Documents Reviewed: **LPAB 60% Submittal** Document Date: **July 9, 2020**

LAKE PARK FRIENDS COMMENTS 8-6-2020

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Reviewer to Complete Columns 2 thru 6			Comment Type Codes O = Omission P = Preference I = Incorrect S = Standards Not Met D = Discussion		Responder to Complete Columns 7 thru 10	Response Codes D = Discussion Required N = No Action Required NS = Not Applicable At This Stage NA = Not Applicable W = Will Comply		Response Status Codes C = Complete IW = In Work / Open E = Evaluation / Not Complete
Com. Ref. No.	Sht. No. / Page No.	Sht. Designation E.G.; GN03 / Spec. Section No.	Reviewer / Agency / Dept.	Comment Type (O,P,I,S,D)	Comment	Responder / Designer	Response Code (D,N,NS,NA, W)	Response	Response Status Code (C, IW,E)
1		General	LPF	d = Discussion	Given the cost estimate exceeds the authorized funding, and given this is a federal contract, will the contractor be implementing Value Engineering (VE) to identify potential areas for cost savings? We suggest this be performed so that decisions can be made about the cost benefit of each line item as well as the need for each rehabilitation activity.				
2		T-2	LPF	P = Preference	Is there an Existing Conditions Survey that can be added to the set?				
3		C1.3	LPF	D = Discussion	The Bollards are 8.5 feet apart. Is this Parks desire for vehicle restrictions?				
4		C2.0	LPF	D = Discussion	Add grade lines				
5		C2.0	LPF	D = Discussion	Extend rip rap at north side to edge of path.				
6		C2.0 & C2.1	LPF	P = Preference	Can you specify as part of site restoration that any erosion control geotextile or ditch checks that contain plastic be removed once vegetation has been established? Plastic matting and some ditch checks are still present in the lion bridge's ravines (rehabilitated over 10 years ago).				
7		CX.X	LPF	D = Discussion	Add topo lines to better show location of drain outfalls.				
8		S-5	LPF	D = Discussion	With 0.0% pitch at outside edge of the octagon elements it is unclear how water drains well from these four areas, especially in the winter months. Should drains be added in these areas?				
9		C1.1	LPF	D = Discussion	Surface water drainage from the west up to the path intersection all flows to one drain. If this drain becomes plugged with debris, water will pond at the south end of the bridge. A second drain would help prevent this likely occurrence. The pathway curb SE corner in this area should be extended far enough to ensure that large storm even runoff will not flow toward the wing wall/abutment foundations. This drainage pattern is the reason for the foundation wash outs on the south abutment and wing walls so care should be taken to elimate any chance for water to overtop the bluff top and erode the bluff.				
10		S-7	LPF		Par. Starting with word Existing, add word "shall" after Contractor				
11		S-9	LPF	D = Discussion	There are no notes regarding fall protection. Will all OSHA requirements be noted as a Contractor Full responsibility in the Construction Contract?				
12		S-20	LPF	D = Discussion	Detail E calls for only a 1 inch deep saw cut during demolition. Shouldn't this through the entire wall?				
13		S-23	LPF	D = Discussion	Provide detail for securing wall access openings and confirm that opening size will comply with OSHA standards for future accessand maintenance.				
14		S-52	LPF	D = Discussion	The Concrete Staples are new to the plans and are long at 5.5 feet. Is there new information about the nature of the surficial cracks since the 30% design to justify why staples are needed? Are staples appropriate for use on a historic bridge? Could their installation actually increase stress on these original bridge elements or otherwise compromise the existing Kahn system of reinforcemnet? We suggest these be evaluated as part of the value engineering evaluation.				
15		S-53	LPF	D = Discussion	This sheet shows Kahn bars being exposed. Please reference the specs for cleaning and painting bars. Will extensive exposure of the Kahn bars indicate the need for cathodic protection?				
16		S-111	LPF	D = Discussion	How will the railing base be sealed at the deck to prevent water infiltration over time?				
17		S-115	LPF	D = Discussion	How will the decks over the abutments and wing walls be drained?				
18		Special Provisions	LPF	Page 31	The need for shotcrete removal is unclear. For VE pupoees, and to reduce the potential that removal of sound material would unecessarily place additional stress on the bridge. Why would you remove sound material?				
19		Special Provisions	LPF	Page 37	(2) talks about pier bases. Should this paragraph be removed?				
20		Special Provisions	LPF	All new concrete & proposed use of Bridge Cote	Thank you for the SHPO letters regarding the use of Bridge Cote on a few historic bridges in MN. We have discussed with multiple SHPOs (MN, WI, OR, and OH) the appropriateness of Bridge Cote (and similar coatings) on historic concrete structures. We understand that use of such coatings has been found appropriate in limited situations, generally only when a bridge has been previously painted. Based on those discussions, LPF continues to believe the use of this coating is inappropriate for this bridge and will irreversibly change the bridge's character and how it contributes to the park's historic significance. Given there are alternatives, the driver for use of this coating appears to be a desire to achieve a uniform look of the bridge, especially given there will be new concrete bridge elements. However, as a historic structure, the new concrete should be "matched" to the old concrete (not the other way around). Furthermore, historic concrete naturally is inconsistent and variable in color, so a uniform appearance is undesirable and inappropriate for this bridge. Please reference the National Park Service Historic Concrete Guidance (excerpted below): "Careful mix formulation, placement, and finishing are required to ensure that replacement concrete units will match the historic concrete. There is often a tendency to make replacement concrete more consistent in appearance than the original concrete. The consistency can be in stark contrast with the variability of the original concrete due to original construction techniques, architectural design, or differential exposure to weather				
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
29									
30									
31									
32									
33									
34									
35									
36									
37									
38									
39									
40									
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									
47									
48									
49									
50									
51									
52									
53									
54									
55									
56									
57									
58									
59									
60									
61									
62									
63									
64									
65									
66									
67									
68									
69									
70									
71									
72									
73									

INSERT ROWS ABOVE AS NECESSARY FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENT SPACE - DO NOT INSERT ADDITIONAL COLUMNS

Sht. No. / Page No. — Sht. Designation Spec. Section No.

Comment Type Codes
O = Omission
P = Preference / Suggestion
I = Incorrect
S = Standards Not Met

Response Codes
D = Discussion Required
N = No Action Required
NS = Not Applicable At This Stage
NA = Not Applicable
W =Will Comply

Response Status Codes
C = Complete
IW = In Work / Open
E = Evaluation / Not Complete