



July 31, 2018

Mr. Derrick Wolbaum
Senior Associate
Rhodeside & Harwell
510 King Street, Suite 300
Alexandria, VA22314

**RE: 50% Review Submittal Plan
Fredericksburg Riverfront Park
KHA Project # 116512000**

Dear Mr. Wolbaum,

In response to the City's review of the above-referenced project received by Kimley-Horn from your department in its entirety on March 27, 2018, we offer the following responses. Included in this re-submittal are the following items:

- Electronic Copy of the revised plans
- Electronic copy of the calculations and narrative
- Electronic Copy of SWPPP
- Electronic Copy of WQIA Form

Development Administrator (Marne Sherman)

1. Please label adjacent properties with zoning, and use.
 - Response: The adjacent properties were labeled with zoning and use.
2. On Sheet CS101 work is shown on GPIN 7789-24-5275. All parking lot improvements must be contained within the City owned property. Any offsite work would require a letter of permission is required prior to plan approval.
 - Response: The direction provided to the design team was to only make physical improvements to the entrance and restroom area of the parking lot. The remainder of the lot will remain as is and be resealed and restriped.
3. Parking Lot:
 - a. Please show dimensions for parking lot driveways to ensure compliance with a minimum of 24' for two-way drives and 15' for one-way drives (please also address for parking on Hanover Street).

- Response: The parking lot driveways are one-way, directional arrows are provided to guide traffic.
 - b. If the internal drives are one way, please show location and detail for signage to manage direction.
 - Response: Internal drives are one-way. Signage is provided to show direction.
 - c. Please update the in arrow to reflect that the entrance/exit onto Sophia Street is a two way.
 - Response: Directional arrows are provided.
 - d. Please show locations and details for ADA parking space signs (please also address for parking on Hanover Street).
 - Response: Locations for ADA parking spaces are called out on the plans. Also, the pertinent details are provided in the Site Details sheet.
 - e. Please label widths of ADA striped aisles (please also address for parking on Hanover Street).
 - Response: Widths for the ADA spaces are shown on the plans.
 - f. Please show wheel stops or similar barricade in accordance with §72-53.1.D.1.(h). to prevent overhang on adjacent property, GPIN 7789-24-5275.
 - Response: Wheel stops were added next to the adjacent property.
4. On-street Parking. On Section BB Detail on Sheet CS101, on-street parallel parking spaces are shown at 6.5-7' in width. VDOT standard for commercial areas is 8' minimum. Please update detail to show the required dimensions by including the gutter pan. If necessary, please also eliminate any variation below 8' in width for spaces intended to serve cars. Discuss designating motorcycle parking where 8' is not achievable.
- Response: The detail in the site plan was revised to show the required 8' width for the on-street parallel spaces.
5. Sheet CS101 (and others) shows a new on-street parking space in front of the driveway curb cut for GPIN 7789-24-5275. Please address/revise.
- Response: There is not intended to be a parking space here. It is leftover space due to returning the proposed bumpout back to the original curb. A "Do not park" sign was provided to discourage parking at this location.

6. Sidewalk:

a. Please show how new 7.5' trail will match up with existing sidewalk within the ROW in front of GPIN 7789-24-5275.

- Response: The trail alignment was modified to match existing sidewalk. Please refer to the site plan.

b. Please discuss crosswalk from new ADA ramp to the west side of Hanover Street.

- Responses: The crosswalk alignment was revised, please refer to the site plan.

7. If the temporary structure is still contemplated, please discuss the following items: height, duration of use onsite, utility connections.

- Responses: Restroom facility is not currently in scope of work. Our plan is to accommodate the location and utilities connection points but not to include the structure. The City is handling that separately.

8. Utilities. Please discuss the relocation of utilities and compliance with installing new utilities underground per §72-54.4. Please update Utility Note 2 on Sheet CA003 to reflect compliance with the City Code.

- Response: There will not be any relocation of existing underground utilities. The proposed underground connections to the existing water and sanitary gravity mains on Sophia Street were designed taking into considerations the design requirements stipulated on the City of Fredericksburg Construction Specifications and Standards for Water and Sewerage Facilities (version revised 2016)

9. Lighting. Please provide height and photometric plan details in accordance with §72-58.2. Please also ensure that all light is fully shielded and downward facing. If the lights used onsite match the City's downtown street lights, this requirement can be waived.

- Response: Photometric calculations have been performed. The light fixtures are full cut-off.

10. Please consider consolidating all of the properties to extinguish interior lot lines through the Final Subdivision Plat process. This would alleviate the technical requirement that structures not cross property lines.

- Response: City has provided all surveying services to date. It is our understanding City will handle consolidation of Plat.

Zoning Administrator (Allyson Finchum)

1. No comments provided.

Environmental Planning (John Saunders)General

1. Please fill out the attached Water Quality Impact Assessment (WQIA) form and sign the Applicant's statements for WQIA and Wetlands on Sheet 3 and provide with original signatures. Please contact with any questions on filling out the form.
 - Response: The WQIA form is provided with this submission.
2. Provide the site plan number SPMAJ 2018-02 on all plan sheets.
 - Response: The site plan number is provided on all plan sheets.
3. This land disturbing activity will require coverage under the 2014 Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) Construction General Permit. A registration statement and fee will need to be paid following approval of the plan and coverage will be required prior to the issuance of a land disturbance permit.
 - Response: Comment noted. A SWPPP is provided with this submission.
4. This land disturbing activity requires a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Provide two copies of your SWPPP for review to ensure that it meets the regulatory requirements of Part II A of the VSMP Construction General Permit (9 VAC 25-880). A SWPPP template is available for your use upon request.
 - Response: Comment noted. A SWPPP is provided with this submission.
5. Sheet CA004 is a duplicate of CA003. Please address.
 - Response: The duplicate sheet was removed.
6. Provide all VRRM calculations and worksheets including the Site Data tab in the plan set.

- Response: VRRM Calculations and worksheets are included in the planset and the Narrative.
7. Provide the City's Standard Erosion and Sediment Control and Pollution Prevention Notes.
- Response: City's Standard Erosion and Sediment Control and Pollution Prevention Notes are included in this submission. Refer to Sheet C2.1
8. Provide an Erosion and Sediment Control narrative that addresses at a minimum:
- a. A brief project description of the nature and purpose of the land disturbing activity, and the amount of grading involved
 - b. A description of the existing topography, vegetation, and drainage
 - c. A description of neighboring areas such as streams, lakes, residential areas, roads, etc., which might be affected by the land disturbance
 - d. A brief description of the soils on the site giving such information as soil name, mapping unit, erodibility, permeability, depth, texture, and soil structure
 - e. A description of areas on the site which have potentially serious erosion problems.
 - f. A description of the methods which will be used to control erosion and sedimentation on the site.
 - g. A brief description, including specifications, of how the site will be stabilized after construction is completed.
 - h. A schedule of regular inspection and repair of erosion and sediment control structures
 - i. Any calculations for the design of such items as sediment traps, sediment basins, diversions, etc.
- Response: An Erosion and Sediment Control Narrative is included in this planset, please refer to Sheet C4.2
9. Provide a Stormwater Management Narrative that discusses how VSMP requirements for water quality and channel protection are being satisfied. Discuss any changes to drainage patterns to manmade systems that are affected by this plan as well.
- Response: A Stormwater Management Narrative is included in this planset, please refer to Sheet C6.2.
10. Provide VMRC coordination for all improvements in and along the river.

- Response: A Joint Permit Application was submitted to the City and to the Core of Engineers.
11. A full hydrologic and hydraulic analysis performed in accordance with standard engineering practice must be submitted to the City that demonstrates the proposed encroachment into the floodway does not result in any increase in flood levels within the community (City of Fredericksburg) during the occurrence of the base flood discharge (1% annual chance flood). Please address.
- Response: A HECRAS model will be provided at a later date.
12. Provide more details on the proposed hydrodynamic structures and bioretention basin including pollutant removal figures and cost estimates. Provide routings for the bioretention basin and soil borings to support the level 2 design. Provide a cross section of the facility and other details to comply with BMP Clearinghouse specification.
- Response: More details on the proposed hydrodynamic structure are provided. Pollutant removal for this structure follows the BMP Clearinghouse pollutant removal rate of 20%. The bioretention was removed from the project.

Sheet CA001

13. Provide a certification statement on the cover sheet “I, (Your Name), certify that XXX.XX acres of land disturbance and XXX.XX square feet of impervious area will be created with this project. Signed (Signature) License #: _____”
- Response: This certification statement is provided on the cover sheet.
14. RPA IMPACTS TABLE – please provide a table on the cover sheet that provides the following information:
- a. States amount of RPA disturbance broken into following categories: road, storm sewer, utilities;
 - b. States the square footage of each RPA disturbance occurrence;
 - c. States a final total of all RPA disturbances.
 - d. Also, please provide on the plan sheets the square footage of RPA disturbed by each disturbance to support the table.
- Response: The RPA impacts table is provided on the cover sheet.

Sheet CE101

15. Show the limits of disturbance and provide the acreage amount.

- Response: LOD and acreage amount are provided with this submittal.

16. Show the soil types in plan-view.

- Response: Soil types are provided in the Phase I E&S Sheet, as well as Sheet C4.2 and the Narrative.

17. Substitute Wire-backed or Super Silt Fence for Silt Fence. Provide the appropriate detail.

- Response: Silt fence is replaced with wire-backed, the appropriate detail is provided.

18. Show safety fence locations.

- Response: Location for the safety fence locations is provided.

19. It does not appear that any rough grading is associated with Phase 1. Please clarify.

- Response: Phase 1 is intended to set up perimeter controls to allow for demo and for grading to begin.

20. Provide a sequence of construction for Phase 1.

- Response: A sequence of construction was provided with this submittal.

21. It appears that silt fence will need to be placed twice, once at the top of the slope along the River, and once again in Phase II along the River. Is there a reason that the silt fence along the River can't be utilized to satisfy both E&S phases, since Phase 1 is primarily demolition of existing structures and surfaces?

- Response: Silt fence at top of the slope was removed. Wire-backed silt fence is now proposed at the bottom of the slope.

Sheet CE102

1. Show the limits of disturbance and provide the acreage amount.

- Response: LOD and acreage amount are provided with this submittal
2. Substitute Silt Fence for Wire-backed or Super Silt Fence. Provide the appropriate detail.
 - Response: Silt fence was replaced with wire-backed, the appropriate detail was provided
 3. Show proposed contours on all disturbed areas.
 - Response: Proposed contours on disturbed areas are provided.
 4. The plan shows both a diversion dike and a temporary diversion. Are both necessary?
 - Response: Diversion dikes are proposed.
 5. Check dams are shown on top of a diversion dike. Please address.
 - Response: The check dams were removed.
 6. Consider utilizing diversion dikes only.
 - Response: Comment noted. Diversion dikes are proposed.
 7. Remove the temporary inlet and 24" CMP at the top of the slope. In lieu of this. Install a slope drain to manage the concentrated runoff from the diversion dike. Provide a detail for the slope drain and anchoring requirements.
 - Response: The temporary inlet was removed and a slope drain is proposed. The appropriate detail is provided.

Sheet CE501

8. Provide the detail for a Diversion Dike instead of designed Diversion.
 - Response: Detail for the Diversion Dike is provided.
9. Provide a wire backed silt fence specification from the 1992 VESCH.
 - Response: Details for the wire-backed silt fence is provided.

10. Provide a table of quantities and cost estimate for all E&S controls.

- Response: A table of quantities and cost estimate is provided.

11. Remove the specifications for silt sack and provide inlet protection specification from the 1992 VESCH.

- Response: The details for the silt sack were removed.

12. Provide a safety fence specification from the 1992 VESCH.

- Response: Safety Fence specification and detail are provided.

13. Provide a tree protection specification.

- Response: Tree protection specification and detail are provided.

Sheet CS101

14. The temporary restroom facility will not be permitted in the floodway/floodplain. This needs to be removed or designed as a permanent facility with proper dry-floodproofing and anchoring to resist the hydrodynamic forces from the floodway.

- Response: Restroom is not currently in scope of work. Our plan is to accommodate the location and utilities connection points but not to include the structure. The City is handling that separately.

15. It appears that some of the layers may have been turned off showing all of the site structures.

- Response: Structures that are not being demolished are shown.

16. How will all of these proposed structures be anchored to resist floodway waters?

- Response: Foundation design is included and buoyant forces have been considered.

Sheet CG101

17. Provide the Floodway and Base Flood Elevations.

- Response: Floodway and Base Flood Elevations are provided in this plan set, refer to sheet C6.2.

18. Add "Intensely Developed Area" to the RPA label.

- Response: Intensely Developed Area was added to the RPA label.

19. Show proposed grades and elevations of the stage area.

- Response: Proposed grades around the stage area are provided.

20. Show the proposed elevation of the wooden dock.

- Response: Dock grades are provided.

21. Incorporate the milled parking lot at the Southern site into the limits of disturbance. This applies to all E&S phases as well. Show the proposed final grade in this parking lot.

- Response: As discussed at the review meeting, the parking lot at the Southern side will only be sealed and won't be included into the limits of disturbance.

22. Clarify the proposed contours between the two mounds on either side of the sidewalk.

- Response: More detailed grading information is provided.

23. Clarify the proposed contours on the mound closest to Sophia Street.

- Response: More detailed grading information is provided.

24. Provide stationing and cross-sections at 50' intervals for the proposed slope from the proposed sidewalk to the River. Show the mean and tidal water surface elevations, existing grade, finished grade, and settled grade for all cross-sections.

- Response: Cross section of the proposed slope are provided on sheet C6.2.

25. Provide a narrative for all cut and fill sections in this area and discuss the use of onsite materials, necessary testing, etc. Discuss how the site is to be brought to grade and provide compaction standards, etc.

- Response: Please refer to the Cut and Fill Recommendation section of the design narrative.

26. Provide a geotechnical slope-stability analysis and how slope failures/sloughing will be mitigated.

- Response: The proposed grading for the park will flatten the existing slope, thus mitigating slope failures. Additionally, the geotechnical report provided by Schnabel (dated May 6, 2016), recommends that slopes no be greater than 3:1, while the proposed slopes are no greater than 4:1.

Sheet CG102

27. Provide a pre and post developed drainage area map.

- Response: Pre and post developed drainage area maps are included in the plan set.

28. This plan appears to show the post developed drainage area. Show all drainage divides, both onsite and off. Provide runoff characteristics for each drainage area in plan view. Show all final contours.

- Response: Pre and post developed drainage area maps are included in the plan set.

29. Amend the notes at Structure 11 and the curb inlet along Hanover Street to read "Replace" instead of "Convert".

- Response: The callout was revised.

30. Add "Intensely Developed Area" to the RPA label.

- Response: Intensely Developed area has been added to the callout.

Sheet CU101

31. There is a connection from the proposed irrigation pump and recirculation system into the storm sewer system. This is not authorized under the City's MS4 permit. Please address.

- Response: Runoff from the Interactive Water Feature is now directly connected to the sanitary sewer system and the recirculation system was removed from the project.

Sheet CU501

32. Provide standard VDOT IS-1 detail.

- Response: Detail is provided with this submission.

Building Services Division (Jeffrey Bragg)

1. The sanitary sewer connection for the restroom facilities must be backwater protected where subject to inundation by the 100-year flood.
 - Response: A bathroom backflow preventer is included with this submission.
2. The timber steps accessing the dock should be staggered according to Section 1009.15 (exception 1) of the 2012 VCC, otherwise handrails are required.
 - Response: The timber steps accessing the dock were revised.
3. Item #51 on Sheet L-101 is detailed as a continuous site stair with a riser height of 15". Is this an actual riser? If so, the max height of the riser should not exceed 7".
 - Response: This is intended to be a sitting wall. It is now designated as a curb wall.

Public Works (Bassam Amin)

1. Drainage structures # 11 and #9A may interfere with ADA ramps.
 - Response: The plans were revised to keep ADA ramps from interfering with any drainage structures.
2. Show the existing ADA ramps at Charlotte Street.
 - Response: Both ADA ramps are called out in the Site Plan.
3. Existing water line vales should be protected and extended where proposed fill.
 - Response: Comment noted. A note was added on the plans.
4. Existing storm drainage should be extended where proposed fill.
 - Response: Comment noted. A note was added on the plans.
5. Proposed parking lot on Hanover Street could be aligned differently.

- Response: Comment noted. The parking stalls have been revised to be perpendicular with the road.
6. Provide parking lot stall angle, stall width, aisle width, etc.
 - Response: Additional site plan dimensions are provided.
 7. Fill in floodway may need to be addressed showing no adverse effect.
 - Response: HECRAS model is currently being coordinated with the City and will be provided at a later time.
 8. Pavement cross sections should be provided.
 - Response: Scope of work stops at the curb along Sophia Street. A pavement patch is provided on the Site Plan.

Public Works (Diane Beyer)

9. Comments issued at earlier plan review meeting were submitted directly to Mr. Fawcett.
 - Response: Comment noted.

Transportation Administrator (Erik Nelson)

1. Sophia Street traffic calming – The new park is going to be visible from Caroline Street and invite visitation. Years ago, we had considered raised intersections at Hanover and Charlotte Street, to provide traffic calming along Sophia Street, and these could be re-considered.
 - Response: N.I.C. City to have separate discussion.
2. Hanover Street intersection – A bulb-out at Hanover Street, east side, could be useful for pedestrians.
 - Response: N.I.C. City to have separate discussion.
3. Mowed trails – Mowed trails need to be moved about on the landscape every year or more so any one route does not become used to the point of wearing away all the vegetation. The current design does not anticipate letting worn areas recover for a year or two. Attention to wooden bench placement and the length of the wood overlook at the

upriver end need to be modified to allow flexibility in maintaining the vegetation on the natural slope.

- Response: More lawn has been added to the areas around the wood overlooks for easier access to the mown trails. The wood benches are anchored in a way that allows them to be moved when a new mown path is desired.

4. Bicycle kiosk – A bicycle kiosk is needed in the bicycle rack area, to provide information on bike repair shops, lodging, and restaurants. The Chatham Bridge bike/ped lane is going to serve local folks as well as long range cyclists on the East Coast Greenway, the Atlantic Coast Trail, and the TransAmerica Trail. We learned about these users at our pathways plan public forum and they are going to increase in numbers.

- Response: N.I.C. City to have separate discussion.

Fire Marshal (JV Skinner)

1. No Comments

Historic Resources Planner (Kate Schwatz)

1. Park elements to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board include the bathroom structure, play structures, stage, fences and walls, and lighting. The review does not include hardscaping or furniture, only those elements that are permanent and above-ground fixtures. Detailed material specifications, dimensions, and, where applicable, elevations should be provided.

- Response: Comment noted.

2. This has been scheduled for an informal, pre-application review with the ARB on Monday, May 14, 2018. The relevant details should be provided for the Board's review at that time. A formal Certificate of Appropriateness application will need to be approved before final approval of the Major Site Plan.

- Response: Comment noted.

Construction Management Consultants Comments (Downey & Scott, LLC)

General

1. Incorporate all required City Standard specs and details.

- Response: All City Standards and details are provided.
2. Please number all pages consecutively to make future review easier.
 - Responses: Sheets are renumbered
 3. Sophia Street traffic calming – The new park is going to be visible from Caroline Street and invite visitation. Years ago, we had considered raised intersections at Hanover and Charlotte Street, to provide traffic calming along Sophia Street, and these could be re-considered.
 - Response: N.I.C. City to have separate discussion.
 4. Hanover Street intersection – A bulb-out at Hanover Street, east side, could be useful for pedestrians.
 - Response: N.I.C. City to have separate discussion.
 5. Show existing HC Ramps at Charlotte Street on relevant pages.
 - Response: Both existing ADA ramps are called out in the Site Plan.
 6. Pavement Cross Sections should be provided.
 - Response: Scope of work ends at curb along Sophia Street.
 7. Add finish grades to relevant pages.
 - Response: Detailed grading is provided with this submission.

Existing Topo

1. Correct spelling to “Sophia” Street (not “Sofia”)
 - Response: Survey was corrected.
2. Dominion Energy contact “Rick Pennington” – Dominion Energy work order number
 - Response: Comment noted. Will revise sheet.

CA003 & CA004

1. Clean-up and Finalize notes.

- Response: Notes have been refined. Further refinement will occur before 100% CD's.
2. Clean-up and Finalize notes. Clarify maintenance and warranty period and include same in specifications.
 - Response: Notes have been refined. Further refinement will occur before 100% CD's.
 3. Verify planting notes meet the City of Fredericksburg standards. We recommend the Architect meet with the City Arborist to discuss any required changes.
 - Response: RHI met with Arborist and has included her comments in the 90% CD submission.

CE101

1. Verify items to be removed and salvaged by Owner prior to Construction
 - Response: As discussed in review meeting, a note was added to the plans indicating that the owner has the right to salvage anything.
2. Include any Archaeological Notes and plan overlay which identifies the mapped historic resources as provided from Dovetail
 - Response: Comment noted.

CS101

1. Review areas near manholes 9A, 9B and 11 for sidewalk ADA accessibility
 - Response: Layout was revised to not interfere with any drainage structures.
2. No ADA accessibility at location of accessible parking spaces at the north end of the project; consider moving accessible spaces to near Sophia Street
 - Response: ADA ramps are now provided.
3. Accessible parking spaces at south end of project; unclear how those parking in these spaces have an ADA accessible path to the park; also, should there be two accessible spaces here – one of them van accessible – instead of the three shown?
 - Response: Layout was revised.

4. On -street parking cross section shows 6.5'-7.0' wide spaces – TRC will likely require wider spaces.
 - Response: Eight-foot parallel spots are provided. The cross section was revised.

5. Mowed trails – Mowed trails need to be moved about on the landscape every year or more so any one route does not become used to the point of wearing away all the vegetation. The current design does not anticipate letting worn areas recover for a year or two. Attention to wooden bench placement and the length of the wood overlook at the upriver end need to be modified to allow flexibility in maintaining the vegetation on the natural slope.
 - Response: More lawn has been added to the areas around the wood overlooks for easier access to the mown trails. The wood benches are anchored in a way that allows them to be moved when a new mown path is desired.

6. How will the existing gas vent be protected?
 - Response: Ongoing coordination with gas company

7. Verify location of gas sleeve and accessibility for future maintenance if necessary.
 - Response: Comment noted. Ongoing coordination with gas company

8. Note #10 indicates all paving and earthwork operations shall conform to the Geotech Report dated May 6, 2016. No earthwork or paving specifications are provided in the spec book. Is this an unclassified site? The Geotech report recommends earthwork be done during warm and dry times of the year. It also recommends an allowance for additional costs due to greater than anticipated unsuitable soils. How can you reduce the risk for additional costs? The report also recommends the Geotech review the plans and specifications as they pertain to the recommendation in the report.
 - Will be addressed in next submission

9. There appears to be a CG-12 with a crosswalk at Sophia Street leading to a DI by Charlotte Street. CG-12 location may need adjustment.
 - Response: Location of ramp was revised.

1. Should SSF be placed along river in lieu of SF due to the amount of disturbance?
 - Response: Wire-backed silt fence was Will replace SF with SSF for next submittal
2. Why are there notes stating in several locations (L-301 by Others)? All work on the documents should be the Prime Contractor's responsibility.
 - Response: Notes were revised.

CS501

1. Verify curb detail matches existing.
 - Response: Existing conditions is a 18" gutter pan and 5" curb. The detail and plans match it.
2. Pavement restoration details do not address what to do at new curb along Sophia Street. You may want to show some mill and overlay.
 - Response: Scope of work stops along curb on Sophia Street. Where new curb is proposed, the pavement will be sawcut.

CG101

1. Concern about significant grading near the river. Where are we on required permits?
 - Response: JPA is in the process of getting approved by the Core of Engineers. The JPA is only needed for work below the Mean High Water. The only improvements that need permitting are the permanent pipe outfall at the northern side of the park and the redecking of the existing dock.

CG102

1. North end of project – where note states to “convert existing drop inlet to manhole”, consider instead moving DI to curb toward river.
 - Response: Drainage was revised. Refer to grading and drainage sheet.
2. General confusion about how storm water system will work at Charlotte Street entrance to park; can sidewalk be shifted to avoid having existing MH in new sidewalk?

- Response: Drainage was revised. Refer to grading and drainage sheet.

CU101

1. Proposed tap for water service to the site is too close to MH 17 in Sophia Street; also, why not run 4' sanitary connection parallel to on site water line and connect to sanitary main in the street near water connection – to avoid conflict with existing communications duct bank south of that location?

- Response: Water and sanitary connections were revised to avoid any conflicts.

2. General questions about the irrigation storage tank at the Charlotte Street entrance - U.V. treatment vault required? (more comments likely to come from John Saunders at 4/12 TRC review)

- Response: Irrigation tank is no longer part of project.

3. There is a lot of fill required by MH-8. Verify existing MH and Pipe will support the fill including what improvements will be needed for MH-8. Due to the depth will a safety slab be required?

- Response: MH-8 was eliminated.

4. Existing Waterline Valves and Storm MH's should be protected and extended where proposed fill is shown.

- Response: A note was added to the plans.

CU102

1. Complete electrical plan. Verify Stage electric requirements and details, Future restroom electrical requirements, etc.

- Response: Electrical Plan was updated and revised with Waiting on more information about power requirements at the stage. As of now, assumptions are for (4) 20A, 120V receptacle circuits at the stage.

2. The electrical requirements shown indicate 3 phase power. Can this be changed to single phase power? Are electrical outlets included on street light poles?

- Response: Currently, 3 phase power is provided for more efficient power delivery to the 5HP water feature pump motors (16.7A per phase at 208V, 3phase compared to 28A per phase at 240V). Single phase power can be provided if the Client has preference for that. There are receptacles accounted for on each light pole.

IR101

1. Submersible pump – above/below grade? – can it be winterized? Are “quick coupling valves” for attachment of garden hoses? Can the irrigation controller be located inside the restroom facility to deter vandalism and permit winterization?

- Response: Comment noted.

IR501

1. The City does not typically use a root watering system as shown on detail 4/IR-501. Further discussion with Architect is required before approval.

- Response: RHI to work with irrigation consultant to come up with alternative approach.

L-101

1. Bicycle kiosk – A bicycle kiosk is needed in the bicycle rack area, to provide information on bike repair shops, lodging, and restaurants. The Chatham Bridge bike/ped lane is going to serve local folks as well as long range cyclists on the East Coast Greenway, the Atlantic Coast Trail, and the TransAmerica Trail. We learned about these users at our pathways plan public forum and they are going to increase in numbers.

- Response: N.I.C. City to have separate discussion.

2. Can the areas shown as broom finish concrete (#13 on legend) as well as the parking areas be a pervious material instead?

- Response: Preference is to keep concrete paving in lieu of pervious paving due to cost and maintenance. It is also not necessary for swm requirements.

3. Can the areas shown as concrete aggregate (#14 on legend) be stamped concrete instead?

- Response: Preference is to keep exposed aggregate concrete in lieu of stamped due to aesthetics. Stamped concrete doesn't look as nice.

4. Concerned that the areas shown as owner provided recycled curb pavers - i.e., cobblestones - (#12 in legend) are too extensive – may not have enough cobblestones for all of these areas (based on square footage included in cost estimate.)
 - Response: Our preference is to use as much of the owner provided material as possible with the addition of new cobble to match if needed. Additional cobble (substitution) to match has been included in the specs
5. Provide locations for Trash Receptacles.
 - Response: This was addressed this submission.

L-102

1. Water feature surface – granite pavers (#11 in legend) – needs to be a different material – cobblestones too uneven
 - Response: Need clarification. Granite is a common material used in water feature surfacing. In lieu of cobble stone at the water feature we are showing all granite unit pavers with two different finishes, spilt and thermal. This is to help provide traction and for aesthetic purposes.
2. Poured in place rubber surfaces (#17 in legend) – color options? Different colors in different areas? Where the rubberized surface next to the restroom approaches the main walkway, the rubberized surface needs to be continued all the way to the walkway – no cobblestone border between.
 - Response: This was addressed this submission.

L-300

1. Significant questions about tree removal/retention plan; need to schedule a conversation/meeting between Diane B and appropriate consultant personnel.
 - Response: RHI had a discussion with City Arborist and Assistant City Manager regarding this.

L-301

1. Need to maximize sight distance between the north area of the lawn/garden area and the stage – proposed plantings appear to block that sight distance. Previous estimates of park accommodating crowds of 1,500-2,000 for concerts need to be met.

- Response: Will look at ways to reduce trees while maintaining sufficient shade. Keep in mind that these trees will be 'limbed up' to provide clear views to the stage. Event Lawn accommodates 2,000 people.
2. Streetscape areas near Charlotte Street entrance to the park are immediately adjacent to on-street parking spaces, creating a conflict for passengers attempting to exit/re-enter vehicles. Similar conflicts at the streetscape areas at the north and south ends of the park can be resolved by eliminating the portion of the streetscape immediately adjacent to the parking spaces.
 - Response: This was addressed this submission. Planted areas along the street have either been pulled further back from the back of curb to allow more room for a car door to open and person to exit a car.

L-501

1. Finalize detail reference Platform "B".
 - Response: This was addressed this submission.

L-601

1. Detail 4 notes "Recycled Cobble Pavers Provide by Client" Change the note to "Recycled Cobble Pavers material provided by the City, all incidental setting bed materials and labor to install Cobble Stone shall be provided by Contractor"
 - Response: This was addressed this submission.
2. Brick Pavers Typical Section – See Typical City of Fredericksburg Brick Paver Specification. Sent in separate file attachment.
 - Response: This was addressed this submission.

L-605

1. Is 18" concrete base needed for Entry Wall (Site Wall 5)?
 - Response: This was addressed this submission. All walls have been reviewed by the structural engineer for proper footing dimensions.

L-612

1. The City is concerned about the long term maintenance, cleaning and replacement of the platform benches. Need further detail and discussion. Provided structural details of Cast-in-place concrete and footings.
 - The decking is designed as a panel system for easy removal and replacement. All walls have been reviewed by the structural engineer for proper footing dimensions.

L-617

1. Distances between boulders?? Is the intent that children will be able to step from one boulder to another? If so, the higher surface needs to overlap the lower surface to prevent the potential for the child getting a foot/leg “wedged” between the boulders. If it is not intended that children step directly from one boulder to another, the boulders need to be separated enough that there is an adequate “fall zone” between the boulders.
 - Response: RHI has reviewed the play area concept with a playground specialist.
 - The boulder groupings will be designated as site features and furnishings, away from the play equipment.

L-625

1. Site Bench – Type 1 ... add arm rests to discourage reclining on bench
 - Response: This was addressed this submission.
2. Light fixture – Type 1 ... change to City Standard Light Fixture to better match existing lights along Sophia Street; City will provide the “Spring City typical Clearwater LED” detail for inclusion in next submission.
 - Our intent is that the park interior has light fixture type 1 while the walkway along Sophia has the city standard.
 - The City standard light fixture will not be installed until the overhead utilities have been removed (separate from this contract).

3. Shade Structure – Type 1 ... What are the wind load limits? What is the weight carrying capacity of the structural supports (assuming someone attempts to “hang” from the structure?)

- This information has been provided to the structural engineer. The footings for the shade structure have been designed for these loads.

4. Provide pad details for furniture as needed.

- Response: This was addressed this submission.

L-701

1. Include the latest City of Fredericksburg Standard Specifications and Details for Landscape Plantings and Mulching.

- Will be provided at next submission.

L-702 & 703

1. Architect to verify plant types, turf grass selection and meadow seed mix with the City Arborist. Recommend the Architect meet with the City Arborist to discuss.

- Response: This was addressed this submission.

MISC

1. Does the entire archaeological report need to be included in the bid documents?

- Response: Need to confirm with City.

2. Specs:

- Provide Earthwork and Paving Specifications.
- Provide detailed electrical specifications.
- Provide Existing Dock Rehab Specifications
- Finalize incomplete items in specifications

- Response: This was addressed this submission.

Please contact me at (757) 213-8600 or David.Dallman@kimley-horn.com should you have any questions or desire additional information.

Sincerely,
KIMLEY-HORN

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Dallman". The signature is stylized with large, rounded letters and a cursive flourish at the end.

David Dallman, P.E.