

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION FORM

PROJECT NO.: 608164

DESCRIPTION: Sudbury BFRT 2D

DESIGNER: Municipality Consultant

SUBMITTAL: 25%

REVIEW SECTION: Landscape Design

PROJ. MANAGER: John Gendall



CONSULTANT EVALUATION SCORE: 5

DATE: February 7, 2018

REVIEWER NAME: Stephanie Smoot

NO.	SHEET OR ITEM	COMMENT	INITIAL ACTION	RESPONSE	QC REVIEW INITIAL	FINAL ACTION VERIFIED
A			COMPLETED BY DESIGNER			BY REVIEWER
1	Sheet 2	Please add note that all tree protection must be in place and approved by RE before onset of construction activities.				
2	Sheet 5	Please field-verify this section of the trail connects to the prior section North of White Pond which is currently under construction. The under-construction 2B section of trail at White Pond end may not reach the Concord/Sudbury line.				
3	general	Item 102 Selective Clearing and Thinning (Area) and Item 102.2 Tree trimming (Foot): Please ensure there is sufficient tree trimming item to cover costs of tree removal and pruning including above overhanging branches 30 feet up or so. Very often they are overlooked in construction walks because they are considered "outside the limit of work". Additional tree work is sometimes needed after the major clearing.				

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION FORM

PROJECT NO.: 608164

DESCRIPTION: Sudbury BFRT 2D

DESIGNER: Municipality Consultant

SUBMITTAL: 25%

REVIEW SECTION: Landscape Design

PROJ. MANAGER John Gendall



CONSULTANT EVALUATION SCORE: 5

DATE: February 7, 2018

REVIEWER NAME: Stephanie Smoot

NO.	SHEET OR ITEM	COMMENT	INITIAL ACTION	RESPONSE	QC REVIEW INITIAL	FINAL ACTION VERIFIED
A			COMPLETED BY DESIGNER			BY REVIEWER
4	general	Design consistency: Please check that design is reasonably consistent with previous sections of BFRT even though they were done by different consultants and going through different towns. Some things that look different or missing compared to previous sections are: lack of stonedust shoulders, split rail fence rather than 3 rail bolted timber railings, landscape screening, preservation of historical relics, flush splitter islands, invasive plant control, modular block wall, directional/informational kiosks and signage, and seating.				
5	Sheet 5	Wall Section RT: What is the height of proposed wood rail fence on top of wall? Label in detail.				
6	Sheet 5	Wall Section RT: What material is the retaining wall composed of?				
7	Sheet 5	Wall Section RT: Consider showing some drainage behind retaining wall.				
8	Sheet 5	Typical Section Boardwalk: Please show location of boardwalk graphically on plan. Other than a label, it is hard to see where this is used.				
9	spec	Clearing and Grubbing: Previous sections of BFRT erroneously required scraping of organics to bare soil and stockpiling. This was an error that has since been changed and we do not want it in this project either. Please double-check to make sure this note doesn't somehow work it's way back into spec book.				

COLUMN "NO.:" PREFIX FOR COMMENT NO'S - PLANS =P, SPEC. PROVS=S, EST.=E, CALC BOOK=C, BRIDGE CALCS=D, OTHER = O
"ACTION" A=WILL INCORPORATE, B=WILL EVALUATE, C=DELETE COMMENT

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION FORM

PROJECT NO.: 608164

DESCRIPTION: Sudbury BFRT 2D

DESIGNER: Municipality Consultant

SUBMITTAL: 25%

REVIEW SECTION: Landscape Design

PROJ. MANAGER John Gendall



CONSULTANT EVALUATION SCORE: 5

DATE: February 7, 2018

REVIEWER NAME: Stephanie Smoot

NO.	SHEET OR ITEM	COMMENT	INITIAL ACTION	RESPONSE	QC REVIEW INITIAL	FINAL ACTION VERIFIED
A			COMPLETED BY DESIGNER			BY REVIEWER
10	Sheet 6	Provide info on type of retaining wall.				
11	Sheet 8	Route 20 trailhead: The trail stops just shy of a busy intersection. Consider interim connection treatment to end of trail so people/emergency vehicles can turn around or exit trail without too much back-tracking. More permanent solution may include acquiring additional ROW to Route 20, or permission to access to Union Street via Chiswick Park driveway/abandoned rail line.				
12	general	Include contingency trees in case selective tree clearing results in residents getting unwanted exposure to rail trail. Some example locations include: North of 117 At Haynes Road, north of Featherland Park, Peakham Road/Route 27 intersection, Pennymeadow Road,				
13	general	In past, dumping has occurred within ROW. If this condition exists, for aesthetic reasons, consider adding a requirement that this material be removed during clearing and grubbing.				
14	Sheet 18	Local connections and wayfinding signage: This trail passes by Featherland Park which could be a logical place for users to park and access trail, use restrooms, etc. Consider if signage is appropriate here and also promote community connections to the three public schools within a quarter mile of the trail.				

COLUMN "NO." PREFIX FOR COMMENT NO'S - PLANS =P, SPEC. PROVS=S, EST.=E, CALC BOOK=C, BRIDGE CALCS=D, OTHER = O
"ACTION" A=WILL INCORPORATE, B=WILL EVALUATE, C=DELETE COMMENT

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION FORM

PROJECT NO.: 608164

DESCRIPTION: Sudbury BFRT 2D

DESIGNER: Municipality Consultant

SUBMITTAL: 25%

REVIEW SECTION: Landscape Design

PROJ. MANAGER John Gendall



CONSULTANT EVALUATION SCORE: 5

DATE: February 7, 2018

REVIEWER NAME: Stephanie Smoot

NO.	SHEET OR ITEM	COMMENT	INITIAL ACTION	RESPONSE	QC REVIEW INITIAL	FINAL ACTION VERIFIED
A			COMPLETED BY DESIGNER			BY REVIEWER
15	Sheet 16	Town Square at Route 27: This is a logical place to stop for water, ice cream, etc. so consider adding signage or other amenities such as benches here to complement. Possibly include signage to historic Sudbury Center buildings, graveyard and elementary school.				
16	sheet 9	Commercial trucks exiting from the landscape supply at the Codjer Lane intersection will not be expecting cyclists. Provide measures to protect users crossing the driveway.				
17	general	There are substantial areas of wetland crossings bridged with boardwalk or retaining walls. Consider design measures to connect isolated wetlands and restore natural drainage patterns where possible.				
18	Sheet 10	Bridge deck replacement at Hop Brook Station and direct viewer to the bridge detail on plans.				
19	general	Invasive plant treatment: Recommend a discussion on invasive plant treatment prior to submittal of NOI. If there are invasive plants to be removed that are located within resource areas, Sudbury Conservation Commission will want to weigh in on any proposed treatment, especially if herbicides are proposed. Any residential abutters should be notified if herbicide is being used. This information will be helpful to define scope and				
20	Sheet 18	Cattle Crossing Station 190+50: Unclear what happens here. Consider alerting path users of any free-range livestock ahead.				

COLUMN "NO." PREFIX FOR COMMENT NO'S - PLANS =P, SPEC. PROVS=S, EST.=E, CALC BOOK=C, BRIDGE CALCS=D, OTHER =O
"ACTION" A=WILL INCORPORATE, B=WILL EVALUATE, C=DELETE COMMENT

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION FORM

PROJECT NO.: 608164

DESCRIPTION: Sudbury BFRT 2D

DESIGNER: Municipality Consultant

SUBMITTAL: 25%

REVIEW SECTION: Landscape Design

PROJ. MANAGER John Gendall



CONSULTANT EVALUATION SCORE: 5

DATE: February 7, 2018

REVIEWER NAME: Stephanie Smoot

NO.	SHEET OR ITEM	COMMENT	INITIAL ACTION	RESPONSE	QC REVIEW INITIAL	FINAL ACTION VERIFIED
A			COMPLETED BY DESIGNER			BY REVIEWER
21	Sheet 21	Landscape shrubs: Much of this corridor is forested. Shrub species indicated may not grow in the shade or may grow slowly. What are the expectations as shrubs will take a while to fill in before they become suitable barriers/screens.				
22	Sheet 20	Plant native and/or pollinators where possible, there are active farming communities in this area. Please change Zelkova trees to something native like a Sugar Maple or American Linden.				
23	Sheet 26	Sheet 273 at Haynes Road: what is purpose of shrub planting at this location?				
24	Sheet 30	Station 304+00 Wetland soil and seeding: Please provide more information on placement and context of these items. Are there any temporary or permanent wetland impacts that will be restored or replicated in this project that would require the services of a wetland specialist and wetland item?				
25	Sheet 31	Retaining wall station 295 +00 to station 305+00 both sides: Would a board walk be cheaper and require less soil disturbance?				
26	general	Show retaining walls in plans on the section or profiles sheets.				
27	general	Include construction details for boardwalk and other constructed features.				

COLUMN "NO." PREFIX FOR COMMENT NO'S - PLANS =P, SPEC. PROVS=S, EST.=E, CALC BOOK=C, BRIDGE CALCS=D, OTHER = O
"ACTION" A=WILL INCORPORATE, B=WILL EVALUATE, C=DELETE COMMENT

DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION FORM

PROJECT NO.: 608164

DESCRIPTION: Sudbury BFRT 2D

DESIGNER: Municipality Consultant

SUBMITTAL: 25%

REVIEW SECTION: Landscape Design

PROJ. MANAGER John Gendall



CONSULTANT EVALUATION SCORE: 5

DATE: February 7, 2018

REVIEWER NAME: Stephanie Smoot

NO.	SHEET OR ITEM	COMMENT	INITIAL ACTION	RESPONSE	QC REVIEW INITIAL	FINAL ACTION VERIFIED
A			COMPLETED BY DESIGNER			BY REVIEWER
28	specific ation	Include specifications for next submittal.				
29	general	Wood privacy fence: Is eight feet height really needed here or is six feet sufficient? Six foot is more readily available and depending on grading, six feet may work just as well as a screen.				