

Project: C9727 - I-405, Brickyard to SR 527 Improvement Project				CODES								
Document Name: BY-CRE-00858_009727_SUB_17.01_Package 8 Preliminary Fish Passage Water Crossings				A = Accept Comment - Correct, Add to, or Clarify document								
Submittal Date: 7/8/2024				D = Dismiss Comment - no change needed on document								
Due Date: 7/29/2024 COB				C = Clarify / Discuss and resolve before next design phase								
Reviewer: L. Assink (LA), Jason Pang (JP), Johan Jorna - City of Bothell (J. Jorna), Alex Strom (ATS), Jenny Gaus - City of Kirkland (JJG), Sonia Berriz (SRB)				R = Resolve comment in the next submittal phase								
Document Lead:				T = Transfer to a different submittal								
COMMENT (WSDOT, City, Checker)				RESPONSE TO COMMENT (Skanska, Originator of Document)				RESPONSE TO RESPONSE (WSDOT, City, Checker)				Skanska CLOSE
No.	Report or Sheet No.	Comment By	TR/Spec Section	Comment	Disposition Code	Response By	ACTION TAKEN / Remarks	WSDOT Disposition Code	Comments / Action Items	Final Disposition Code		
1	QB Appendix B	LA		What is provided in Appendix B is not the Hydraulic Field Report Form	R	MLC	Adjusted for FHD.	R	Will look for this in the FHD	R		
2	QB Appendix D	LA		Plan sheets should be part of PHD.	R	MLC	Added for FHD.	R	Will look for this in the FHD	R		
3	QB Appendix I	LA		Why is Existing Monitor Line 1 showing instability?	R	MLC	Resolved for FHD.	R	Will look for this in the FHD	R		
4	Juanita Page 59	LA		Section 6.1 says no downstream infrastructure will be adversely affected but Appendix Q shows a downstream road overtopping and possibly structures being flooded.	R	YR	Will clarify in FHD that there are ongoing investigations into potential downstream flooding, outside of the design-build contract.	R	Will look for this in the FHD	R		
5	Juanita Appendix D	LA		Plan sheets should be included as part of PHD.	R	YR	Added for FHD.	R	Will look for this in the FHD	R		
6	Plans	JP		Much of the line work is grayed and too light to read. This includes, utilities, basemap features, etc. Revise.	R	YR	Added for FHD.	A		A		
7	FP6-02	J. Jorna		Provide a section with existing channel profile minimum of 50-ft upstream an downstream of any project work. Include existing culvert invert elevations.	R	MLC	Added for FHD.	R		R		
8	Juanita PHD Section 4.1.1 Pg 26	ATS		4th para - If the channel is filled, won't it flood more often? Clarify your design intent here.	R	YR	Clarified in FHD - The new culvert is offset 50 feet south of the existing channel and a new channel will be built downstream of the new crossing. Flow will not be entering the old channel immediately downstream of the existing culvert. Refer to Figure 5-18.	R		R		
9	Juanita PHD Section 4.3.1 Pg 31	ATS		We are proposing a sediment mix that is well over the 20% allowable from the Design Manual, there needs to be further justification for this.	R	YR	A sediment mix within 20% of the existing streambed material is unstable for the design storm. The design requires a coarser mix for stability. A compromise was discussed to provide 1 ft of standard WSDOT streambed sediment within the bankfull channel which will be provided in the next phase of the construction documents.	R		R		
10	Juanita PHD Section 4.3.2.1 Pg 34	ATS		Update meander spacing to WSDOT Design Manual standards, not Rosgen... Rosgen methods creates a lot of push back by area experts.	R	YR	Updated for FHD - We confirmed and adjusted the meander wavelengths developed by WSDOT by using guidance from WSDOT Design Manual standards, contract requirements, NEH Part 654 Stream Restoration Design National Engineering Handbook (Channel Alignment and Variability Design, Ch 12), and Thorne and Soar (2001). Please see Appendix O: Channel Design.	R		R		
11	Juanita PHD Section 5.1.3 Pg 43	ATS		A generic manning's n across the channel of 0.65 may not represent wood structures well enough... May think about upping to somewhere around 0.8	R	YR	A Manning's n of 0.065 was only for the existing channel; the new channel with logs was 0.078. These will be refined once again for FHD, where there are individual Manning's regions for each log.	R		R		
12	Juanita PHD Section 5.4 Pg 54	ATS		Title is misleading... Are you providing 23, or 30 ft width?	R	YR	The minimum hydraulic width is 23 feet but PHD structure width is 30 feet. Clarified for FHD.	R		R		
13	Juanita PHD Section 6	ATS		Is there proof that the risk to downstream structures is considered minimal?	R	YR	Clarified in FHD that there are ongoing investigations into potential downstream flooding, outside of the design-build contract.	R		R		
14	QB 527 PHD Section 4.3.1 Pg 35	ATS		We are proposing a sediment mix that is well over the 20% allowable from the Design Manual, there needs to be further justification for this.	R	MLC	A sediment mix within 20% of the existing streambed material is unstable for the design storm. The design requires a coarser mix for stability. A compromise was discussed to provide 1 ft of standard WSDOT streambed sediment within the bankfull channel which will be provided in the next phase of the construction documents.	R		R		
15	EFP5-01, EFP5-04, EFP5-05	JJG		These sheets all mention the inline detention facility (i.e. the control structure). Make language consistent on all of these sheets to note that the structure will be removed rather than abandoned - this is what COK prefers and what may be required because of stream buffer proximity.	T	MLC	Transfer comment to Package 8 Final Fish Passage Water Crossing RSCR.	R	Will review in final Fish Passage Water Crossing RSCR	R		
16	I-405 MP 21.94 Juanita Creek Preliminary Hydraulic Design Report, June 2024	JJG	Chapter 5 - Hydraulic Analysis	The existing and proposed conditions should be presented in the same SRH2D project file. This would allow for lining up of stations, and for easier comparison of water surface elevations, depths, velocities, and avg shear.	R	MLC	The existing and proposed conditions were combined into one model and will be provided as part of the FHD submittal.	R	Will review in final FHD	R		
17	I-405 MP 21.94 Juanita Creek Preliminary Hydraulic Design Report, June 2024	JJG	Chapter 6 - Floodplain Evaluation	The report states a Flood Risk Assessment Memo is forthcoming. When can the City expect to see this memorandum? We have the following expectations within the Flood Risk Assessment: Analysis will extend to at least the NE 141st Street culvert, survey information will be updated such that there is a reasonable channel bottom that can then be used to evaluate risk of overtopping (in the current model there is an abrupt break between survey data and LIDAR data downstream of the culvert).	D	YR	The FRA will be submitted with the FHD. Per local requirements, the FRA will identify increases and flow and/or WSEL's at our project boundary that could result in downstream increased flood risk. However, it is out of the scope of the Design-Build contract to extend the model further downstream and analyze potential flooding. It is our understanding that WSDOT will lead ongoing and future communication related to potential downstream flood impacts and/or improvements.	C	WSDOT should commit to a process for evaluating and addressing downstream flooding and erosion impacts, and, prior to installation of the fish passage culvert, should either direct the design-build team to incorporate any required mitigation measures, or should provide an alternative process for how any required mitigation will be accomplished.	D		
18	EFP5-01, EFP5-04, EFP5-05	COK-JJG		These sheets all mention the inline detention facility (i.e. the control structure). Make language consistent on all of these sheets to note that the structure will be removed rather than abandoned.	T	MLC	Transfer comment to Package 8 Final Fish Passage Water Crossing RSCR.	R	Will review in final Fish Passage Water Crossing RSCR	R		
19	EFP5-01	COK-JJG		Existing access road on WSDOT property - is this to be used for construction access? Is this going to be maintained and used following construction?	T	MLC	Transfer comment to Package 8 Final Fish Passage Water Crossing RSCR. Skanska is still developing the access plan for construction operations at the East Portal. WSDOT to provide input if the existing access road will be maintained and used following construction operations.	R	Will review in final Fish Passage Water Crossing RSCR	R		
20	EFP5-03	COK-JJG		There was previously a beaver dam at the inlet of the culvert that is to be removed - what are provisions for removing if this dam has been re-established? What are plans for working with beavers in the area?	R	YR	Discussion added to FHD - Beavers and beaver dams to be removed/relocated following WDFW protocols. FYI - During AECOM field visits there were no beaver dam present at the inlet. There was a beaver dam found approximately 400 feet downstream from I-405, which is outside of the project limits.	R	Will review in final FHD	R		

Project: C9727 - I-405, Brickyard to SR 527 Improvement Project							CODES			
Document Name: BY-CRE-00858_009727_SUB_17.01_Package 8 Preliminary Fish Passage Water Crossings							A = Accept Comment - Correct, Add to, or Clarify document			
Submittal Date: 7/8/2024							D = Dismiss Comment - no change needed on document			
Due Date: 7/29/2024 COB				Formal Design Review			C = Clarify / Discuss and resolve before next design phase			
Reviewer: L. Assink (LA), Jason Pang (JP), Johan Jorna- City of Bothell (J. Jorna), Alex Strom (ATS), Jenny Gaus - City of Kirkland (JJG), Sonia Berriz (SRB)				Form RCSR (Review Comment Summary and Resolution)			R = Resolve comment in the next submittal phase			
Document Lead:							T = Transfer to a different submittal			
COMMENT (WSDOT, City, Checker)				RESPONSE TO COMMENT (Skanska, Originator of Document)			RESPONSE TO RESPONSE (WSDOT, City, Checker)			Skanska CLOSE
No.	Report or Sheet No.	Comment By	TR/Spec Section	Comment	Disposition Code	Response By	ACTION TAKEN / Remarks	WSDOT Disposition Code	Comments / Action Items	Final Disposition Code
21	EFP5-10	COK-JJG		Nourishment piles total 40cy of gravel - is this needed given the amount of sediment that is expected to move from upstream?	R	YR	For the FHD, the nourishment pile volume was reduced to 20cy of gravel, one dump truck (10cy) for each of the two nourishment piles. The rate of sediment supply from upstream does not drive the design of nourishment piles; rather, it's the gradation of the nourishment piles relative to the gradation of the incoming supply (as estimated by the gradation of sample of the existing material). The gradation of the nourishment material was designed such that nearly all of that material will be within the size range that the salmonids present in the stream prefer to use when spawning. The intent is that when entrained, the nourishment material will increase the percentage of the material in the stream that is within that preferred spawning size range. Thus, while nourishment piles are not "needed" per se, they contribute to the improvement of spawning habitat. The lower the percentage of spawning size gravels in the incoming sediment supply, the greater the potential for spawning habitat improvement. This discussion was added to the FHD.	R	Will review in final FHD	R