the titleblock.

The bubble on the view title shall be on the left side of the view title.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

Revised Sep 10 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Vicksburg District is no longer on the title block. Scale bars have been added to sheets. All callouts will be adjusted to be left justified. REACH 4 in the sheet title line 1 has been changed to VOLUME 1. All bubbles are now shown on the left side of the view title.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Sep 11 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Vicksburg district has been removed from the upper right corner. The bubbles on the view titles have been corrected.

Scale Bars are still missing on S-102 and S-504.  
One call-out on S-102 is still not left justified.  
reach 4 is still in the sheet title line.

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

**2-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

Scale bars are now shown on S-102 and S-504. The call-out on S-102 has been corrected to be left justified. The first sheet title line now reads:

"VOLUME 3 - REACH 4 PIPE DROP STRUCTURE"

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Jun 26 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

scale bars have been added. text justification updated. titleblock line update.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817367 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' S-100 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

The Profile seems to be missing some grid lines.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

I went back and checked. All the grid lines are showing up in my Microstation drawing. The PDF displays the lines very lightly. I will modify the grid lines to show darker when printed to PDF.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Sep 11 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The grids lines are on the PDF.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817370 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' S-101 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

The RIPRAP callout is not pointing to anything. Please clarify.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The callout arrow has been moved and now points to the riprap.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Sep 11 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The call-out points to the riprap. The riprap is very light on the PDF and thus didn't print very well on the hard copy so I almost missed it.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817380 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' n/a n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Incorrect levles used. All levels within each file shall begin withthe discipline of that file (eg if it's a Civil fle, there is a C in the filename and all levels begin with C-). The only exception is the G-levels are allowed for any discipline. Also, all levels shall following the filenaming convention (X-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX). There shall be no levels named stationing, proposed road, section, etc. (eg FMMDR4\_C-103PLN.DGN, FMMDR4\_MASTER.DGN, FMMDR4\_CS151---.DGN, FMMDR4\_RUSH\_SITEPLAN\_C-SP0001.DGN, etc)

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The correct level designations will be used in the future.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

### 1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

FMMDR4\_V2\_ROWPLAN\_C-SP0065.dgn has V-PROP-RWAY. This should be a C level or in a different file (survey & mapping).

FMMDR4\_V2\_SITEPLAN\_C-SP0065.dgn has C-STAGING-AREA which is not in the correct form C-XXXX-XXXX and C-RRAP-WEIR-BOULDERS which is not in the correct form C-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX.

FMMDR4\_CS101pln.dgn (Volume 3) has A-ANNO-REFR and V-AFLD-BCNS-STRB. These should be C levels or in a different files.

FMMDR4\_C-SPMAST.DGN had default, B-BORE-HOLE, B-BORE-IDEN, prop\_horiz alignment, proposed road, S-SLAB-EDGE, stationing, V-TOPO levels. These should be C levels or in a different file.

FMMDR4\_STRUCTURE\_MODEL.dgn has default, channel profile, elevation chart, hanger, inlet structure, outlet structure, railing, reference lines, riprap areas, and soil are incorrect level names.

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

### 1-2 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

FMMDR4\_V2\_ROWPLAN\_C-SP0065.dgn has V-PROP-RWAY. This should be a C level or in a different file (survey & mapping).

FMMDR4\_V2\_SITEPLAN\_C-SP0095.dgn (was FMMDR4\_V2\_SITEPLAN\_C-SP0065.dgn) has C-STAGING-AREA which is not in the correct form C-XXXX-XXXX and C-RRAP-WEIR-BOULDERS which is not in the correct form C-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX.

FMMDR4\_C-SPMAST.DGN had default, B-BORE-HOLE, B-BORE-IDEN, profile, S-SLAB-EDGE, V-TOPO, V-GRAD levels. These should be C levels or in a different file.

FMMDR4\_CS101-V3.dgn (was FMMDR4\_CS101pln.dgn) (Volume 3) has A-ANNO-REFR and V-AFLD-BCNS-STRB. These should be C levels or in a different files.

FMMDR4\_STRUCTURE\_MODEL.dgn has default, channel profile, elevation chart, hanger, inlet structure, outlet structure, railing, reference lines, riprap areas, and soil are incorrect level names.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4817382	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [fmmdr4\\_rush\\_siteplan\\_c-sp0001.dgn](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

This siteplan model file also contains section information. Please clarify by creating a separate section model file.

There is an element on C-LEVE\_BERM that has a point at elevation 0. Please clarify.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Design support information removed from siteplan model file and saved in Design Support file under Design Info. Point at elev 0 on C-LEVE-BERM has been corrected.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 10 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Section information has been removed/relocated. C-LEVE-BERM is no longer used.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817386	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [fmmdr4\\_basemap\\_v-sp----.dgn](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

V-STRM-PIPE has text and pipling elements on the same level. Text shall be on a separate level (V-STRM-IDEN or something).

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred**

The FMMDR4\_BASEMAP\_V-SP---.dgn file was provided "as-is" by the St. Paul District. The labels referred to in the above comment do not fall within the limits of reach 4. Please re-address this comment with John Gustavson (of MVP) to insure that the correct changes are made to all districts that received some form of a copy of this file.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

the file was corrected in St. Paul.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712) Submitted On: Apr 18 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817390	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	CS151	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

The Rush River Drop Structure Detail Plan is identified in the plan view. Please add a detail bubble around the plan area that is represented in the detail plan. The symbol should point to the detail bubble and not to a tilde in the plan view.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

Will revisit for the 65% submission. The detail plan is a larger scale drawing for the ramp and channel realignment for purposes of labeling and dimensioning. A bubble around this whole plan area will be quite large and may cause the siteplan to look crowded.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 10 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

The Fargo guideline discusses scales that are acceptable for plan views (sheet type 1s) and details (sheet type 4s). The plan view should be consistent scales. the 100' scale drawing should be a 4 series. Then either a bubble or a reference note (see attached as a sample from Reach 1) is used to point to the drawing.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Non-concurred**

The 1"=200' scale was determined to be the desired scale for the plan sheets that depict the Diversion Channel. CS102 is a plan sheet showing the Rush River relocation and drop structure that requires a larger scale in order to adequately represent the design features. C-101 and C-102 are also 100 series drawings that do not use a 1"=200' scale. I would prefer to keep CS102 as a 100 series drawing instead of a 400 series drawing so the reader is presented with this critical plan layout prior to the encountering the profile, typical sections, and cross sections for the area.

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

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

If it is preferred to keep CS102 as a 100 series at 1"=100', then it should be clearly identified that it is an enlarged plan. The plan should be called out on CS101 with a bubble referring to CS102. then it should be noted on CS102 that the drawing is at a different angle.

NOTE: THE ORIENTATION OF THIS VEIW HAS BEEN ROTATED XX DEGREES FROM THE ORIGINAL DETAIL PLAN ON SHEET CS101.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4817391	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	Plan views	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	------------	-----



Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Work limit lines are missing.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Work limit lines will be added to all sheets with a plan view.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

work limit lines were added. They are plotting with an incorrect linestyle.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The scale of the linestyle has been corrected.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

work limit linestyle is correct.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817400	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	CS351 through CS367	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Incorrect text size for Notes.

Typical sections shall be pulled out and put on a separate sheets with just typical sections.

Callouts are missing (eg existing ground line, control line, etc).

Typical Sections shall identify the station ranges that they apply.

Titleblock titles shall be unique. Suggest listing the stations represented.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Text size for notes will be corrected. Typical sections for 65% submittal will be on separate sheets. These were included with cross sections in order to provide more information at the 35% in lieu of only providing typical sections as done for Reach 1 35%. Callouts and station ranges for typical sections will be added. Station ranges for cross sections will be included in sheet titles.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 12 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Text size was corrected. Typical sections were pulled out. the labels have been added. Section ranges were added. Titleblock titles are unique for volume 2.

Titleblock titles are not unique for volume 1 and 3.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Title block titles on cross section sheets have been made unique in Volumes 1 and 3.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

title blocks for cross sections sheets are unique.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817407	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	CS451	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Call-outs shall be left justified (typical).

Incorrect text size on the alignment station.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

All call-outs have been left justified. Station text size will be corrected.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 10 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

This is now CS102, Volume 2. The text size and the left justification was corrected.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4817665	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Cone penetration Tests and Stratigraphy belong in the DDR and not the P&S set.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 10 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

CPTs and Stratigraphy will be removed from the P&S and only included in the DDR.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

the sheets were removed from the P&S set. The files need to be relocated to Design\_info.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Files have been moved to the Design\_Info folder.

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

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

stratigraphy files were relocated to design\_info folders.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4828966	Cultural Resources	Preliminary Design Analysis	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------------	-----------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

Appendix K: Environmental -- Section K.1.5 Cultural Resources, line 2 -- change "phase 2 surveys" to "phase 2 testing and evaluation"

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasik](#) (651-290-5262). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The word "surveys" was replaced with "testing and evaluations".

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Wording has been replaced.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasik](#) (651-290-5262) Submitted On: Oct 24 2012

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829290	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Section 2.2.3, Pg 7)

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Project Management

Which side of the diversion channel is the drainage structure on? Why is the EMB being designed to function as a levee? Please provide more details.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

The local drainage structure will be on the left bank of the diversion channel. Further geotechnical analysis has been completed that led to the decision that the EMB WILL NOT be designed to function as a levee.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Oct 05 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The report indicates the drainage structure will be beneath the EMB and there is no reference to a levee.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829292	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Section 6.3.2, Pg 13](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Indicate that the EMB maximum height of 22 ft is only based on geotechnical analysis, other criteria maybe used to determine the final maximum height.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Report will be updated to indicate that the maximum height was based on geotechnical analyses and other criteria may be used to determine the final maximum height.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The report has been updated to indicate the EMB max height is based on geotechnical considerations.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829295	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Section 7.3.2, Pg 15)

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Project Management

The statement of "or 15' from the landside crown of the levees in areas with EMB's" is not correct. Please review MFR and correct.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The MFR was reviewed and the language in section 7.3.2 was revised to state "The VFZ will be a minimum of 15' from the toe of stand-alone levees and partially embedded levees. The VMZ will extend 15' from the landside crown of the levees embedded within EMB's."

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The VMZ zone has been corrected to be consistent with MFR.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829296	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Section 8, Pg 16)

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Project Management

What EMB height is being used for the drainage structure? The EMB height can be reduced at this location to reduce the footprint of the EMB and load on the pipes. Please coordinate with MVP lead H&H and Geotech engineers.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Will coordinate with MVP Geotech and hydraulics to determine the height required at the local drainage structure and incorporate any changes to the report and analyses. The structure was being designed for a grade 3ft above the diversion levee profile elevation, but additional guidance has been given that states the grade only has to be 1 ft above the diversion levee profile elevation.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Oct 09 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The EMB height at the drainage structure has been indicated and is a reduced height when compared to the normal EMB.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829299	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Section 11, Pg 18](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Project Management

Do not use cardinal directions to indicate the side of the diversion channel. Instead use right or left (looking downstream).

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The words "east" and "west" were revised to "right bank" and "left bank".

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The cardinal directions have been replaced with left and right.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829302	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Section D.4.1.2, Pg D-5](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

The height of the left bank EMB at the drainage structure can be reduced further so it is only 1 foot above the design levee profile, not 3 feet. Please coordinate with MVP's lead geotech and hydraulic engineers as this is a recent change.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Will coordinate with MVP geotech and hydraulics to determine the height required at the local drainage structure and incorporate any changes to the report and analyses.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The left EMB has been reduced in width and height in the location of the Reach 4 drainage structure.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829306	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Section D.4.2, Pg D-5)

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

The naming convention for the analyzed sections should be such that each analyzed section has a unique name and is not duplicated in other reaches. Sections 1 and 2 are located in Reach 1. Please coordinate with other reach designers so that unique section names can be used. If additional sections are needed between original sections, indicate these additional sections with a letter suffix (i.e. 6, 6B, 6C).

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Section names will be revised to provide unique names.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The analyzed sections have been revised such that they all have a unique identification.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829337	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Attachment D-1)

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

The "FMMFRM\_GEO\_PROFILE\_B-SCXXXX.DGN should be referenced in to the drawings, not copied in. This way when the profile drawing is updated/revised, the stratigraphy drawings are automatically updated. Please verify that the latest profile drawings is being used.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Stratigraphy is being revised and the most up to date profile will be incorporated into the plots. Also, the profile will be referenced, not copied.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The stratigraphy has been revised.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829342	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	B201 - B206	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Attachment D-3](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

The elevation grid lines need to be trimmed such that they do not cross through the boring log staff, soil description, and notes.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Boring log sheets are being revised to be include references to the stick logs, not copies of them. Grid lines will be trimmed as requested.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The grid lines have been trimmed.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829345	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	B206	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Attachment D-3](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

The topsoil auger borings staffs should not be stretched or scaled.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012



**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Concur. The topsoil auger borings have been revised and are no longer stretched and scaled.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 28 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The topsoil auger borings have ben corrected.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829347	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Attachment D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Include total head contour labels on the seepage results.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

total head contour labels will be included on the seepage results.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Total head contour labels are included.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829349	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Attachment D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

If the critical slip surface entry/exit is located at or near the edge of the entry/exit extents when analyzing the stability of the EMB, the entry/exit extents need to be shifted. Exceptions to this are the EMB global check, Lower and localized entry extents, as these should not be shifted. (Example, the simplified 22-ft EMB undrained analyses show the entry occur at edge of entry extent)

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Search extents will be shifted to capture critical surface except for Global, Lower, and Localized searches.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The search extents have been modified such that the critical slip surface is not located on the extents of the search.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829352	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Attachment D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Make sure the FS reports in the table are the same as shown on the results plates. For example, Section 1, Simple 15', Case 4, localized result table indicates 1.16 but plate indicates 1.15.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

concur. will ensure all factors of safety presented in tables match the plates.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

FSs reported in the table match the plates.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829353	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Appendix D, Attachment D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Include a figure indicating the diversion channel cross section used in the seepage/stability model. This can be a chart generated in Excel. See Reach 1 DDR for an example.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

concur. figures will be added similar to Reach 1 to show the cross section being used.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Figures indicating the channel geometry are included.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4829382	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Rush River Main Report, Section 6.3.3, Pg 13](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Indicate that the EMB maximum height of 24 ft is only based on geotechnical analysis, other criteria maybe used to determine the final maximum height.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Language will be includede in the 65% DDR that indicates what the EMB max height is based on geotechnical analysis. Due to revisions to the geologic profile the max EMB height will be less than 24ft and the 65% review will reflect this. Finally, viewshed analysis have imposed a Max EMB height of 21 ft on the project. This is a non geotechnical related restriction.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The report has been revised to indicated the maximum EMB grading guidelines based on geotechnical considerations.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4829383	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Rush River, Plan Set](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Civil

Why are EMBs laid out with initial height of 10 feet and stepped height of 15 feet?

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

Revised Sep 17 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

Geotech determination of max EMB envelope not completed, max EMB envelope developed for Reach 1 used to provide ballpark EMB size necessary for earthwork balance.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 10 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The EMBs are laid out using the current grading guidelines.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829388	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Rush River Appendix D, Section D.4.1.2, Pg D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Indicate that the EMB maximum height of 24 ft is only based on geotechnical analysis, other criteria maybe used to determine the final maximum height.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

See response to comment 4829382

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The report has been revised to indicate grading guidelines based on geotechnical considerations.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829389	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: R4 PER ATR, Rush River Appendix D, Section D.4.2, Pg D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Include a table summarizing the contact elevations of the formations for sections analyzed.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

This will be added to the 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Table of contact elevations has been included.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829390	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Rush River Appendix D, Section D.4.3, Pg D-5](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Seepage analysis indicates "half-space" models used but results shown that "full-space" models used. Please revise the description in report and include why a "full-space" model is used.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The diversion channel models will be revised to reflect half-space modeling. Modeling for the Rush River structure may require full-space modeling. If so, a discription will be included in the report.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Half-space models have been used and the report has been updated to reflect this.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829391	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Rush River Appendix D, Section D.4.5, Pg D-5](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Include a FS summary table in the write-up.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

A FS summary table was included in attachment D-4. For the 65% DDR the FS summary table will be included in the write-up.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

A table summarizing the FSs has been included.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829394	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Rush River Appendix D, Attachment D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

If the critical slip surface entry/exit is located at or near the edge of the entry/exit extents when analyzing the stability of the EMB, the entry/exit extents need to be shifted. Exceptions to this are the EMB global check, Lower and localized entry extents, as these should not be shifted. (Example, the simplified 22-ft EMB undrained analyses show the entry occur at edge of entry extent)

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Models have been updated so that the entry/exit extents are not near the critical slip surfaces. The lower and localized entry extents were not shifted as noted in the comment.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The entry/exit extents have been modified.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829396	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Rush River Appendix D, Attachment D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Undrained analyses will likely require a tension crack which is 2 to 4 feet deep. Please include tension crack in the undrained analyses.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

A tension crack has been added to the appropriate models and the 65% DDR will reflect this. In general the tension cracks have been about 4 feet in depth.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Tension cracks have been added as needed.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411) Submitted On: Apr 02 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4829397	Geotechnical	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [R4 PER ATR, Rush River Appendix D, Attachment D-4](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Geotechnical

Include a figure indicating the diversion channel cross section used in the seepage/stability model. This can be a chart generated in Excel. See Reach 1 DDR for an example.

Submitted By: [Kurt Heckendorf](#) (651-290-5411). Submitted On: Sep 17 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

This will be included in teh 65% DDR submittal.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Oct 17 2012

*Backcheck not conducted*

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4831043	CAD-BIM	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

I did not find Real Estate drawings to review. When they are submitted, they should not have coordinate tables until the lines have been approved.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The real estate drawings included with future submittals will not have coordinates tables presented with them until the recommended right of way limits have been approved.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Sep 28 2012

### 1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

The Real Estate drawings were submitted.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831064 CAD-BIM Plans n/a' n/a n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** CAD-BIM

Each volume shall have a Overall General Plan showing the plan areas of each Volume's general Plan sheet. Volume 1 overall General plan will reference Volume 1 General Plan (eg See Sheet C-101) and only label Volume 2 General Plan (eg VOLUME 2 GENERAL PLAN - SEE VOLUME 2 DRAWING SET). Volume 2 would be reversed. Remember not to cross referent between the two volumes.

Submitted By: [Chris Afdahl](#) (651-290-5712). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

### 1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

The 65% submittal will be broken into a 3 volume set. Labeling and referencing of the volumes will be consistent with the labeling in the other reaches that contain multi-volume plan sets.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 04 2012

### 1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

The overall general plan should be a G series so that it is upfront (before geotech). This is part of the Fargo Guidelines.

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

### 1-2 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

The overall general plan should be a G series so that it is upfront (before geotech). This is part of the Fargo Guidelines.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4831612 Design Team Design Paragraph 11  
Leader Memorandum or Landscape and  
Report Recreation (page 18) n/a n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

(**Document Reference:** Reach 4 - PER)

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Landscape Architecture

Please delete and use verbage from R4 Rush Inlet PER for paragraph 11. See attached for language to use.



(Attachment: [Paragraph11\\_landscape\\_recreation.pdf](#))

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

Revised Sep 18 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The updated language provided in the pdf attachment was incorporated.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Landscape and Recreation paragraph has been adequately revised.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831617	Civil	Design Memorandum or Report	Paragraph 4.3 (page 10)	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

(Document Reference: [Reach 4 Rush River Inlet - PER](#))

**Coordinating Discipline(s):** Landscape Architecture

Please delete and use the same language as Reach 4 PER paragraph 4.6. See attached for language.

(Attachment: [Paragraph4\\_6.pdf](#))

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation For Information Only**

The language provided in the attachment is the same language that was presented in the Reach 4 main report.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Paragraph 4.2 in the Reach 4 main report has been adequately revised.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Paragraph 4.3 has been updated with suggested language.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 20 2012

*Backcheck not conducted*

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831619	Design Team Leader	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A  
(Document Reference: Reach 4 - PER Appendix J)  
Coordinating Discipline(s): Landscape Architecture

Since the recreation master plan is changing and has already been reviewed multiple times, please remove from Appendix J.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

Revised Sep 18 2012.

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The recreation master plan will not be included in future review documents.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Appendix J has been removed.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831651	Design Team Leader	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	-----------------------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A  
Coordinating Discipline(s): Landscape Architecture

General comment:

The Right Bank EMBs are too narrow and too tall to accommodate recreation.

The local sponsor is recommending a minimum of 250' to accommodate recreation and undulation design for the right bank EMB. Just to clarify, this 250' is from 15' outside the edge of the maintenance road to the hinge point where the 2% slope meets the 1:6 side slope.

Submitted By: [Renee McGarvey](#) (651-290-5640). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The EMB is being redesigned to incorporate the 250' crown width as well as the 21' max height proposed by the view shed analysis.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Plans have incorporated the wider EMBs.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831842 Civil Plans n/a' C101 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A  
([Document Reference: Volume 1](#))

It is assumed that Reach 3 will be constructed prior to reach 4. Therefore, Reach 4 will tie into Reach 3 transition slopes at 325+00. Make necessary changes to plan and profile to show this, and call out tie-in requirements. Verify tie-in elevations with Reach 3.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Reach transitions at stations 325+00, 403+47, 456+00, and 521+00 will be clarified in the 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Need to also show the EMB transition slope and need to callout the elevations.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Non-concurred**

There is no guarantee that the adjacent EMBs will be built to their maximum grade neat lines, therefore calling out the elevations could lead to inconsistencies during construction. The actual elevation of the adjacent constructed EMBs could vary widely due to settlement, rebound, and error associated with the assumption that there will be a uniform 15% swell of excavated material.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Recommend that the levee transition slope be shown. EMB can be left off.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

---

4831844 Civil Plans n/a' C101 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A  
([Document Reference: Volume 1](#))

Right bank EMB layout does not allow for the 250' width for undulating berm design, and exceeds recent guidance on EMB max height.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The EMBs are being redesigned to be consistent with the 250' crown width recreation requirement as well as the 21' max height view shed constraint.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Verified changes made.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831845	Civil	Plans	n/a'	C101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	------	------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A  
([Document Reference: Volume 1](#))

Sinuus channel design needs refinement. Insufficient information to review sinuous channel design at this time.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The sinuous channel has not been finalized. It will be further refined by the 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Verified that information has been added.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831847	Civil	Plans	n/a'	C101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	------	------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A  
([Document Reference: Volume 1](#))

Profiles do not show all the necessary information, such as top of channel, embedded levee, and local drainage.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Profiles will be updated by the 65% review to be consistent in format with the Reach 1 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Verified that all necessary information is shown.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831848 Civil Plans n/a' C102 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

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

It is assumed that CR32 bridge reach will be constructed prior to reach 4. Therefore, Reach 4 will tie into CR 32 transition slopes at 403+47. Make necessary changes to plan and profile to show this, and call out tie-in requirements. Verify tie-in elevations with CR32.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The 65% submittal will include transition details at stations 325+00, 403+47, 456+00, and 521+00.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Need to include tie-in station/elevations for all features.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Tie-in and station/elevations have been included for all features.

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

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Verified tie-in and station/elevations have been added.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831849 Civil Plans n/a' C105 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

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

Show transition slopes to Reach 5 on profile.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The 65% submittal will include transition details at stations 325+00, 403+47, 456+00, and 521+00.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Need to call out the transition and define stations/elevations for all features.

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

**2-0 Evaluation Non-concurred**

Transition beginning and ending stations have been called out. However, there is no guarantee that the adjacent EMBs will be built to their maximum grade neat lines, therefore calling out the elevations could lead to inconsistencies during construction. The actual elevation of the adjacent constructed EMBs could vary widely due to settlement, rebound, and error associated with the assumption that there will be a uniform 15% swell of excavated material.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

**2-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment**

Recommend the levee transition slope be shown. The EMB can be left off.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

4831859	Civil	Plans	n/a'	Page 12 of 27, 5.2.2	n/a
---------	-------	-------	------	-------------------------	-----

Comment Classification: N/A  
([Document Reference: PER Main Report](#))

Revise paragraph to discuss the two different low flow widths in this Reach. Revise sinuosity figure to reflect actual design.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Paragraph 5.2.2 has been revised to read "Based on the most recent hydrology and hydraulics for the project, the low-flow channel has two typical design sections for Reach 4. The top widths of the two sections are approximately 90 ft and 100 ft. The bottom width is approximately 46 ft and 52 ft for the 90 ft and 100 ft top widths, respectively. The side slopes of the low flow channel are 1V:4H for both sections and there is a 2% slope on the bottom. Both low flow channel sections will be designed to meander across a 200 ft wide meander belt with a variable meander wavelength for an overall sinuosity of 1.125. With a slope of 0.9 ft/mile, the sinuosity results in the low-flow channel having a slope of 0.8 ft/mile. This 0.8 ft/mile slope replicates the average slope of the nearby Maple River. This mild slope and slight sinuosity should allow for environmental variability and closer conditions to a natural river channel. It is important to note that the size could change as more data collection and analysis becomes available. Sediment transport modeling, soil erosion rate testing, further hydrologic analysis, and further consideration of Devils Lake outflows could all lead to changes in the size and meander of the low-flow channel."

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Oct 22 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Verified changes made.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4831866 Civil

Plans

n/a'

Page 12 of 27,  
4.7 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: PER Main Report](#))

All utility relocations will be complete prior to start of construction of the flood risk management project. Underground utilities abandoned in place within the project limits will be required to be removed in the Reach 4 construction contract. Abandoned overhead utilities will be removed by the utility owner prior to construction.

Submitted By: [Gary Wolf](#) (651-290-5288). Submitted On: Sep 18 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The updated language was added to the PER main report paragraph 4.7 Incorporation of Utility Relocation Designs.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Oct 22 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Verified, information added to Appendix E.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4832926 Civil Plans n/a' C301 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

In future submittals the cross sections should show the embedded levee in the right bank EMB.

Submitted By: [Richard Femrite](#) (651-290-5550). Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The cross sections in future submittals will show the embedded levee in the right bank EMB.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Embedded levee shown. Comment resolved.

Submitted By: [Richard Femrite](#) (651-290-5550) Submitted On: Oct 08 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4832929 Civil Plans n/a' C301 n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

The dimension for the set back of the EMB from the top of the channel should be shown.

Submitted By: [Richard Femrite](#) (651-290-5550). Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The dimension for the set back of the EMB from the top of the channel will be shown in the next submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

Set back dimension is shown. Comment resolved.

Submitted By: [Richard Femrite](#) (651-290-5550) Submitted On: Oct 08 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4833007 Civil Design Memorandum or Report n/a' n/a n/a

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: PER\\_FMM\\_R4\\_Appendix\\_E\\_Civil\\_20120827](#))

Courtesy comments were provided directly on the pdf file to be considered for preparation of the DDR. Comments were issued via. email to Jonathon Boone and Colby Bankston.



Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Courtesy comments were received. Any deviation from the recommendations in the submitted pdf will be discussed either via email or phone call prior to the 65% DTR submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 03 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The 95% FTR DDR Civil Appendix E (DDR\_FMM\_R4\_Appendix\_E\_Civil\_220130828.pdf) was reviewed for considerations of the courtesy comments provided at the PER level and all comments were addressed.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4833008	Civil	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: PER\\_FMM\\_R4\\_Attachment\\_1\\_DrawingsReducedFileSize](#))

Courtesy comments were provided and issued via. email to Jonathon Boone and Colby Bankston.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

The courtesy comments were received. Any deviations from the recommended changes will be discussed with you if the need arises before the 65% submittal.

Submitted By: [Colby Bankston](#) (601-631-5327) Submitted On: Oct 04 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

The 95% FTR documents (FMMDR4\_FTR\_ATR\_VOL1\_PLANS.pdf, FMMDR4\_FTR\_ATR\_VOL2\_PLANS.pdf, and FMMDR4\_FTR\_ATR\_VOL3\_PLANS.pdf) for Volumes 1, 2, and 3 were reviewed for consideration of the courtesty comments provided at the PER lever and were addressed.

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

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4833010	Civil	Plans	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	-------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: PER\\_FMM\\_R4\\_Rush\\_Appendix E\\_Attach 01\\_Drawings\\_2012-08-24](#))

Courtesy comments were provided and issued via. email to Dennis Gillmore and Mike Hanks.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Courtesy comments were received. Any deviation from the recommendations in the submitted pdf will be discussed either via email or phone call prior to the 65% DTR submittal.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 12 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

FMMDR4\_DTR\_ATTR\_VOL2\_PLANS.pdf for the 65% ATR Submittal were reviewed for consistency with the courtesy comments provided. The following comments were not addressed:

The slope of the low flow channel shall have a reference to the note that the slope varies. This comment was also provided on the 65% DTR courtesy comments, therefore, will be reviewed once the 95% FTR documents are provided. This comment is therefore being closed out.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

4833012	Civil	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a'	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	-----------------------------------	------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: N/A

([Document Reference: PER\\_FMM\\_R4\\_Appendix E\\_Civil\\_2012-08-24](#))

Courtesy comments were provided directly on the pdf file to be considered for preparation of the DDR. Comments were issued via. email to Dennis Gillmore and Mike Hanks.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025). Submitted On: Sep 19 2012

**1-0 Evaluation Concurred**

Courtesy comments were received. Any deviation from the recommendations in the submitted pdf will be discussed either via email or phone call prior to the 65% DTR submittal.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 12 2012

**1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment**

DDR\_FMM\_R4\_Appendix\_E\_Civil\_20130321.pdf, dated March 21, 2013 for the 65% ATR was reviewed for consistency with the courtesy comments provided at the PER level. All comments were addressed.

Submitted By: [Christine Moss](#) ((651) 290-5025) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

---

---

Public / SBU / FOUO

Patent 11/892,984 [ProjNet](#) property of ERDC since 2004.

---