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**Summary Review**

Comments to Construction Drawings and Specifications Hofmann Dam Section 206 Phase II 50% BCOE Review Set January 2011.

Following is a summary of work that is being proposed:

A length of 150 feet of the center of the Dam is being removed to full depth which is approximately elevation 593.5. Approximately 30 feet on either side will be cut to an elevation of approximately 600. At this elevation the Dam appears to be approximately 8 feet thick according to section provided. Approximately 12 feet at either end will remain at the full height of the existing dam at elevation 605. There will be 1 to 1 transitions between each elevation change. The removal is required to be finished using Diamond Wire Technology which will provide a smooth, clean finish. The normal water surface elevation depicted on the plans appears to be approximately at elevation 600.

Prior to work starting the Contractor is required to survey the river bottom to determine the extent of sediment to be removed. A sediment and river spoil management plan is required as a submittal for approval by the COR. Prior to removal of the Dam “sediment and entrained water …is to be removed from the river bed, placed into self-contained water tight roll off containers and disposed of legally…and shall not be discharged to the DesPlaines River or any other waterway.”

Dam is to be removed “in the wet” from downstream of the Dam, in 1 foot increments within the 150 foot full depth removal. After completion of 1 foot of removal the Contractor is required to allow the river to reach equilibrium for an unspecified number of days. A turbidity curtain is to be installed down river at an unspecified location to collect debris.

Any area of river bank that is exposed from the lowering of the water level is to be planted and stabilized within one day. It is unclear exactly how it is to be stabilized or what it is to be planted with.

There was really no information provided for what is to be performed at Swan Pond although the Work Area is defined and appears to include up to the top of the embankment along Barry Point Road.

**Comments to Drawings**:

1. A note should be added that no “high value trees” of any size with in the work area should be removed. A “high value tree” is defined as a species that appears on the Village of Riverside Approved Planting List. Staging areas and access roads should be defined in the field and should be laid out in a manner that will not encroach on the drip zone of any high value tree.
2. Selective clearing only should be performed within the work zone for the removal of invasive species and unhealthy trees.
3. Work limits do not match planting area on Sheet C-06, specifically area north and west of the Dam and bypass structure.
4. Proposed contours should be added to the river upstream from the Dam to better define what is being proposed there.
5. It is unclear what work is being performed in the North and South Stabilization & Planting Areas. Plant list and planting details should be provided for review.
6. Some trees are identified for removal with replacement in kind. What is the definition of in kind? Trees should be replaced in greater than a 1:1 ratio. (1 40 year old oak does not equal one oak sapling)
7. On Sheet C-04 note indicates inlet and outlet of diversion structure to be covered with steel grate. On Sheet C-05 note indicates same inlet and outlet to be plugged by others. If Steel Grates are to be installed provide detail. If plugged by others, who are others? Why not fill the structure with low strength concrete or CLSM.
8. There is no clear indication of what is to be done in Swan Pond.
9. The extent of existing wetlands should be identified on the plans to ensure avoidance.

**Comments to Specifications**

1. Sediment Tables include information on sediment at Fairbank and Armitage Dams by not Hofmann Dam.
2. Specifications require tree clearing for staging, storage and access areas. It seems unnecessary to remove any trees except invasives and unhealthy trees.
3. Specifications require that the Contractor survey the river 100 feet upstream of the Dam on a 10 foot by 10 foot grid to determine the location and volume of sediment. From the contours presented on Sheet C-04 it seems that a distance of 200 feet would be more appropriate.
4. The documents require the removal of sediment. It is not clear how much sediment is to be removed. It is also unclear how the sediment will be removed from the river or from the site. Will it be removed utilizing the Dam Removal Staging area or utilizing seeding access and storage areas?
5. Tree protection measures seem inadequate. Contractor should be required to use Riverside Standards. All trees to remain should minimally have construction fencing installed at drip line. (Section 02-41-00 pg 5 1.6.4)
6. Specifications state that “Dam staging and storage sites shall be cleared and grubbed as needed and within the work limits as shown on the drawings. No trees with diameter at breast height of 10 inches or greater shall be cut down without the COR’s approval. The government will physically identify trees that shall remain. Any tree that the contractor deems ncessary to be removed shall be approved by the COR prior to the removal.” We believe that this language is not sufficiently clear and that there should be NO tree removal except as specifically indicated on the plans or for invasives and unhealthy specimen. (Section 02-41-00 Page 8)
7. Specifications indicate that a Coffer Dam is not needed but do not specifically exclude the use of one.
8. The contractor is required to review the site with the COR and identify trees and areas within the Work Area to be protected and undisturbed during construction. The Village should try to participate in this meeting or perform an independent review of the area to identify trees and or areas that should be protected during construction. Perhaps a member of the LAC and/or the Olmsted Society could assist in this.
9. Specifications talk about area of clearing indicated in Plans. No area of clearing is indicated in the plans and again, we would contend that areas of clearing and grubbing should not include any high value tree specimen.
10. Specifications indicate to Remove All Trees in Zone 1. Zone 1 is not defined.
11. Specifications discuss new stone pathways indicated on the plans with aluminum L shaped edging and a stone/stabilizer mix. These paths are not indicated on the Plans. Further we would advocate the use of a more natural design, specifically an impervious surface without edging. (Section 32-15-41)
12. Specifications state that all areas delineated on the plan and associated with a seeding/planting list shall be planted with the specified seed list. No delineation of areas is shown on the plans and no plant list is provided. Perhaps the LAC and/or the Olmsted Society can assist in creating/reviewing the plant list. (Section 32-92-19.10-03)
13. Specifications state the Meadow Trail Area as shown in the drawings shall be seeded with Turf grass seed mix shown in Table 1. It is unclear what area is to be seeded with turf grass; however we question whether turf grass is appropriate since it is high maintenance and nonnative. Maybe a no mow fescue or some other more sustainable seed mix should be considered. (Section 32-92-19-.13)
14. Herbicides and fertilizer are being specified. Use of chemicals should be limited and natural products used as much as is feasible. Perhaps the nature of the herbicides and fertilizers should be reviewed by the LAC and/or the Olmsted Society.
15. Sod is being proposed at the Hofmann Dam Site including one year of maintenance. It is not clear from the documents where sod is being used. (Section 32-92-23)