

Comment Report: All Comments

Project: Fargo Moorhead Metro - Reach 4 Design by MVK

Review: 95% FTR - DQC

Displaying 157 comments for the criteria specified in this report.

Id	Discipline	DocType	Spec	Sheet	Detail
5278426	Environmental	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

DDR, Section 11.4 and Appendix K, Section K.4 -- Provided updated Cultural Resources input for these two sections to the Environmental Lead for the Reach 4 PDT which includes results of November 2012 Phase II testing at prehistoric find spot site 32CSX384 and Phase I survey of Reach 4 parcels in November 2012 and June 2013.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasik](#) (651-290-5262). Submitted On: Jul 18 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Thanks.

Submitted By: [Ken Cook](#) (314-331-8498) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Updated cultural resources input has been inserted in DDR Section 11.4 and Appendix K, Section K.4.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasik](#) (651-290-5262) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5278434	Specifications	Specifications	01 14 00.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

([Document Reference: Volume 1 and Volume 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Cultural Resources

WORK RESTRICTIONS, paragraph 1.3.1 Prehistoric Archeological Site -- This paragraph can be omitted from the Specs as site 32CSX384 in Reach 4 was tested in November 2012 and determined to be not eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. No further cultural resources work is necessary at its location.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasik](#) (651-290-5262). Submitted On: Jul 18 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Paragraph deleted.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Paragraph has been deleted in both Specs volumes 1 and 3.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasiik](#) (651-290-5262) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5278447	Specifications	Specifications	35	31	19.00	13	n/a	n/a
---------	----------------	----------------	----	----	-------	----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

(Document Reference: [Volume 1 and Volume 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

STONE PROTECTION (RIPRAP), paragraph 2.1 Stone Sources and Evaluation -- First sentence mentions a list of stone sources in the attachments to this section, but such a list is not present. There is such a list attached to this same section in Reach 4 Specs Volume 2.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasiik](#) (651-290-5262). Submitted On: Jul 18 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Stones sources will be added to the spec set.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

List of Material Sources has been added to end of Stone Protection (Riprap) spec section in both volumes 1 and 3.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasiik](#) (651-290-5262) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5278456	Specifications	Specifications	31	00	00.00	13	n/a	n/a
---------	----------------	----------------	----	----	-------	----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Environmental

EARTHWORK -- Omit paragraphs 1.4 and 1.4.1 as no construction monitoring for buried cultural resources is needed at the channelized Rush River in FMM Project Reach 4.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasiik](#) (651-290-5262). Submitted On: Jul 18 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Paragraph deleted.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Paragraphs on monitoring for cultural resources have been deleted.

Submitted By: [Virginia Gnabasik](#) (651-290-5262) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290377 Geotechnical Technical Report Topography D-2 of D-25 n/a

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

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Last sentence. Instead of stating discussed in "other reports" suggested listing the reports names at a minimum and possibly listing as a reference somewhere in the report.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

It has been decided to remove the reference to "other reports" and just state that the topography discussion only references the project extents.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Ok. This is acceptable.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392) Submitted On: Oct 29 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290378 Geotechnical Technical Report Past Experiences D-20 of D-25 n/a

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

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Last sentence "...as very little water seepages into the excavation." Possible reword "...water seepage was found in the excavation."

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Concur. Wording has been changed to "... concern as very little water has been observed seeping into excavations."

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Jul 31 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Ok. Thank you for the correction.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392) Submitted On: Oct 29 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290382 Geotechnical Technical Report Attachments D-iii of D-iii n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Rename attachments as D1-# when appropriate (also update throughout report if you do so) or call them out differently. Possibly "Attachment D2-1: See Attachment D1-1: Stratigraphy (Included in MVK-Reach 4 PER)"

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The attachment names have been updated to Attachment D2-1: See Attachment D1-1: Stratigraphy (Included in MVK-Reach4 FTR)

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Ok. Thank you this is more straight forward.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392) Submitted On: Oct 29 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290389 Geotechnical Technical Report Geology D-2 of D-22 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Last sentence. Confusion with the attachments (goes with last comment). Make sure you are consistent throughout the report. This location uses reference D1-1 while other areas call this D2-1.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Where attachments are referenced from the MVK report the attachments are called out as D1-x. When the attachment is included in the report it is called out as Attachment D2-x.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Ok. Thank you.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392) Submitted On: Oct 29 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290393 Geotechnical Technical Report Table D-11 of D-22 n/a

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

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Table D2-5 Summary of EMB Max. Grading Extents, is not included.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The table was inadvertently left out of the report and has been added in.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Ok. Thank you for the correction.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392) Submitted On: Oct 29 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290398	Geotechnical	Technical Report	n/a	Attachments	n/a
---------	--------------	------------------	-----	-------------	-----

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

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Suggest inserting one page per attachment at the rear of the report to say Attachment D2-1 : See D1-1 in MVK-Reach 4 PER, also suggest inserting a page before the attachments that are included D2-4 and D2-5 so there is separation between them.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

This has been added to the DDR.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 26 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Ok. Thank you.

Submitted By: [Amanda Goltz](#) (314-331-8392) Submitted On: Oct 29 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290785	Environmental	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------------	-------	-----	-----	-----

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

DDR_FMM_R4_Appendix_K_Env_20130716__DQC__95%.docx Page K-3 of 4

K.6 NEPA COMPLIANCE

Remove yellow highlighting.

Last sentence states "A draft will be available to the public in May of 2013." Since we are past that date, revise the sentence to update the status of the EA and NEPA compliance.

Submitted By: [Teri Allen](#) (314-331-8084). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Replaced wording of last sentence to read: A draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment and supplemental 404(b)1 was made available for public review with the comment period ending 15 July 2013. Comments received are currently being addressed.

Submitted By: [Ken Cook](#) (314-331-8498) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Teri Allen](#) (314-331-8084) Submitted On: Sep 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5290895	Environmental	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------------	-------	-----	-----	-----

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

The Environmental Review of DDR_FMM_R4 (Appendix K)has been completed. Editorial comments have been provided to Environmental PDT member Ken Cook.

Submitted By: [Teri Allen](#) (314-331-8084). Submitted On: Jul 26 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Thanks.

Submitted By: [Ken Cook](#) (314-331-8498) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Teri Allen](#) (314-331-8084) Submitted On: Sep 05 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292332	Civil	Plans and Specs	Section 01 00 00 00.13 3.4	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	-----------------	-------------------------------	-----	-----

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

([Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Para 3.4 "Disposal Offsite for Useful Purposes"

Ensure that contractor hauls wood chip piles offsite at least once every week. The piles may begin to heat up and steam. Don't want any concern for spontaneous combustion.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The MVP team has notified the MVK team that Section 01 00 00.00 13 Paragraph 3.1 Disposal of Debris and Waste adequately addresses the concerns associated with this project.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292340	Civil	Plans and Specs	Section 01 00 00 00.13	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----	-----

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

([Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Para 3.1.2 "Historical Cone Penetration (CPT) Data

Only historical CPT data is provided as reference material only. Shouldn't all data from the conventionally drilled exploration be made available as well?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The boring logs and test data are supplied as part of the contract drawings since they are considered more definitive. CPTs are provided as a reference in the specifications as supplemental information.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292345	Civil	Plans and Specs	Section 01 14 00 00.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	-----------------	------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Para 1.3.1 "Prehistoric Archeological Site".

Please fill in the [date TBD] at the end of this paragraph.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Paragraph 1.3.1 will be deleted since site 32CSX384 in Reach 4 was tested in November 2012 and determined to be not eligible to the National Register of Historic Places.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292349	Specifications	Plans and Specs	Section 01 22 00 00.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	----------------	-----------------	------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment.

Paragraph 1.8.5 Care of Water. Paragraph should exclude the Right Bank and Left Bank Drainage Ditching which appears to be covered in paragraph 1.9.14.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP response: This is for Care of Water for the project. 1.9.14 is for the construction of the drainage ditch excavations.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292351 Specifications Plans and Specs Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment.Paragraph 1.8.8 Care of Water appears to repeat paragraph 1.8.5.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Paragraph 1.8.8 has been deleted.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292353 Specifications Plans and Specs Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment.

Define the acronym SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan).

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

SWPPP to be defined as noted.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292355 Specifications Plans and Specs Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment. Paragraph 1.9.1.2 If contractor strips outside of the lines and grades shown on the drawings. How will the volume of stripping outside of those lines and grades be measured for non-payment? And should that method be mentioned here?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

MVP response: Volume measured outside the required area will be deducted.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Respectfully, the provided response does not answer the question. How will the volume of stripping outside the lines and grades be measured?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

The contractor is responsible for performing the necessary quantity surveys. All stripping measurements will be measured using the triangle volume method, but payment will be limited to the lines and grades shown. If overstripping occurs, the volume outside the required lines and grades will be deducted from the overall volume of material measured.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Nov 04 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292359	Specifications	Plans and Specs	Section 01 22 00 00.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	----------------	-----------------	------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment. Paragraph 1.9.2.1 Paragraph should remove reference to the access road embankment. This access road embankment should be named in paragraph 1.9.15.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The current verbiage is correct and is consistent with the Reach 1 specifications.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292360	Specifications	Plans and Specs	Section 01 22 00 00.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	----------------	-----------------	------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment. Paragraph 1.9.3.2 Why are undulations paid for by the square yard when other earthwork is paid for by the cubic yard?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The volume of undulation is not defined in the design however the area of undulation is, therefore this unit of measure was used.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292495	Civil	Specifications	Section 01 33 00.	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

No submittal register is included.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The submittal register will be added before the next review.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292498	Civil	Specifications	Section 01 45 04.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	---------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.6.2.1 Soils testing lab required to meet ASTM capability check and not USACE Validation? USACE validation a Corp-wide requirement.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Spec revisions will include....In 3.6.1, replace "The Contractor shall procure the services of a testing laboratory meeting the requirements listed under PARAGRAPH: CAPABILITY CHECK, or establish a..." with "The Contractor shall procure the services of a Corps of Engineers approved testing laboratory or establish a..."

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292501	Civil	Specifications	Section 01 50 02.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	---------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

1.5.2 On Site Haul Roads.

This paragraph states that "The contractor shall, at its own expense, construct access and haul road necessary for proper prosecution of the work . . ." Does this paragraph conflict with Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 paragraph 1.9.15 "Access Road Embankment (Outlet and EMB) " which provided measurement and payment for certain access roads?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

There is no conflict, these are temporary Contractor access roads vs. Project Feature Access Roads in 1.9.15.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

then perhaps clearly identify the Project Feature Haul Roads in the drawings.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292508	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 2.1.1 Recommend revising the 2nd sentence as follows:

The material shall be free of ice, snow, frozen earth, trash, debris, sod, roots, and organic matter.

The material shall be free of stones larger than 3 inches in any dimension.

This revision should eliminate any questions about what materials the "3-inch" dimension applies to.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no change be made to the second sentence.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292511	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Section 31 00 00.00 13 Paragraph 2.2.1 "Select Granular Fill" . This paragraph uses the term "common borrow" . I don't see common borrow defined anywhere.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The first sentence will be revised to delete the following "meet requirements for common borrow and shall".

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292512 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 2.2.1 "Random Fill" . Suggest revising this sentence as follows:

Random fill shall consist of all remaining materials required to be excavated which are not to be used as impervious fill, topsoil, or select granular fill.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The recommendation will be incorporated as stated.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292515 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 2.2.3.2 "Excavated Materials Containing Frost" . Revise the phrase ". . .smaller the 8 inches . . ." to ". . .smaller than 8 inches . . .".

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The recommendation will be incorporated as stated.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292516 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 2.2.4 "Topsoil". This paragraph allows the contractor to determine the amount of stripping and excavation of topsoil that is required. I assume this allows the contractor to determine the required depth of stripping. Since paragraph 1.9.1 in Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 Measurement and Payment defines stripping as a unit price pay item, strongly recommend that paragraph 2.2.4 limit the contractor's depth of stripping. Also, paragraph 3.4 in this same section says that topsoil will be stripped from the areas to the depth indicated on the drawings. These three areas of the spec should be better coordinated.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The stripping required in this contract is only the topsoil under the levee or access roads. The rest of the topsoil will come from the upper layer of excavation. The Contractor will be responsible for determining how much of the excavated topsoil needs to be used for topsoil and how much can be spoiled in the EMBs. The drawings show the depth of stripping required under the levee. These areas of the spec are coordinated when read in the proper context and compared to the drawings.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292518 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 2.3 "Compaction Construction Equipment". Consider including descriptions of allowable compaction , spreading, sprinkling, and miscellaneous earthwork equipment as shown in the attached file.

(Attachment: [Equipment.docx](#))

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no changes be made to this paragraph.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292519	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 2.3.1 "Compaction of Embedded Levee". Revise the phrase "Use of sheepsfoot roller (vibratory or non-vibratory), or scarification between lifts, is required . . ." to "Use of sheepsfoot roller (vibratory or non-vibratory), and scarification between lifts, is required . . ."

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The use of a sheepsfoot roller effectively bonds adjoining lifts. Scarification is only required when a smooth drum or rubber tired roller is used as covered in the last sentence. DELETE ", or scarification between lifts, " in the first sentence.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

As written, the spec provided a choice (it included the word "or") between the sheepsfoot roller or scarification. Scarification is typically ALWAYS required between lifts, regardless of what type of roller is used. Please ensure your proposed change does not eliminate the scarification requirement.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292520	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 2.3.3 "Compaction of Excavated Material Piles". Add this sentence after the first sentence. "The only compaction shall be only that obtained from the spreading and placement activities."

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no change be made since this is a redundant statement.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292521	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.2.2 "Dewatering Plan". Care of Water is defined as a Payment Item and the Submittal Register instructs the contractor to submit a dewatering plan, referring to this paragraph. I see no dewatering requirements in these specifications.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP provided a revised specification. Dewatering is now covered in section 31 23 19.41 13 DEWATERING COFFERDAMS AND CARE OF WATER . All references to dewatering in 31 00 00.00 13 will be deleted.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292523	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.5.1 "Erosion Control of Topsoil Stockpiles". Hey, I'll be the first to admit that my front lawn looks terrible; I don't have a green thumb! But is it wise to spray the topsoil stockpiles with herbicide to prevent weeds from flowering??? Won't the herbicide keep the new turf from growing as well?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Herbicides are available that will not prevent the growth of grass. Timing of application may be required to allow germination of desired ground cover, but this requirement is in here to comply with ND regulations regarding noxious weeds

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292525	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.7.1.2 "Excavated Material Containing Frost". The first phrase of this paragraph refers to "Excavated material containing frost . . ." The next paragraph, 3.7.1.3 refers to "Excavated materials containing frozen material . . ." Is there any difference between "frost" and "frozen material"?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Please see paragraphs 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.3.3 for definitions.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292526	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.7.1.2 "Excavated Material Containing Frost". This paragraph allows frozen chunks less than 4-inches thick and frozen chunks between 4 and 8 inches. Is there any limit on the percentage of the embankment that can be placed with frozen chunks? As currently written, I don't see anything to prevent the contractor from building the outward third of the EMB completely out of frozen chunks that are between 4 and 8 inches.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

MVP has revised these paragraphs to provide for more clarification.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292527 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.7.1.3 "Frozen Excavated Material". A minor issue, but the first sentence repeats the last sentence of paragraph 3.7.1.2.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The sentence will not be modified in order to maintain consistency with the Reach 1 specifications.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292528 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.7.1.3 "Ditches and Diversion Canals". Stumps left in the bottom of the diversion channel are likely to become scour attack points during flow events which will then become unwanted erosion features in the bottom of the canal. Recommend grubbing out the stumps and backfilling the voids.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The bottom of the diversion channel is 20 feet below existing grade. It is unlikely that stumps will be encountered that deep below existing grade.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292531 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.11.2 "General". Do any of the previously defined limitation on Winter Construction apply to Structural excavation? I see no frozen materials or cold weather limitations in this section.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Section 03 31 00.00 10 Cast in Place Structural Concrete has limitation stated in the Cold Weather Requirements paragraph 3.6.3.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292532 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.11.2 "Overdepth Excavation". The word "except" in the middle of the long second sentence implies that a COR approved increase in concrete thickness will be paid for. Is that correct? Please clarify the paragraph.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

If unsatisfactory material is encountered and over excavation is required, the contractor will be paid for the extra concrete placed in the structure footing if approved by the Contracting Officer.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292533 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.13 "Subgrade Preparation". The second sentence partially repeats the information in the subsequent paragraphs. On its own, this sentence does not provide the protection against improper placement. Recommend deleting this sentence.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no change be made.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292536 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.13.1 "Subgrades for Embedded Levees". Recommend revising the third sentence to "For placement of cohesionless soils, the subgrade . . .".

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The cohesionless soils are the subgrade, not the material being placed.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292537 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.13.1 "Subgrades for Embedded Levees". Recommend revising the fourth sentence to "For placement of cohesive soils, the subgrade . . .".

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The cohesionless soils are the subgrade, not the material being placed.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292540 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.13.1 "Subgrades for Embedded Levees". Why is there such a potentially costly difference between the subgrade treatments for placement of cohesive or cohesionless soils? The subgrade treatment for placement of cohesionless soils requires the surface to be compacted to 100% Std Proctor Density but the treatment for cohesive soils requires only "proof rolling". I can't tell what proof rolling implies: does it mean 5 passes of a sheepsfoot? Or 10 passes or a rubber tired vehicle? To assure the performance of the embedded levee, the same density requirement (100% Std Proctor Density) should be required for either placement material type.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The proof rolling requirement will be modified to state:

"For cohesive soils, the subgrade shall be proof rolled with either a loaded tandem dump truck or a larger standard rubber tired piece of loaded heavy construction equipment, and any soft areas shall be brought to the Contracting Officer's attention."

In addition, we are not sure exactly what type of equipment the Contractor may use on the project and do not want to limit the equipment that can be used for proof rolling. One pass is sufficient to determine if subgrade is soft or not for the application of embedded levee or excavated material berm. The subgrade would not need to be compacted to 100% to support the compaction of the embedded levee material (90%) and excavated material berm material (85%)."

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

the response defines what "proof rolling" requires. But there is still a costly difference between the required subgrade treatment for cohesionless soils (compact to 100% std Proctor) and proof rolling. Why?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292542 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

([Document Reference: FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.13.2 "Subgrades for Embankments Across Existing Drainage Features". Why is there such a potentially costly difference between the subgrade treatments for placement of cohesive or cohesionless soils? The subgrade treatment for placement of cohesionless soils requires the surface to be compacted to 100% Std Proctor Density but the treatment for cohesive soils requires only "proof rolling". I can't tell what proof rolling implies: does it mean 5 passes or a sheepsfoot? Or 10 passes with rubber tires? To assure the performance of the levee embankment, the same density requirement (100% Std Proctor Density) should be required for either placement material type.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The proof rolling requirement will be modified to state:

"For cohesive soils, the subgrade shall be proof rolled with either a loaded tandem dump truck or a larger standard rubber tired piece of loaded heavy construction equipment, and any soft areas shall be brought to the Contracting Officer's attention."

In addition, we are not sure exactly what type of equipment the Contractor may use on the project and do not want to limit the equipment that can be used for proof rolling. One pass is sufficient to determine if subgrade is soft or not for the application of embedded levee or excavated material berm. The subgrade would not need to be compacted to 100% to support the compaction of the embedded levee material (90%) and excavated material berm material (85%)."

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**

This response is the same as the response to my previous question. Please see my backcheck to that previous question.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292543 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

([Document Reference: FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.14.1 "Roadway Subgrade Tolerance". This tolerance is stated as +/-0.05-feet (0.6-inches) which is a greater than the allowable tolerance listed in the next paragraph for the diversion channel. Seems that roadway subgrades should be prepared more closely than the channel excavation.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation **Non-concurred**

MVP response.....The diversion channel design elev. is required for hydraulic reasons. The aggregate roadway elev. on top of the EMB is not as critical.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292545 Geotechnical Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a

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

([Document Reference: FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.14.2 "Diversion Channel Tolerance". This paragraph requires an overall average finish surface within (-)0.5-inches of the drawing's lines and grades while allowing up to (-)3.0-inches of local area variance. The 0.5-inch tolerance for earthwork is too tight. Recommend relaxing this to 0.10-foot.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVPP has requested no change be made.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292547	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.17.2 "Field Density Tests". Strongly recommend that each field density test also include a laboratory completed, Unified Soil classification. This will help the QA personnel ensure that the soils in the field density test are correctly matched to the most appropriate Proctor curve. A similar comment was made for the Proctor Tests.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

There will likely be CH and CL materials, which will be distinguishable in the field and the dry densities between the two should be different enough that a representative proctor can be chosen. Also, considering the redundancy there is for the embedded levees, there is less concern in the compaction requirements than for a stand alone levee.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Do not concur. There will likely be enough field variations between CH materials (or CL materials) that the field inspector would like to have the lab classification on the sample to ensure that he/she picks the correct Proctor.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292550	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.17.3 "Proctor Tests". Strongly recommend that each Proctor test also include a laboratory completed, Unified Soil classification. This will help the QA personnel ensure that the soils in the Proctor curve are correctly matched to the most appropriate field density test. A similar comment was made for the Field Density Tests.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

There will likely be CH and CL materials, which will be distinguishable in the field and the dry densities between the two should be different enough that a representative proctor can be chosen. Also, considering the redundancy there is for the embedded levees, there is less concern in the compaction requirements than for a stand alone levee.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 23 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

There will likely be enough variation in the materials selected for Proctor curves will require a lab classification. You may have two Proctors on CH material that differ by 3 pcf, but the field inspector cannot know which CH material he should compare to? Lab classifications on the Proctor and the field sample help match the most correct Proctor to the field samples.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292552	Geotechnical	Specifications	Section 31 11 00.00	n/a	n/a
---------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	-----

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

([Document Reference: FMM Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Paragraph 3.4.3 "Nonsaleable Materials". If Nonsaleable Materials are chipped on site, the resulting piles shall be removed from the site on a weekly basis.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The paragraph states the nonsaleable materials shall be disposed of in a Contractor furnished disposal area outside the project work area, however a time requirement for removal has not been accepted by MVP.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 26 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Why not require the contractor to remove his non saleable material on a timely basis? It helps keep the construction site clean.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

2-0 Evaluation Concurred

The areas being cleared and grubbed on this project are mostly agricultural fields. There is no anticipation of having large piles of chipped material.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Nov 06 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292646 Civil Specifications Section 01 00 00 00.13 n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Para 3.1.2 "Disposal Offsite for Useful Purposes"

Ensure that contractor hauls wood chip piles offsite at least once every week. The piles may begin to heat up and steam. Don't want any concern for spontaneous combustion.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The MVP team has notified the MVS team that Section 01 00 00.00 13 Paragraph 3.1 Disposal of Debris and Waste adequately addresses the concerns associated with this project.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292653 Civil Specifications Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment Define the acronym SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan).

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

SWPPP acronym definition has been added to paragraphs 1.8.3.1 and 1.8.5.1.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292654 Civil Specifications Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment Paragraph 1.9.1.2 If contractor strips outside of the lines and grades shown on the drawings. How will the volume of stripping outside of those lines and grades be measured for non-payment? More importantly, should that method be mentioned here?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

MVP response: Volume measured outside the required area will be deducted.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Your response does not answer the question! How will the volume be measured?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

2-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The volume will be determined by comparing digital terrain models prior to stripping and after stripping is complete. Only the areas within the stripping limits as shown on the drawings will be considered in the volume determination (unless other allowances have been authorized by the Contracting Officer).

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Nov 07 2013

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292656 Civil Specifications Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Measurement and Payment Paragraph 1.9.3.1 Why are undulations paid for by the square yard when other earthwork is paid for by the cubic yard?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The volume of undulation is not defined in the design however the area of undulation is, therefore this unit of measure was used.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292660	Civil	Specifications	Section 01 45 04.00 13	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	---------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.6.2.1 Soils testing lab required to meet ASTM capability check and not USACE Validation? USACE validation a Corp-wide requirement. Labs should be USACE valicated.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Spec revisions will include....In 3.6.1, replace "The Contractor shall procure the services of a testing laboratory meeting the requirements listed under PARAGRAPH: CAPABILITY CHECK, or establish a..." with "The Contractor shall procure the services of a Corps of Engineers approved testing laboratory or establish a..."

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292665	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 2.1.1 Recommend revising the 2nd sentence as follows:
The material shall be free of ice, snow, frozen earth, trash, debris, sod, roods, and organic matter.
The material shall be free of stones larger than 3 inches in any dimension.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no change be made to the second sentence.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292667	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Section 31 00 00.00 13 Paragraph 2.2.1 "Select Granular Fill" . This paragraph uses the term "common borrow". Unless it is on the drawings (haven't got there yet) I don't see common borrow defined yet.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The first sentence will be revised to delete the following "meet requirements for common borrow and shall".

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292669	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 2.2.1 "Random Fill" . Suggest revising this sentence as follows:
Random fill shall consist of all remaining materials required to be excavated which are not to be used as impervious fill, topsoil, or select granular fill.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The recommendation will be incorporated as stated.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292671	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 2.2.3.2 "Excavated Materials Containing Frost" . Revise the phrase ". . .smaller the 8 inches . . ." to ". . .smaller than 8 inches . . .".

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The recommendation will be incorporated as stated.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292673	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 2.2.4 "Topsoil". This paragraph allows the contractor to determine the amount of stripping and excavation of topsoil that is required. I assume this allows the contractor to determine the required depth of stripping. Since paragraph 1.9.1 in Section 01 22 00 00.00 13 Measurement and Payment defines stripping as a unit price pay item, strongly recommend that paragraph 2.2.4 limit the contractor's depth of stripping. Also, paragraph 3.4 in this same section says that topsoil will be stripped from the areas to the depth indicated on the drawings. These three areas of the spec should be better coordinated.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The stripping required in this contract is only the topsoil under the levee or access roads. The rest of the topsoil will come from the upper layer of excavation. The Contractor will be responsible for determining how much of the excavated topsoil needs to be used for topsoil and how much can be spoiled in the EMBs. The drawings show the depth of stripping required under the levee. These areas of the spec are coordinated when read in the proper context and compared to the drawings.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292675	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 2.3 "Compaction Construction Equipment". Consider including descriptions of allowable compaction , spreading, sprinkling, and miscellaneous earthwork equipment as shown in the attached file.

(Attachment: [Equipment1.docx](#))

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no changes be made to this paragraph.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292677	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 2.3.1 "Compaction of Embedded Levee and Levees". Revise the phrase "Use of sheepsfoot roller (vibratory or non-vibratory), or scarification between lifts, is required . . ." to "Use of sheepsfoot roller (vibratory or non-vibratory), and scarification between lifts, is required . . ."

."

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The use of a sheepsfoot roller effectively bonds adjoining lifts. Scarification is only required when a smooth drum or rubber tired roller is used as covered in the last sentence. DELETE ", or scarification between lifts, " in the first sentence.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

As written, the spec provides a choice between using a sheepsfoot roller or scariing each layer between lifts. I believe that list should always be scarified, regardless of the type of roller used. Ensure that the proposed change does not eliminate the scarification requirment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292678	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 2.3.3 "Compaction of Excavated Material Piles". Add this sentence after the first sentence. "The only compaction shall be only that obtained from the spreading and placement activities."

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no change be made since this is a redundant statement.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292681	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.2.2 "Dewatering Plan". Care of Water is defined as a Payment Item and the Submittal Register instructs the contractor to submit a dewatering plan, referring to this paragraph. I see no dewatering requirements in these specifications.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP provided a revised specification. Dewatering is now covered in section 31 23 19.41 13 DEWATERING COFFERDAMS AND CARE OF WATER . All references to dewatering in 31 00 00.00 13 will be deleted.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292819	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.2.2 "Dewatering Plan". Care of Water is defined as a Payment Item and the Submittal Register instructs the contractor to submit a dewatering plan, referring to this paragraph. I see no dewatering requirements in these specifications.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Check and Resolve

This comment is a duplicate of comment ID 5292681.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292822	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.5.1 "Erosion Control of Topsoil Stockpiles". Hey, I'll be the first to admit that my front lawn looks terrible; I don't have a green thumb! But is it wise to spray the topsoil stockpiles with herbicide to prevent weeds from flowering??? Won't the herbicide keep the new turf from growing as well?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Herbicides are available that will not prevent the growth of grass. Timing of application may be required to allow germination of desired ground cover, but this requirement is in here to comply with ND regulations regarding noxious weeds

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292826	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.8 "Ditches and Diversion Canals". Is it wise to leave stumps in the bottom of the diversion canal. These are likely to become scour attack points during flow events which will then become unwanted erosion features in the bottom of the canal. Recommend grubbing the stumps and backfilling the voids.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The bottom of the diversion channel is 20 feet below existing grade. It is unlikely that stumps will be encountered that deep below existing grade.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292834 Civil Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a
13 Earthwork

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.12 "Subgrade Preparation". The second sentence partially repeats the information in the subsequent paragraphs. On its own, this sentence does not provide the protection against improper placement. Recommend deleting this sentence.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP has requested no change be made.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292836 Civil Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a
13 Earthwork

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.12.1 "Subgrades for Embedded Levees and Levees". Recommend revising the third sentence to "For placement of cohesionless soils, the subgrade .".

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The cohesionless soils are the subgrade, not the material being placed.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292838 Civil Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a
13 Earthwork

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Division Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.12.1 "Subgrades for Embedded Levees and Levees". Recommend revising the fourth sentence to "For placement of cohesive soils, the subgrade . . .".

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The cohesionless soils are the subgrade, not the material being placed.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292841	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Division Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.12.2 "Subgrades for Embankments Across Existing Drainage Features". Why is there such a potentially costly difference between the subgrade treatments for placement of cohesive or cohesionless soils? The subgrade treatment for placement of cohesionless soils requires the surface to be compacted to 100% Std Proctor Density but the treatment for cohesive soils requires only "proof rolling". I can't tell what proof rolling implies: does it mean 5 passes? Or 10 passes? To assure the performance of the levee embankment, the same density requirement (100% Std Proctor Density) should be required for either placement material type.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

PER MVP

"For cohesive soils, the subgrade shall be proof rolled with either a loaded tandem dump truck or a larger standard rubber tired piece of loaded heavy construction equipment, and any soft areas shall be brought to the Contracting Officer's attention."

In addition, we are not sure exactly what type of equipment the Contractor may use on the project and do not want to limit the equipment that can be used for proof rolling. One pass is sufficient to determine if subgrade is soft or not for the application of embedded levee or excavated material berm. The subgrade would not need to be compacted to 100% to support the compaction of the embedded levee material (90%) and excavated material berm material (85%)."

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

the response clarifies the proof rolling requirement. But there still remains a large difference in ocast between proof rolling for cohesive soils and compaction to 100% for cohesionless soils. As originally stated?: Why the large difference in effort?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292842	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.13.1 "Roadway Subgrade Tolerance". This tolerance is stated as +/-0.05-feet (0.6-inches) which is a greater than the allowable tolerance listed in the next paragraph for the diversion channel.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVP response.....The diversion channel design elev. is required for hydraulic reasons. The aggregate roadway elev. on top of the EMB is not as critical.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292847	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.14.2 "Diversion Channel Tolerance". This paragraph requires an overall average finish surface within (-)0.5-inches of the drawing's lines and grades while allowing up to (-)3.0-inches of local area variance. The 0.5-inch tolerance for earthwork seems too tight. Recommend relaxing this to 0.10-foot.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

MVPP has requested no change be made.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292854	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 00 00.00 13 Earthwork	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Division Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.15.2 b (2). "Placement and Compaction". Why is there such a potentially costly difference between the subgrade treatments for placement of cohesive or cohesionless soils? The subgrade treatment for placement of cohesionless soils requires the surface to be compacted to 100% Std Proctor Density but the treatment for cohesive soils requires only "proof rolling". I can't tell what proof rolling implies: does it mean 5 passes of a sheepsfoot or 10 passes of a rubber tired vehicle? To assure the performance of the levee embankment, the same density requirement (100% Std Proctor Density) should be required for either placement material type.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Per MVP

"For cohesive soils, the subgrade shall be proof rolled with either a loaded tandem dump truck or a larger standard rubber tired piece of loaded heavy construction equipment, and any soft areas shall be brought to the Contracting Officer's attention."

In addition, we are not sure exactly what type of equipment the Contractor may use on the project and do not want to limit the equipment that can be used for proof rolling. One pass is sufficient to determine if subgrade is soft or not for the application of embedded levee or excavated material berm. The subgrade would not need to be compacted to 100% to support the compaction of the embedded levee material (90%) and excavated material berm material (85%)."

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 27 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

See backcheck to similar comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292855 Civil Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a
13 Earthwork

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Division Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.16.2 "Field Density Tests". Strongly recommend that each field density test also include a laboratory completed, Unified Soil classification. This will help the QA personnel ensure that the soils in the field density test are correctly matched to the most appropriate Proctor curve. The same comment was made for the Proctor Tests.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

There will likely be CH and CL materials, which will be distinguishable in the field and the dry densities between the two should be different enough that a representative proctor can be chosen. Also, considering the redundancy there is for the embedded levees, there is less concern in the compaction requirements than for a stand alone levee.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

See my response to similar backcheck comment/response made earlier. Sorry, I don't know the number.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292857 Civil Specifications Section 31 00 00.00 n/a n/a
13 Earthwork

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: FMM Division Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.16.3 "Proctor Tests". Strongly recommend that each Proctor test also include a laboratory completed, Unified Soil classification. This will help the QA personnel ensure that the soils in the Proctor curve are correctly matched to the most appropriate field density test. The same comment was made for the Field Density Tests.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

There will likely be CH and CL materials, which will be distinguishable in the field and the dry densities between the two should be different enough that a representative proctor can be chosen. Also, considering the redundancy there is for the embedded levees, there is less concern in the compaction requirements than for a stand alone levee.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Again, please see my backcheck evaluation on the similar comment made earlier.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5292860	Civil	Specifications	Section 31 1100.00 13 Clearing and Grubbing	n/a	n/a
---------	-------	----------------	---	-----	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Divesion Reach 4: Vol 2 of 3 Drop Structure](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Paragraph 3.4.3 "Nonsaleable Materials". If Nonsaleable Materials are chipped on site, the resulting piles shall be removed from the site on a weekly basis.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The following was added to the last sentence in Paragraph 3.4.3..."in accordance with SECTION 01 00 00.00 13, paragraph 3.1 DISPOSAL OF DEBRIS AND WASTE" so that both sections are consistent with each other.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5292937	General	Plans	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-------	-----	-----	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): General

Check/revise Index To Drawings and sheets that are referenced (i.e. CSXXX on sheet CS102).

Submitted By: [Jamie Tillotson](#) (601-631-5030). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Index to drawings has been updated. Placeholder notes (i.e. CSXXX) have been removed from plan sheet notes and replaced with actual sheet numbers.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

No discussion required.

Submitted By: [Jamie Tillotson](#) (601-631-5030) Submitted On: Oct 25 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293426 Geotechnical Plans n/a B-101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Need this drawing to show boring locations.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

There is only one boring in the footprint of Volume 1, and it is shown in the civil plan sheet CS102. Adding boring layout sheets would add unnecessary pages and file size to the drawing set without adding any value. However, the boring location will be added to the general plan sheet (C-101) for additional clarity.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

I did not suggest adding a boring layout sheet! I suggested adding the boring locations on existng drawing B-101. But adding the boring location to drawing C-101 will suffice.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293437 Civil Plans n/a C-101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Should indicate what work is in this contract. Also indicate that Volume 2 and Volume 3 limits are not part of this contract.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Notes have been added to C-101 indicating that volumes 2 and 3 are not part of this contract as well as calling out that only volume 1 is included in this contract.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293439 Civil Plans n/a C-101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

This drawing indicates an area labeled "Work by Others" outside of the work limits of Volume 1. But Drawing CD-102 identifies work by others within the limits of Volume 1 in the vicinity of project station 385+00 and between stations 395+00 to 403+00. Drawing C-101 should also indicate this additional work by others.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

C-101 will be updated to show work conducted by others that falls within the work limits of volume 1.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293443 Civil Plans n/a CD-101 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Correct spelling errors in the Notes.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Spelling errors have been corrected in the notes on CD101.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293449 Civil Plans n/a CS-101 and CS-102 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Identify FD-1, FD-2, and FD-3 (field drains?). Are these the drain tile inlets shown on drawing CS-504? If so, name them consistently, either field drains or drain tiles. The specifications refer to drain tile in spec section 02 41 00 Demolition.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

FD-1, 2, and 3 are not referencing drain tiles to be demolished. They are callouts for field drainage inlets to be installed as shown on sheets CS502 - CS504 and tabulated on sheet CS603.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

At a minimum define what FD stands for on drawings CS-101 and CS-102. I was guessing.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5293453 Civil Plans n/a CS-101 and CS-102 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

CS-502 shows details for handling drain culverts. If these culverts are planned, these drawings (CS-101 and CS 102) should show the culvert's locations.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The culvert locations are already shown on CS101 and CS102 as annotation callouts (FD-1, FD-2...), and they are tabulated on CS603.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

So FD-1 and FD-2 represent the culvert locations? You previously defined them as field drains. Confusion reigns!

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

2-0 Evaluation For Information Only

I apologize for the confusion. I should have clarified my previous response further: FD-1 and FD-2 (as well as FD-3,4, and 5) are field drainage locations. At every field drainage location, there will be either a culvert inlet (typ. detail on CS502), an open swale inlet (typ. detail on CS503), or a drain tile inlet (typ. detail on CS504). The coordinates and type of drainage inlet at each location are tabulated on sheet CS603. NOTE: I misspoke when I referred to FD-2 as a culvert, as it is an open swale inlet.

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

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5293456	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-201	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Revise title to Profile Diversion Canal and Embedded Levee

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The sheet title will be revised to "DIVERSION CANAL AND EMBEDDED LEVEE".

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293459	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-201	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

The embedded levee profile should be terminated in the appropriate place.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The embedded levee profile has been corrected to terminate at station 350+00 and 403+47

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293465 Civil Plans n/a CS-20???? n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Should there be profiles for the Left and Right Bank EMBs?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

No. The left and right bank EMB elevations are to be determined based on the typical section and cross sections. No profile is required.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293467 Civil Plans n/a CS-301 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Correct CS4XX and CS6XX references in notes 4 and 5.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Sheet title placeholders have been removed from the notes on CS301.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293476	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-310 to CS-327	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

I know these sections are very similar to the typical section shown on drawing CS301, but the drawings look rather barren and without more detail, are of limited use. These drawings should also include:

Enough coordinate pairs at selected vertices, or elevation and offset labels to allow volume computations.

Label major project pieces such as left bank and right bank, main channel control line, embedded levee, select fill, random fill.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The point of the typical section on sheet CS301 is to not have to label all of those points in the 100 ft cross sections. The cross sections shown on sheets CS310 to CS327 follow the guidelines and examples provided with the project documentation.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293477	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-314	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Drawing did not plot completely.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

It is plotted correctly in the file that was uploaded to projectwise, but it is not plotted completely in the file that is in projectwise, so the data got corrupted during the transfer. When the next set is updated, the design team will check for this error.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293482	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-401 to CS-403:	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	----------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Overall project stationing should be added to these drawings. Similar to the overall stationing shown on CS-421 to CS-423.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The overall project stationing is already shown on sheets CS401 thru CS403 in 500' increments.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293486	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-421 to CS-423	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Label the horizontal break lines on these drawings and add slope indicators.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Horizontal break line annotations and slope indicators have been added to CS421 thru CS423.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293506 Civil Plans n/a CS-501 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Embedded Levee Detail: "Semi Compacted Fill" not defined in spec. Refer to earthwork spec, especially table ??? that lists loose lift, density, and moisture requirements.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

We have now revised the Embedded levee detail to say "Semi Compacted Impervious Fill". "Impervious Fill" material requirements are defined in Earthwork Spec Section 2.2.2 while embedded levee compaction requirements are called out in Section 3.16.2 Placement and Compaction.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5293508 Civil Plans n/a CS-501 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Levee Benching Detail: I'm having difficulty visualizing where the note "Reach 4 Embedded Levee" applies to this section. I keep thinking that the note and associated witness line would be better placed at the bottom of the detail.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The detail is showing a profile view of the connection of the Reach 4 embedded levee to the adjacent constructed levee. The annotation is pointing to the top of the embedded levee. The bottom of the detail is the existing ground.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293512	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-501	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Levee Benching Detail. Correct Stripping reference to Table XX.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Placeholders have been removed from notes on sheet CS501.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293520	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-502 to CS-504	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Section "A": Verify that all information plots on the drawing. Looks like some might be cutoff on the top of 502.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The information that was cut off has been corrected on Section A of sheet CS502.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293521	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-502 to CS-504	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Elevation: Consider carrying riprap (on the slope opposite the culvert pipe or open swale or drain tile) up to the flow line elevation of the culvert or open swale or drain tile.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The detail was developed after extensive coordination with the Local Sponsor. The detail incorporates a locally preferred design that is proven effective at providing necessary erosion protection at an acceptable cost. Since the Local Drainage District will likely own and operate the local drainage inlets, it is preferred to stick with a design that they prefer.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293537	Geotechnical	Plans	n/a	CS-301	n/a
---------	--------------	-------	-----	--------	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
([Document Reference: FMM Diversion Reach 4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

What is the purpose of the 5-foot tall embedded levee? Its within the right bank excavated materials berm which is typically at least 380 to 400 feet wide. The two borings show that the channel excavation will be mostly, if not all clay. Even though the right EMB is to be placed as random fill (18 inch loose lift, 85% Std Proctor, with no moisture control) it should be massive enough to provide stability and seepage control without the relatively tiny, high quality earth fill, embedded levee.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The embedded levee was proposed as a means of meeting policy and FEMA requirements for certification. There is no restriction on future use of the EMB material, so at least in principle much of the EMB section at a given location could be used as borrow material . On the other hand the levee must remain a part of the project in order to maintain certification. The embedded levee has stricter material and compaction requirements consistent with other levees in the FMM area.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293616	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS101 and CS-102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Any access ramps anticipated on either side of the channel. These should be shown.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

There are no anticipated access ramps due to the proximity of nearby access ramps in adjacent reaches which will be completed prior to construction of Reach 4 Volume 3.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293626	Civil	Plans	n/a	General Drawing	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-----------------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 1 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Need a regional location map

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

A location map is provided on sheet G-002 of the overall plan set.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293628	Civil	Plans	n/a	B-101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Show locations of borings 09-62M, 12-147M, and 12-148M.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Table has been added to drawing showing horizontal coordinate location for each boring.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

A table will be somewhat helpful. Dots on the map would be more helpful.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293632	Geotechnical	Plans	n/a	B-201	n/a
---------	--------------	-------	-----	-------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

I expect that there were more than three borings (one deep machine and two very shallow auger) drilled for this 6,500-foot long project. Please ensure that all borings that were drilled be plotted and located in these drawings.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

All borings in the vicinity of the Rush River are included in the plan set.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293638	Civil	Plans	n/a	C-101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Should indicate what work is in this contract. Also indicate that Volume 1 and Volume 3 limits are not part of this contract.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The only project footprint and sheet IDs shown belong to Volume 2. Volumes 1 and 3 and the County Road 32 bridge reach are shown as hatched areas only to provide context and to show where the Volume 2 work lies within the overall Reach No. 4. At this time, MVP has not decided how Volumes 1-3 will be contracted. Depending on how funds are received for the project, Reach 4 may be awarded one volume at a time or all volumes together.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 16 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293640	Civil	Plans	n/a	C-101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

This drawing indicates an area labeled "Work by Others" outside of the work limits of Volume 2. But Drawings CD-101 identifies work by others within the limits of Volume 2 removing and relocating the existing county road 32. Drawing C-101 should indicate this additional work by others.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

County Road 32 relocation centerline has been added to C-101 to provide additional clarity. Callout revised to "County Road 32 relocation, bridge & channel work by others". All County Road 32 relocation, bridge and channel work will be completed prior to Volume 2 construction.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293648	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-101 to CS-102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

([Document Reference: FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

CS-102 provides an enlarged view of the Rush River transition and drop structure shown on CS-101. But there is enough going on in these two features that each deserves to be enlarged and shown on its own individual drawing. These would be CS-103 and CS-104.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

CS102 provides the necessary details of the Rush River realignment and drop structure from an overview perspective. All further details of design features within the realignment or drop structure are provided on subsequent sheets and are listed as references at the bottom of the CS102 (including profile of Rush, profile of drop structure, detail of intersection geometry, riprap layout, drop structure details, stone dike details, drop structure horizontal control).

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293653	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-201	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Revise title to Profile Diversion Channel, Rush River, and Embedded Levee

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Embedded levee has been added to the sheet title.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293656	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-201	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

The embedded levee profile should be terminated in the vicinity of project station 414+00..

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The embedded levee for Vol 2 stops as shown at Sta 413+47. It is at this point that the Vol 2 levee is benching into the levee from the adjacent County Road 32 reach to form a continuous line of protection.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293659	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-20????	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-----------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Should there be profiles for the Left and Right Bank EMBs? Especially to show the relationship between the EMB and the abandoned Rush River channel.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The left and right bank EMB elevations are to be determined based on the typical section and cross sections. No profile is required.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293667	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-302 to CS-304.	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------------------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

The typical sections on these plates should be enhanced with the notes and details shown on the typical section on CS-301.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The typical section callouts and notes on CS-302 to CS-304 provide the critical information necessary for project construction.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293679	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-310 to CS-331	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	------------------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

I know these sections are very similar to the typical section shown on drawings CS-301 through 304, but the drawings look rather barren and without more detail, are of limited use. These drawings should also include:

Enough coordinate pairs at selected vertices, or elevation and offset labels to allow volume computations.

Label major project pieces such as left bank and right bank, main channel control line, embedded levee, select fill, random fill

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The purpose of the typical section on sheet CS301 is to not have to label all of those points in the 100 ft cross sections. The cross sections shown on sheets CS305 to CS328 follow the guidelines and examples provided with the project documentation.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293689	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-315	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion R4 Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Delete the section at station 442+00 and replace with a section at station 442+40 to capture the crossing of the abandoned Rush River channel.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The cross sections are cut on even 100 ft intervals. Station 442+00 is near enough to the center of the Rush River channel to capture the crossing. The attached shows Station 442+27 (the exact intersection station - lines in red and blue) overlaid on Station 442+00 (lines in purple and green). I don't believe there is a lot of value added.

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

(Attachment: [XSection_44227.pdf](#))

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Concur - Thanks for the proof.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293699 Civil Plans n/a CS-317 n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

The station number did not plot below the section at station 450+00.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Missing cross-section station has been added.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 06 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293702 Geotechnical Plans n/a CS-501 n/a

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Embedded Levee Detail: "Semi Compacted Fill" not defined in spec. Refer to earthwork spec, especially table ??? that lists loose lift, density, and moisture requirements.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

We have now revised the Embedded levee detail to say "Semi Compacted Impervious Fill". "Impervious Fill" material requirements are defined in Earthwork Spec Section 2.2.2 while embedded levee compaction requirements are called out in Section 3.16.2 Placement and Compaction.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293721	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-101 to CS-102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Any access ramps anticipated on either side of the channel. These should be shown.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

According to MVP (11/20/12 email), the only access to be provided within Volume 2 is from CR32 to the maintenance roads on top of the EMBs. The Local Sponsor has incorporated access roads off of CR32 within their bridge plans that tie into the left and right EMB maintenance roads shown within Volume 2.

Submitted By: [Michael Hanks](#) (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 12 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5293728	Geotechnical	Plans	n/a	CS-301	n/a
---------	--------------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

(Document Reference: [FMM Diversion Vol 2 of 3](#))

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

What is the purpose of the 5-foot tall embedded levee? It's within the right bank excavated materials berm which is typically at least 380 to 400 feet wide. The two borings show that the channel excavation will be mostly, if not all clay. Even though the right EMB is to be placed as random fill (18 inch loose lift, 85% Std Proctor, with no moisture control) it should be massive enough to provide stability and seepage control without the relatively tiny, high quality earth fill, embedded levee.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

Revised Jul 29 2013.

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The embedded levee was proposed as a means of meeting policy and FEMA requirements for certification. There is no restriction on future use of the EMB material, so at least in principle much of the EMB section at a given location could be used as borrow material . On the other hand the levee must remain a part of the project in order to maintain certification. The embedded levee has stricter material and compaction requirements consistent with other levees in the FMM area.

Submitted By: [Nathan Rose](#) (314-331-8443) Submitted On: Aug 25 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294041 Civil Plans n/a G-001 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Need a regional location map.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

Guidance has been provided stating that one location map is to be provided with the overall plan set (the first G-002 in the volume 1 PDF) instead of having one in each volume.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294049 Geotechnical Plans n/a B-101 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

Need this drawing to show boring locations.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

There is only one boring in the footprint of Volume 3, and it is shown in the civil plan sheet CS101. Adding boring layout sheets would add unnecessary pages and file size to the drawing set without adding any value. However, the boring location will be added to the general plan sheet (C-101) for additional clarity.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

I did not recommend adding a boring location sheet! I suggested adding the boring locations to existing drawing B-101. But adding the boring location to C-101 will suffice.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294053 Geotechnical Plans n/a B-201 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

I expect that there were more than three borings (one deep machine and two very shallow augers) drilled for this 6,500-foot long project. Please ensure that all borings that were drilled be plotted and located in these drawings.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

All soil borings for the Reach 4 project are shown in the plan set.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294062 Civil Plans n/a C-101 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Should indicate what work is in this contract. Also indicate that Volume 1 and Volume 2 limits are not part of this contract.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Notes have been added to C-101 indicating that volumes 1 and 2 are not part of this contract as well as calling out that only volume 3 is included in this contract.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294067 Civil Plans n/a C-101 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

This drawing indicates an area labeled "Work by Others" outside of the work limits of Volume 3 (between Volumes 1 and 2). But Drawings CD-101 and 102 identifies work by others in the notes and within the limits of Volume 3 removing the existing power line (or is it the overhead utility line?). Drawing C-101 should indicate this additional work by others.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

C-101 will be updated to show work conducted by others that falls within the work limits of volume 1.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294072 Civil Plans n/a CD-101 and CD-102 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Correct spelling errors in the Notes.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Spelling errors on the demolition sheets have been corrected.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294074	Civil	Plans	n/a	CD-101 and CD-102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	----------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

CD-101 indicates a "powerline to be relocated by others". CD-101 refers to the same(?) powerline as an "existing overhead utility line to be removed by others." Is it a powerline or utility line to be removed or relocated?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Both annotations on CD101 and CD102 have been updated to read "EXISTING OVERHEAD UTILITY TO BE RELOCATED BY OTHERS".

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294081	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-101 and CS-102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	----------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Identify FD-1, FD-2, FD-3, and FD-4 (field drains?). Are these the drain tile inlets shown on drawing CS-504? If so, name them consistently, either field drains or drain tiles. Are these the same drain tile referred to in spec section 02 41 00 Demolition?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

FD-1, 2, 3, and 4 are not referencing drain tiles to be demolished. They are callouts for field drainage inlets to be installed as shown on sheets CS502 - CS504 and tabulated on sheet CS603.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Perhaps define what FD stands for. I was guessing at "field drain".

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5294084	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-101 and CS-102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	----------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

CS-502 shows details for handling drain culverts. If planned, drawings CS-101 and CS 102 should show the culvert's locations.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The culvert locations are already shown on CS101 and CS102 as annotation callouts (FD-1, FD-2...), and they are tabulated on CS603.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Earlier, FD said to stand for "Field Drain". Now they are culvert locations? Field Drians or Culverts?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

2-0 Evaluation For Information Only

FD-1 and FD-2 (as well as FD-3,4, and 5) are field drainage locations. At every field drainage location, there will be either a culvert inlet (typ. detail on CS502), an open swale inlet (typ. detail on CS503), or a drain tile inlet (typ. detail on CS504). The coordinates and type of drainage inlet at each location are tabulated on sheet CS603.

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

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5294087	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-201	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Revise title to Profile Diversion Canal and Embedded Levee

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The sheet title will be revised to "DIVERSION CANAL AND EMBEDDED LEVEE".

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294174	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-201	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

The embedded levee profile should be terminated in the appropriate place.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The embedded levee profile has been corrected to terminate at station 456+00 and 521+00.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294180	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-20?	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Should there be profiles for the Left and Right Bank EMBs?

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

No. The left and right bank EMB elevations are to be determined based on the typical section and cross sections. No profile is required.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294185 Civil Plans n/a CS-301 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Correct CS4XX and CS6XX referenced in notes 4 and 5.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Sheet title placeholders have been removed from the notes on CS301.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294188 Civil Plans n/a CS-301 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

ReNUMBER the second CS-301 plate as CS-302

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The second CS301 has been renumbered to CS302.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294190 Civil Plans n/a CS-301 n/a

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Recommend adding a typical section at the Reach 4 Drainage Structure (approx sta 492)

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

There is a typical section of the Reach 4 drainage structure located in the structural drawings on sheet S-100.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294196	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-310 to CA-331	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

I know these sections are very similar to the typical section shown on drawings CS-301 and 302, but the drawings look rather barren and without more detail, are of limited use. These drawings should also include:

Enough coordinate pairs at selected vertices, or elevation and offset labels to allow volume computations.

Label major project pieces such as left bank and right bank, main channel control line, embedded levee, select fill, random fill

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The point of the typical section on sheet CS301 is to not have to label all of those points in the 100 ft cross sections. The cross sections shown on sheets CS310 to CS331 follow the guidelines and examples provided with the project documentation.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294200	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-322	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Delete the section at station 492+00 and replace with the nearby section that includes the Reach 4 Drainage Structure.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

Volume 3 Sheet S-100 provides the information that is requested. For consistency purposes, the cross section interval will not be changed.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294204	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-331	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

The low flow channel did not plot properly for station 521+00.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The low flow channel has been corrected at station 521+00.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294206	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-401 to CS-403	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Overall project stationing should be added to these drawings, similar to that shown on drawings CS-421 to CS-424.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The overall project stationing is already shown on sheets CS401 thru CS403 in 500' increments.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294215	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-421 to CS-423:	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	----------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Label the horizontal break lines on these drawings and add slope indicators.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Horizontal break line annotations and slope indicators have been added to CS421 thru CS423.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294220	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-424:	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Add drawing number to the title block.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The title block has been filled out on CS424.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294228	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-501:	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Embedded Levee Detail: "Semi Compacted Fill" not defined in spec. Refer to earthwork spec, especially paragraph 3.16.2 that lists loose lift, density, and moisture requirements.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Detail now calls out the levee fill as "semi-compacted impervious fill". "Impervious fill" material requirements are defined in section 2.2.2 while embedded levee compaction requirements are called out in section 3.16.2 Placement and compaction of the Earthwork Spec.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294232	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-501:	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Levee Benching Detail. The entire detail did not plot.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The levee benching detail has been moved so that it plots fully.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294234	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-501:	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Levee Benching Detail. Correct Stripping reference to Table XX.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Placeholders have been removed from notes on sheet CS501.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294235	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-501:	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

I'm having difficulty visualizing where the note "Reach 4 Embedded Levee" applies to this section. I keep thinking that the note and associated witness line would be better placed at the bottom of the detail.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The detail is showing a profile view of the connection of the Reach 4 embedded levee to the adjacent constructed levee. The annotation is pointing to the top of the embedded levee. The bottom of the detail is the existing ground.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294241	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-502 to CS-504	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Drawing CS-504 out of order in the pdf.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

CS504 has been moved to the correct location in the plot set.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294243	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-502 to CS-504	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Elevation: Consider carrying riprap (on the slope opposite the culvert pipe or open swale or drain tile) up to the flow line elevation of the culvert or open swale or drain tile.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The detail was developed after extensive coordination with the Local Sponsor. The detail incorporates a locally preferred design that is proven effective at providing necessary erosion protection at an acceptable cost. Since the Local Drainage District will likely own and operate the local drainage inlets, it is preferred to stick with a design that they prefer.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 28 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294248	Civil	Plans	n/a	S-101	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

I'm concerned that the handrails on the lower structure will be damaged by debris flowing in the main channel.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Discussions about the handrail design are ongoing with the local sponsor and the design team for Reach 1.

The Reach 4 designer is waiting on guidance.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Open Comment

Please advise when the final guidance is received and the nature of that final guidance.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

2-0 Evaluation For Information Only

Final guidance has been received.

On the top back of the structure, the existing railing design will remain with the addition of an end loop on each side to prevent a person from accessing the top side of the structure.

The railing running perpendicular to the channel has been removed and replaced with a concrete cap and reflective posts.

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

Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

5294251 Geotechnical Plans n/a S-101 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

The select granular fill in all cases will likely be placed on CH clay. Consider placing an appropriate geotextile between the granular fill and CH to prevent contamination of the granular fill.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The granular fill is being placed to minimize frost heave. Little to no flow from the clay to the granular fill is anticipated due to the highly impervious nature of the clay. While there may be some contamination of the edges of the granular fill prism, it is not expected to affect overall fill performance

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 22 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294260 Structural Plans n/a S-101 and S-502 n/a

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Structural

S-101 and S-502. The grating cutaway details (plots black on S-101) and clearly shown in Plan View on S-502, initially make me think of a multi-stage pump! Use a different cut-away view that doesn't require repetition.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The grating cutaway details will be revised.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294263	Structural	Plans	n/a	S-301	n/a
---------	------------	-------	-----	-------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Structural

Revise scale of Section B and C to show backfill and surface on the upstream and downstream sides of the structure.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

It is the preference of the designer to only show structural elements on S-301. Backfill is shown on CS407 for the impact basin.

Submitted By: [Marneshia Richard](#) (601-631-7055) Submitted On: Aug 19 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294276	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS-101 to CS-102	n/a
---------	-------	-------	-----	---------------------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Any access ramps anticipated on either side of the channel? These should be shown.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

There are no anticipated access ramps due to the proximity of nearby access ramps in adjacent reaches which will be completed prior to construction of Reach 4 Volume 1.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294288	Geotechnical	Plans	n/a	CS-301	n/a
---------	--------------	-------	-----	--------	-----

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

Coordinating Discipline(s): Geotechnical

What is the purpose of the 5-foot tall embedded levee? It's within the right bank excavated materials berm which is typically at least 380 to 400 feet wide. The borings show that the channel excavation will be mostly, if not all clay. Even though the right EMB is to be placed as random fill (18 inch loose lift, 85% Std Proctor, with no moisture control) it should be massive enough to provide stability and seepage control without the relatively tiny, high quality earth fill, embedded levee.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The embedded levee was proposed as a means of meeting policy and FEMA requirements for certification. There is no restriction on future use of the EMB material, so at least in principle much of the EMB section at a given location could be used as borrow material . On the other hand the levee must remain a part of the project in order to maintain certification. The embedded levee has stricter material and compaction requirements consistent with other levees in the FMM area.

Submitted By: [Heather Sibley](#) (601-631-5917) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: [Patrick Conroy](#) (314 331 8430) Submitted On: Oct 26 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294544	General	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Page i, Table of Contents)

The page numbers for the first few items of the table of contents should be roman numerals, not 5, 6, etc.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The corrections in the table of contents have been made.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Change made, comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294546	General	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Page 8, Table 1)

Coordinating Discipline(s): Hydraulics

The "Diversion Inlet to Sheyenne River" has the same discharge listed under the 1% flow and 0.2% flow. Please explain why the 0.2% flow is not greater than the 1%.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The second paragraph before this table states that "The gated diversion inlet structure will limit flow at the inlet to 20,000 cfs for floods up through the 0.2% flood."

Submitted By: [Donald Duncan](#) (314-331-8809) Submitted On: Aug 01 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Thanks for the explanation. Comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 03 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294547	General	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Page 12, Table 2)

Many design features are not yet completed, and are listed in the table as "TBD". Is there enough time in your schedule between the 95% submittal and the final documentation and design to complete all of these design requirements?

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The low flow channel information from the inlet to Drain 21c and from Drain 21c to Drain 14 is upstream of Reach 4 and has not been designed at this point. The Reach 4 team will incorporate the inform if or when it is provided by the St. Paul District.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Thanks for the explanation. Comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 03 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294548	General	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Page 15, Section 2.10.1)

The title should probably be "Previously Obtained Existing Condition Data". There is an extra word, "Data" in the title.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

The correction has been made in the title of paragraph 2.10.1

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Change made, comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294551	General	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Page 18, Section 3.1.2)

Is there a typo in the last sentence of this paragraph? Should this indicate that the "undulating EMB" is on the left side of the channel instead of right? The previous sentence described the right bank, so I thought that this last sentence might be describing the left bank (where the guidelines are less stringent).

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Non-concurred

The statement is correct as currently written. The right bank EMB will have the undulating landscape and ultimately accomodate mulit-use and equestrian trails.

Submitted By: [Jonathan Boone](#) (601-631-5502) Submitted On: Aug 20 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Thanks for the explanation. Comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 03 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294555	Hydraulics	Engineering Appendix	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	----------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: App. C. PDF Page #11, Table C-2)

Same comment as Table 1 of the main report; why is the 0.2% flow the same as the 1% flow, instead of greater, for the first location in the table?

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation For Information Only

The second paragraph before this table states that "The gated diversion inlet structure will limit flow at the inlet to 20,000 cfs for floods up through the 0.2% flood."

Submitted By: [Donald Duncan](#) (314-331-8809) Submitted On: Aug 01 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Thanks for the explanation. Comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 03 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294556	Hydraulics	Engineering Appendix	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	----------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: App. C. PDF Page #22, Figure C-5)

The text reference just above the two figures has a formatting error of some kind: "Error! Reference source not found."

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

Reference has been corrected.

Submitted By: [Donald Duncan](#) (314-331-8809) Submitted On: Aug 01 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Revision completed, comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294557	Hydraulics	Engineering Appendix	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	----------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: App. C. PDF Page #28, Table C-8.)

Is the "Drop" in feet missing from the 10-yr line in the table? I can see why the 500-yr is missing (TBD), but the 10-year should be 17.1 feet, by my calculation. Does this need to be added to the table?

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

That value has been added to the table.

Submitted By: [Raymond Wilson](#) (601-631-5738) Submitted On: Aug 05 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Revision completed, comment closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 04 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

5294558	Hydraulics	Engineering Appendix	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	------------	----------------------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **For Official Use Only (FOUO)**
(Document Reference: App. C. PDF Page #46, Section C.6)

The note referencing "Appendix M" should be changed to the correct name, which was shown on Projectwise as "Appendix C, Attachments 1 and 2". (This comment is made with the assumption that these local drainage reports are not also included in Appendix M.)

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801). Submitted On: Jul 29 2013

1-0 Evaluation Concurred

That reference to "Appendix M" in Section C.6 is correct. The reference to "Attachment 01" in Section C.1.2.11 on page C-12 has been changed to "Appendix M" and Attachment 01 has been removed from Appendix C.

Submitted By: [Raymond Wilson](#) (601-631-5738) Submitted On: Aug 21 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation Close Comment

OK. Thanks for the explanation. Comment Closed.

Submitted By: [John Boeckmann](#) (314-331-8801) Submitted On: Sep 03 2013

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

Public / SBU / FOUO

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