

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)

Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I

Document Considered: Bridge PH I Reconstruction plans

Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.

Design Discipline Lead(s): Roadway

Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI:

Date: 9/6/2018

Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments

Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
Drainage		1	The Basin map is not legible, and inaccurate. Contributing drainage areas are missing	HDR will provide a more legible basin map. HDR will provide a more legible basin map. Existing and proposed basins were reviewed and deemed accurate as shown in the Final Drainage report. The basins delineated in the city's provided HMS model differ from HDR's delineated basins. HDR used survey data and verified basin delineations in a field visit. Areas outside of Tower road were not delineated or analyzed per HDR's scope of work.
Drainage		2	Time of concentration calculations are missing	Will be included
Drainage		3	Corporate C and CN calculations are missing	Will be included

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)
 Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I
 Document Considered: Bridge PH I Reconstruction plans
 Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.
 Design Discipline Lead(s): Roadway
 Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI: _____
 Date: 9/6/2018
 Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments
 Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
Drainage		4	The effect of the orifice plates on the hydrology is poorly documented. Further analysis needed	Report documents the rationale behind the orifice plates and how they were included in the analysis. HDR did not run inlet calculations on the interim condition with existing land use and the 2 cfs/acre orifice plate restrictions on the trunk line. HDR sized inlets to capture existing runoff (this is higher than the future 2 cfs/acre runoff) in the event the pond is upsized. HDR sized trunk line to handle full 100 year flows in case the county upsizes the pond. Interim conditions with the proposed pipe and inlet system is significantly better than the existing conditions. Both the methodology and analysis was approved by the city and county throughout the design process.
		5	EGL missing from HGL calculations, it looks like the wrong procedure was used in SotrmCad, losses must be applied to EGL per DPM. Use HEC-22 (3rd edition) option	Will be updated and included.
		6	Analyse the impact of the new downstream pipes on the existing 36" RCP in Bridge that is to remain. HGL calculations required	HDR can provide a HGL comparison in existing and proposed conditions. However, proposed system is significantly larger than the existing system and HGL is below ground level as required in the criteria manual.
	146	7	The 2nd lane north of the median is dimensioned at 10'. Other lanes are 11'. and typical section shows 11'. Is this intentional?	Revise dimension to 11'
Roadway	N/A	8	A typical section from Station 201+96 to 205+27 is not provided. This is the confusing area with the 19' lane and the turn to Cortez.	See sht. 31 for Slip Lane typical Sections.
	153	9	Upper view: Your match line should refer to sheet 146	Revised matchline to refer to sht. 146 in lieu of 147.

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)

Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I

Document Considered: Bridge PH I Reconstruction plans

Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.

Design Discipline Lead(s):

Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI:

Date: 9/6/2018

Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments

Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
	146	10	Upper view. Your match line should refer to sheet 153	Revised sheet 146 matchline to refer reader to sheet 153 in lieu of 154
Roadway	35	11	On the back-to-back curb at wheelchair ramp detail, it seems expansion joint materials should be included between the two curbs	Revised: Note for "1/2" expansion joint material" added.
Roadway	96	12	Suggestion comment (BernCo jurisdiction): the refuge doesn't line up with a pedestrian route nor an ADA path. If it's just designed for bicycles, is seems the detectable warning surfaces are unnecessary.	The medina refuge does line up; however, the median opening is not intended for ADA crossings so detectable warning surface to be removed. Also, update median opening dimension (8.0'). Dimension all median and bike openings.
	62	13	Suggestion comment (BernCo jurisdiction): Intersection detail R12D - east-west crosswalk aligns poorly with ADA ramp.	Revised: Crosswalk realigned.
Drainage	N/A	14	Drainage P&P sheets, various: type of inlet being used seems unclear - plan call-outs say CDOTs, but General Notes (on Drainage P&P sheets) refer to COA standards.	HDR will revise the general notes
Drainage	129	15	Some profiles have a Q and V of zero.	Will add Q and V's where they're missing
	142	16	The cross-walk details - 4' dimension from stop bar to crosswalk should be 4' clear ... not 4' to centerline of stop bar.	Revised
Roadway	N/A	17	Please provide a general note to ensure that all driveways and intersection include a 4' wide ADA path at 1.5% typical, 2.0% max. cross-slope. (If you already have this and we just didn't see it, please let us know.)	Revised: Added to general notes located on driveway and intersection details.
Roadway	98	18	The shelter relocation is shown correctly in the same place as it is currently. The ROW line another ~25' back, so we don't want the shelter located back there. They also need to show the sidewalk connection to the back of curb for ADA access to the bus across the landscape strip. They just need to replicate what's there now as shown in the removals on sheet 47.	Revised: Note revised to read "EXISTING ABQ RIDE BUS SHELTER/BENCH: REPLACE AND RELOCATE AS SHOWN PER COA STANDARDS."

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)

Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I

Document Considered: Bridge PH I Reconstruction plans

Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.

Design Discipline Lead(s): Roadway

Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI:

Date: 9/6/2018

Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments

Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
Roadway	108	19	The County gave us permission to locate the shelter outside of the ROW on their property, so we want the shelter replaced in the same location. Also at that location, they're not showing the symbol for the shelter relocation, just the note.	Revised
Roadway	103	20	Has a note pointing at the bus stop (about Sta 67+00) that says "Match existing walkway. 8.33% max grade. 2.0% preferred" That sight looks pretty level to me in Streetview. Did they mean to apply that note to a stop that's missing on sheet 99 at about station 48+00, which is on the hill westbound just west of Foothills Dr. SW?	The note refers to the residential walkway, not the bus shelter.
Roadway	1	21	please add a prominent note near the title block: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE APPROVAL APPLIES TO PORTION OF PROJECT WITHIN MUNICIPAL LIMITS, AS DELINEATED ON SHEET 9.	Revised
Roadway	3	22	on Note 22, contractor shall notify CITY TRANSIT rather than the "County." Also, remove reference and contact information for Shabih Rizvi. Douglas Goff's contact info should remain.	Revised
Roadway	39	23	please put a station equation where the main construction baseline intersects the 200-series (Slip Lane) baseline.	Revised
Roadway	50	24	at approximately Station 71+50 right, there should be a note to relocate the bus stop. Sheet 104 puts it back, but the removal note is absent on Sheet 50.	Revised
Roadway	97	25	suggest adding a Keyed Note 2 on the skinny part of the median curb & gutter in the vicinity of Sta. 39+50, assuming your intention is median curb & gutter. On the median east of Old Coors, you are calling for pinned curb in a similar situation, so a clarification might be in order.	Revised
	146	26	please check north arrow orientation on upper view. Please add north arrow to lower view. Since match lines aren't parallel on the two views, the north arrow orientations should be different.	Revised
	152	27	lower view - it seems the symbol should be rotated 180° for the R4-7-24 sign. The sign should face eastbound traffic.	Revised

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)

Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I

Document Considered: Bridge PHI Reconstruction plans

Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.

Design Discipline Lead(s):

Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI:

Date: 9/6/2018

Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments

Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
	153	28	as we discussed on the phone earlier today, we feel the traffic circulation heading from eastbound Bridge turning onto Cortez creates a hazardous situation. Please take another look at this area. Some combination of signage, striping, and minor curb-line changes should be employed to improve this situation.	OM1-1 with warning arrow added. Regulatory sign and yield sign added. Striping added.
	153	29	lower view – please fix north arrow – it's currently pointing south.	Revised
LANDSCAPE	206	30	please display centerline, ticks, and station labels on the Planting Plans. An alternative would be to station the matchlines. It is difficult to orient oneself on these!	
LANDSCAPE	217	31	please display centerline, ticks, and station labels on the Irrigation Plans. An alternative would be to station the matchlines. It is difficult to orient oneself on these!	
	N/A	32	Traffic did not provide comments to the traffic signal designs since the Bernalillo County is going to operate and maintain these traffic signals, per the email sent from Jeanne Wolfenbarger on 4-20-16.	
	N/A	33	City of Albuquerque (COA) Traffic has a fiber optics that exists along Bridge from Coors to Old Coors. See image of the utility below. If this COA fiber utility is disturbed or damaged with this project the project needs to make provisions to replace from existing fiber full splice to existing full splice. No intermediate splices will be allowed	
	N/A	34	This existing COA fiber needs to be connected to the new fiber that is being installed with this project. No fiber splice details were shown in this plan set to illustrate how and what connections are being done (existing/new). The Bernalillo County (PM and Traffic), HDR (fiber designer), COA Traffic and Lee Engineering need to discuss and coordinate the fiber splice details to ensure that when the project is complete the fiber network will be fully operational.	

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)
 Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I
 Document Considered: Bridge PH I Reconstruction plans
 Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.
 Design Discipline Lead(s): Roadway
 Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI: _____
 Date: 9/6/2018
 Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments
 Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
	N/A	35	Make sure that work being done on all COA Traffic ITS facilities meets COA Traffic ITS standards, specifications, and bidder qualifications. These should be incorporated into the projects contract documents. HDR should have copies of these documents.	
	N/A	36	Project will be responsible for the evaluating all fiber test result to ensure that they meet City of Albuquerque Traffic fiber specifications.	
Logan Patt plan set				
Roadway	33	37	Update symbol in General notes: Note C	Revised: Remove symbol from letter.
	56	38	Can this be shorter	The stop bar is moved close to ramp.
Roadway	74	39	5' section?	Not enough room for 5.0' landing.
Roadway	78	40	No gate?	Add note: protect gate in place.
Roadway	79	41	Should this be a common drive?	Proposed layout is correct.
Roadway	87	42	Should this be closed?	Proposed layout is correct.
	96	43	Signs and refuge comments	Signing to be included on signing sheets. ADA ramps not to be provided. It is a bike refuge, not an ADA crossing. Detectable warnings removed at this location. Bike warning signs are added.
	97	44	Striping comments	8' is shoulder. No bike buffer.
Roadway	98	45	Location and side of driveway. Detail?	Layout is correct. Please refer to miscellaneous detail.
Roadway	100, 101 & 102	46	circled notes	Layout is correct. Please refer to miscellaneous detail.

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)

Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I

Document Considered: Bridge PH I Reconstruction plans

Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.

Design Discipline Lead(s):

Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI:

Date: 9/6/2018

Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments

Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
Roadway	105	47	Running cross?	Note is for existing residential walkway.
Roadway	107	48	Close?	No, to remain open.
Roadway	108	49	Why is this not closed curb & gutter sidewalk?	I thought there was a gate here. Remove drivepad and put removal instead.
Roadway	109	50	Does this need to be this big. 40'	Yes, not enough room for a 5.0' landing between the two.
Roadway	110	51	Why is this not connecting? Should be connected?	Layout is correct. Design further east is outside of our environmental clearance limits.
Roadway	112	52	What is the angle?	70.2 deg.
Roadway	142	53	6" solid white for bikes	6" stripe detail is added
Roadway	143	54	Bike lane 6" stripe	Revised.
Roadway	145	55	Continental striping? Ped crossing sign hawk?	Continental crosswalk is not needed for cross street. There is no pedestrian crossing, but bike crossing. Warning signs are added.
Roadway	146	56	Check sheet #s	Revised.
Roadway	150	57	any new speed limit signs?	Revised. Speed limit sign added.
Roadway	152	58	painted nose yellow? Flip sign?	Curb marking details is added. Callouts for curb marking are added. Sign is rotated
Roadway	153	59	Stop sign crossing? More info needed	OM1-1 with warning arrow added. Regulatory sign and yield sign added. Striping added.

Form DCPR-4 - TCP COMMENT DISPOSITION FORM

Owner: Bernalillo County/City of Albuquerque (COA)
 Project: Bridge Boulevard - Phase I
 Document Considered: Bridge PH I Reconstruction plans
 Project Manager: Ed Potthoff Jr., P.E.
 Design Discipline Lead(s): Roadway
 Responsible Professional(s): HDR Engineering

DPI: _____
 Date: 9/6/2018
 Review Type: PS&E CABQ comments
 Reviewer: City of Albuquerque DRC

Discipline	Sheet	COMMENT No.	Reviewer Comment	Responsible Professional Response
Landscape	160	60	Existing? Hawk?	Proposed hawk signal. Layers are grey in lighting sheet.
	164	61	Existing?	Existing light pole will be removed.
	165	62	Existing? Street name	Existing light pole will be removed. Street name added. New light pole added.
	206	63	Check on all	
Jane WVA plan set				
Roadway	5	64	Note for damage, Moratorium	
Drainage	123	65	Road name	Will add road name
Drainage	127	66	Undersocre	Please clarify comment
Drainage	128	67	Clearance for S&S service?	12" or more of horizontal clearance
Drainage	130	68	Relocate SAS? Material type? Lean fill	Will add lean fill call out to profiles
Drainage	131	69	Lean fill on all? Crossings where compaction can't be met	Will add lean fill call out to profiles
Drainage	132	70	Relocate?	Relocate if necessary
Utilities	236	71	Add concrete collar if non-existing. Add gate valve to FH leg if not existing. Show FH leg on plans	
Utilities	239	72	Add gate valve to FH leg if not existing. Show FH leg on plans	