

Project: C9727 - I-405, Brickyard to SR 527 Improvement Project					Formal Design Review Form RCSR (Review Comment Summary and Resolution)			CODES		
Document Name:		BY-CRE-02210_009727_SUB_17.01_Package 9 Preliminary Structures - Juanita Creek Fish Passage (FP5) Ea						A = Accept Comment - Correct, Add to, or Clarify document		
Submittal Date:		3/25/2025						D = Dismiss Comment - no change needed on document		
Due Date:		4/8/2025 COB						C = Clarify / Discuss and resolve before next design phase		
Reviewer:		Gabe Ng, HQ Hydraulics, Jason Pang (JP), Jeff Bruce (JSB), Todd B. Livingston (TBL)						R = Resolve comment in the next submittal phase		
Document Lead:								T = Transfer to a different submittal		
								5/21/2025 G.Ng		
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	FP5-02	HQH	RFP QC 2.28/QMP	Update Note 4 to: "DRAFT HYDRAULIC REPORT DATED NOVEMBER 2024" - Confirm you are using the most current report and that you finalize your designs with the FINAL HYDRAULIC REPORT, which has yet to be published/stamped. There is a risk completing final structure designs based on a preliminary report that can have an impact on the structure if those preliminary scour numbers change once they are finalized.	A	IR (Originator)	Comment noted. The results from the final report will be used. References updated to refer to final hydraulic report. 09/08/2025: Drawings updated for East Portal final submission.	R	Cannot resolve without review of updated drawings/plans and cross checking with stamped Final Hydraulic Design Report. Please provide for review and comment resolution.	R
2	FP5-17	HQH	Preference	Not sure why you need to extend Wingwall 3 paralled to stream. Why couldn't you come off at 25-45 degree angle off the headwall? (would stay on right of way, would reduce depth and length of walls, reduce disturbance/impacts, etc.)	C	IR (Originator)	The wingwall was extended to allow the grading to develop towards the new stream bed without incurring in large cuttings. The existing ground slopes up towards the south on that area, therefore modifying the wingwall angle would still require a long wingwall to keep the slopes within 2H:1V in the regraded ground.	A		A
3	FP5-18	HQH	BDM 8.1.10	See BDM 8.1.10 Scour of Retaining Walls These wing walls (both 3 & 4) are parallel to the stream alignment and are subject to total scour along the entire length of the wall. Please confirm bottom of wall is 2 feet below total scour at check flood elevation; including lateral migration (structural).	A	IR (Originator)	Yes, the bottom of the fascia wall is 2 ft below total scour at the check flood elevation. This is reflected in the drawings as per comment #13. 09/08/2025: Drawings updated for East Portal final submission.	R	Cannot resolve without review of updated drawings/plans. Please provide updates for review and comment resolution.	R
4	FP5-21	HQH	BDM 8.1.10	BDM 8.1.10 Scour of Retaining Walls The foundation for all walls constructed along rivers and streams shall be evaluated during design by the Hydraulics Engineer for total scour in accordance with LRFD-BDS and Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 23 (HEC-23). The bottom of the wall foundation and bottom of wall elements such as, the fascia panel, lagging, leveling pad, footing, pile cap or shaft cap shall be located a minimum of 2 feet below the total scour at the check flood. Also see Figure 8.1.10-2	A	IR (Originator)	Agreed, this has been followed. Please see response to comment #3. 09/08/2025: Drawings updated for East Portal final submission.	R	Cannot resolve without review of updated drawings/plans. Please provide updates for review and comment resolution.	R
5	FP5-22	HQH	Preference	Creek Bed call out is confusing as it's pointing to what appears to be top of footing and the call out to the right calls out Final Ground (Thalweg). Consider revising to be consistent with stream sheets or deleting call out.	A	IR (Originator)	Noted and agreed, the callout is not pointing to the correct location. Amended to point to the shaded area.	A		A
6	Revision Box	JP	2.13.7.3	Some sheets have several revisions listed despite this only being a preliminary submittal to WSDOT. Please reconcile. Every revision shall be assigned a number. The assigned number shall be located both at the location of the change on the sheet and in the revision block of the plan sheet along with an explanation of the change.	A	IR (Originator)	Revision box to be reconciled. Reviews to be included only on RFC submissions.	A		A
7	Plans	JP	3.7.1.1., 2.28.3	Show all information required per Preliminary Plan Checklist, including but not limited to: Contours; survey lines, angles, bearings, stations; lane, median, shouder widths; traffic arrows; top of cut, toe of fill; test holes; section, township, range, city; limits of pigmented sealer; water surface elevations; datum; stage constructions; location of temporary barrier, etc. Review could not be completed.	A	IR (Originator)	Noted, reviewed and updated accordingly.	A		A
8	Plans	JP	.1.11.C, 2.13.4	Show wall drainage requirements - drain mat, underdrain, gutter, weep hole locations. Only seeing a weep hole in section.	A	IR (Originator)	Wall drainage elements are presented in FP5-15. Reference to that drawing included.	A	Will review updates in final	A
9	FP5-18	JP	15.11.3C	Please clarify what portions of the wall is permanent and what portions of the wall is temporary. Several notes generally point to an element saying it is temporary, but it is unclear what portions will remain in the final condition. Please provide a construction sequence the walls	C,T	IR (Originator)	All elements other than the ones noted in the callouts/notes are permanent works.Construction sequence to be developed by temporary works designer and to be submitted separately to this East Portal package. 09/08/2025: Drawings updated for East Portal final submission including construction sequence in general notes.	R	Provide construction sequence as required per cited reference	R
10	FP5-18	JP	2.28.3.4.2	Understood this is preliminary. "Proposed" should be "Final Grade Line", as it will be built with this project. Please reconcile gap in grading on left where finish grade in front of wall does not tie in with finished grade behind the wall.	A	IR (Originator)	Naming and grading in front of the wal updated as per comment.	A		A
11	FP5-18	JP	2.15.4.1.3	"Proposed surface" on right side looks steeper than 2:1. Please reconcile	A	IR (Originator)	Noted. Grading reviewed to a max. slope of 2:1.	A	Will review updates in final	A
12	FP5-17	JP	2.13.1.1	What is the exact dimension of the FC limit to the closest point on the backside of the head wall/wing wall? It appears there is insufficient clearance to reasonably fit a barrier required clearances.	C	IR (Originator)	The distance is 1'-9". A standard barrier such as STD PLAN C-81.15-00 would have room to be fitted, either full on grade or partially over the headwall. The soldier pile and headwall at that location can be cut. Elevation of tieback at the corner pile to be reviewed to allow for more flexibility on future excavations in the area - minimum clearance of 6 ft to final grade level. 09/08/2025: Collision load assessed and reinforcement requirements verified. Additional appendix in Calcs report to be included. Please refer to Addendum document attached in the email as an advance copy for this.	R	FC grading and concept is required to be shown in plans per 2.13.1.1. If your FC concept is to provide moment slab, we would anticipate the head and wing wall may need to include design of the FC grading and ESL load for collision.	R
13	FP5-18&21	JP	8.1.5D	Embeddment depth of wall fascia could not be verified for compliance. Please provide dimensions of water elevations, scour, thalwed	A	IR (Originator)	Comment noted, items requested to be added to allow for verification. 09/08/2025: Noted.	R	Will review in final. I understand open items with the hydraulic design may lend to scour changes. FHD needs to be finaled and RFCed for structure to be released per 2.28.3.4	R

