Public / SBU / FOUO

Comment Report: All Comments
Project: Fargo Moorhead Metro - Reach 4 Design by MVK
Review: PER Rush River - Sponsor Review
Displaying 10 comments for the criteria specified in this report.

Id	Discipline	DocType	Spec	Sheet	Detail
4840773	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS151	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526): Provide excavation transition detail at station 403+47 for transition to CR-32 construction package.

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Transition details for excavation, EMBs, levees, roads, etc. adjoining the CR-32 construction package to be included in the 65% submission.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4840784	Hydraulics	Planning Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: PER pg 9 of 24, Table 1)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Hydraulics

Mark Anderson (503-872-4700), PER pg 9 of 24, Table 1: Have designers considered the impact of scenarios that may vary the magnitude and frequency of flows in the diversion channel? For example, if Red River levees are raised to allow larger flows in the river, does that affect the drop structure design?

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Flows listed in Table 1 represent the flow entering the main diversion through the Rush River channel. The design utilized these flows with the supplied tailwater condition. To check worst case condition, normal depth was used as a tailwater condition for a range of flows. The design of this struture will function with a range of flows in the diversion.

Submitted By: Donald Duncan (314-331-8809) Submitted On: Oct 29 2012

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4840789	Hydraulics	Planning Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: PER pg 11 of 24, Hydraulics)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Mark Anderson (503-872-4700), PER pg 11 of 24, Hydraulics: Will riprap be exposed or buried? Are there maintenance, hydraulics, and/or fish passage benefits from keeping an open plunge pool area at the toe of the ramp? Safety considerations? Will extensive exposed riprap deter fish from moving up into the ramp area?

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
All of our riprap will be exposed. There is no plan to go through the extra effort of burying it during construction. There will not be an extra plunge pool constructed at the downstream end of the ramp structure. Riprap will extend well beyond the end of the ramp and into the low flow channel. Many of these structures have been built throughout the Red River basin with fully exposed riprap and have been successful at passing a variety of fish species.
Response from Don Duncan, St. Louis District

Submitted By: Ken Cook (314-331-8498) Submitted On: Mar 15 2013

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4840792	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS251	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Kyle Volk (701-499-5861): Main Channel Elevation – Unclear if this is the elevation of the main channel toe or the intersection of the low flow channel with the main diversion channel bottom. Need to coordinate elevations between reaches.

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Based on Reach 1 65% DQC, the elevation represents the main channel toe. However, for 65% ATR, Reach 1 changed to show the theoretical point of intersection where the 2% bottom slopes meet in the middle of the channel. Profile will be updated to follow suit for the 65% submittal.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**
Still Unclear, should update notes to reflect response in evaluation

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013

2-0 Evaluation **For Information Only**
For the 65% submission, the profile is labeled as the main channel invert. The typical section then labels the point that represents the main channel invert.

Submitted By: Michael Hanks (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 26 2013
Backcheck not conducted
Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

4840795	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS251	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Kyle Volk (701-499-5861): Embedded Levee Elevation – Elevation varies a couple of hundredths from the Bridge Team elevations; need to coordinate elevations between reaches.

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Attached is the Diversion Levee Design Profile that MVP furnished to all the reach teams. The levee elevations on the plans were pulled or interpolated from this profile. They are DESIGN elevations and settlement will be added to determine CONSTRUCTION elevations for the 65%.

Submitted By: Michael Hanks (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Oct 22 2012
(Attachment: FMM_DLDPprofile_HH_20120619.pdf)

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Open Comment**
Embedded levee elevation still varies, will back-check at next submittal

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013

2-0 Evaluation **For Information Only**
See comment #5008640 posted to the CR32 90% review and comment evaluation submitted by Lyndon Pease.

Submitted By: Michael Hanks (314-331-8252) Submitted On: Aug 26 2013
Backcheck not conducted

Current Comment Status: **Comment Open**

4840798	Civil	Plans	n/a	CS361	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Kyle Volk (701-499-5861): Typical Section – Section has extra 100' bench within EMB; Need to coordinate transition between reaches.

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
EMB layout has not been finalized. Recent geotech changes (including viewshed analysis, revised stratigraphy, and a new low flow erosion design case) will result in changes to the EMB layout. Likely, the 100' bench will be eliminated. Agree that the transition needs to be coordinated between reaches. With difference in schedules, our reach will likely transition to to the bridge reach EMBs.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4840802	Design Team Leader	Plans	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Bruce Spiller (719-338-1484), General: Is the EMB surface ready for undulation design by the Local Sponsor or are there know or expected changes?

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **For Information Only**
The EMB surface provided was preliminary and for information only. Recent geotech changes (including viewshed analysis, revised stratigraphy, and a new low flow erosion design case) will result in changes to the EMB layout.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4840807	Design Team Leader	Plans	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Bruce Spiller (719-338-1484), Plans and Profiles: Are the Main Channel Profile and Low Flow Profile Control Line layouts consistent with what was agreed to for the Reach 1 DTR?

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **For Information Only**
The St. Paul Reach 1 team provided the Main Channel and Low Flow profiles to be used by all the design teams. For the 35% review, the main channel profile represented the main channel toe. However, for 65% review, the main channel profile will represent the theoretical point of intersection where the 2% bottom slopes meet in the middle of the channel.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4840809	Civil	Plans	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
(Document Reference: Plans and Profile Sheets)
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Bruce Spiller (719-338-1484), Plans and Profile Sheets: The Low Flow Channel appears to be outside the 200 foot meander belt width.

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

Revised Sep 26 2012.

1-0 Evaluation **Non-concurred**
Entire low flow channel footprint falls within 200' meander belt width.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

4840811	Design Team Leader	Plans	n/a	CS151 and CS451	n/a

Comment Classification: **Public (Public)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Bruce Spiller (719-338-1484): Should the river inlet enter the Low Flow Channel at a point of tangency? It appears that the LFC was deliberately straightened at the point of connection.

Submitted By: John Glatzmaier (651-365-8526). Submitted On: Sep 26 2012

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
The straightened section of the low flow channel will remain; however, a horizontal curve will be added to the end of the ramp alignment so it will enter at a point of tangency.

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

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Ok Thanks

Submitted By: Matthew Marosek (913-458-9318) Submitted On: Jun 24 2013
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**