

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Osborn Drawings: Sheets C-003 and S-100 both show slightly different information regarding locations of pea gravel backfill and clay or earth backfill.	The drawings have been revised to match the limits of the pea gravel and earth backfill.
Osborn Drawings: Preservation Designs did not see the minimum slope for both perforated pipes (is this 1% slope to the east?).	The pipe slope has been added to the drawings.
Osborn Drawings: the perforated pipes exit the east wall, but there is no detail on their exterior appearance. Ideally, having white PVC sticking out of the wall does not lend itself to a historic look. Instead, the exterior appearance should reflect what the original masons used on this wall for drainage points, provided the historic appearance would not inversely impact the wall's structural integrity. (See PHOTO 2 for what may be such a drainage exit point). If no existing historic drainage point can be used as a reference, the next best way would be terminating those pipes so no PVC is visible and then using a termination device appropriate to c.1900, provided the design would not interfere with the wall's structural integrity.	After review, it has been determined that a stone scupper will be installed at each outlet to keep with the historic appearance. A picture of what will be used has been provided.
Osborn Drawings: Sheet S-100 appears to not match the location of the section marker noted on C-003. Either S-100's drawing should be flipped so that the wall is on the right side of the section or that the section outlined on C-003 is mirrored to face West, not East.	Section marker has been revised.
The Korda report states roots and other vegetative matter should be removed from the entire length of the stone retaining wall, not just the southeast corner. Adding this to the statement of work would ensure its completion. Coordinate with the owner, the City of Dublin or another entity having authority regarding who would conduct this work, if this work is approved.	Note has been added to eradicate this invasive tree with herecide treatment and removal.
The Korda report notes the south wall's top row of dressed, rectangular stones are missing, likely due to the drain-off from the parking area above. Ideally, the stone mason should add back the original stones or their reproductions, if the originals are not available, as part of the scope of work. The top of these dressed stones should correspond to the top of wall shown on Osborn's Sheet S-100.	The intent of the re-building of the wall is to mimic the wall near Cohatch to the best extent practical utilizing the existing stones available on site. If additional dressed stones are needed a local stone quarry will be used to obtain closely matching stones.
The Korda report noted that a lower segment of wall, corresponding to the southernmost portion of the east wall (see PHOTO 3), had shifted east. The Osborn report does not note this shift east. (See also the additional request for information below regarding the wall's northeast corner having an apparently similar condition.)	This area of the wall is being re-built.
The Korda report noted that mortar-filled joints were inhibiting the retaining wall's design function to shed water behind and through. The Osborn report did not provide information regarding mortaring joints, whether in wall areas that are to be rebuilt or are to remain as-is. Please confirm what areas require mortar, if any, and how would the wall's traditional water shedding function would be impacted and if any additional mitigation would be necessary.	Mortar will be used as needed to facilitate the repair, however the drainage issue is being resolved with the installation of the two-tier underdrain system. The drainage will no longer route through the wall, therefore the mortar will no longer present an issue.

<p>Regarding the exposed sewer pipe penetrating the east wall (see note 5 in Fig. 2), please provide information on how rebuilding the wall would be best accomplished, also taking into account if the sewer pipe were to stay as-is, or if the sewer pipe could be moved westward, inside the eastern wall during the rebuild (the preferred option). If the sanitary pipe were to stay as-is, what additional work is needed, including mortaring, sanitary repairs, etc? Please provide any details of this work if this work is approved.</p>	<p>The sanitary pipe will be relocated westward to avoid the penetration through the wall. A note has been added to the plan sheets indicating such.</p>
<p>Where the new perforated pipes exit the stone, would splash blocks need to be installed below, or would mortar need to anchor the pipes in place on the wall?</p>	<p>Stone splash blocks will be installed to maintain a historic look. A picture of what will be provided has been included.</p>
<p>Would the PVC drainage pipes need some sort of grill or screen to prevent animals from using and/or obstructing the exiting water's flow? Would the far end of the perforated pipes need a cap?</p>	<p>A stone scupper will now be installed at these areas.</p>
<p>In May 2021, Preservation Designs conducted a brief site visit, taking photos including of the northeast corner of the stone retaining wall, where it appears to have some lateral shifting similarly to that at southeast corner (see PHOTO 4). Preservation Designs asks for the structural engineer(s) to review this portion of the wall and devise any additional work, if necessary.</p>	<p>This work in the northeast corner is out of this project's scope. The Engineer has reviewed the area of lateral shifting and has determined it to be minor and not effecting the structural integrity of the wall.</p>
<p>The construction of the new COhatch building north of the eastern half of 40 N High's lot appears to have affected a segment of the retaining wall, showing a small leg of the wall roughly disassembled per PHOTO</p>	<p>This work in the northeast corner is out of this project's scope.</p>
<p>Please confirm if work is needed to stabilize the northern retaining wall and/or the stub retaining wall that is perpendicular to 25 North Street's building (COhatch).</p>	<p>This work in the northeast corner is out of this project's scope.</p>
<p>Please provide guidance regarding the parking lot at the top of the retaining wall. The original wall design could not have accounted for parking, much less the heavier vehicles in use today. Should parking at this location be removed or reduced, and if parking can remain, what guidelines should it follow? What is the minimum clear distance in plan need where parking and/or vehicular traffic can occur? What barriers should be used to prevent areas from receiving vehicular traffic (such as parking bumpers) would work best?</p>	<p>Proposed parking blocks will be installed to avoid cars parking close to the wall.</p>
<p>Regarding the rebuilding of a portion of the stone wall, are there any foundation materials or issues that would be unacceptable from the structural point of view? The mason believes the wall originally sat on clay, and is assuming a 1500psi of undisturbed soil; however, Dublin's Historic District is known for having limestone near its surface. Ideally, a soil report would inform the engineer of the types of soil in this area and the best methods for reconstruction.</p>	<p>The wall configuration is not changing and there is no sign of settlement, hence there will no change in soil pressure. The existing condition is adequate to support it.</p>

<p>The current proposed work states the existing 1950s low retaining wall, located behind 36 N High, would be utilized to replace stones deemed unable to be reutilized. Please outline your procedure regarding procuring new stone, in case this is also needed. Ideally this would be from the same source as what was originally used on the retaining wall, which is believed to be on-site or from a nearby quarry. It is important for any new stone to match the form, texture, and color of the stone it is replacing.</p>	<p>The intent is to utilize existing stone on site to re-build the wall. If additional stones are needed a local stone quarry will be used to obtain stones that closely match the form, texture and color of the existing.</p>
<p>Regarding the use of historic mortar, this should depend on whether the structural engineer(s) feel mortar in general would be needed, and if so, what areas and what specific mortar type, and if weeps or other material and/or details are necessary. From the historical perspective, the wall functioned without the use of mortar, so returning the wall to its original function would be ideal.</p>	<p>Mortar will be used sparingly and on a "as needed" basis. The drainage concerns indicated in this report on the use of mortar are being relieved with the underdrain system.</p>
<p>The current proposal did not include a safety plan, and the representative projects provided are of retaining walls appearing shorter than this six-foot-plus wall. Excavating the existing soil and fill behind the retaining wall could destabilize the remaining soil and/or the wall. Please ensure all work is conducted under Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards, including a review of the soil analysis report.</p>	<p>A safety plan can be provided for building permit.</p>
<p>Also, regarding the 1950s retaining wall located behind 36 N High, a row of large, rectangular dressed stones, similar to the ones used on top of the retaining wall, sit a few feet east of the 1950s wall (see PHOTO 6). Please ensure these stones are to remain, ideally in their existing locations, unless there is evidence that they are the stones missing from the top of the southern portion of the retaining wall.</p>	<p>This wall is to be preserved.</p>
<p>Regarding the drainage of the new perforated PVC to be installed (see notes regarding Osborn Drawings), if Vic Art Masonry has any familiarity with what a drainage point would have looked like historically, whether similar to what is seen in PHOTO 2 or is typical historically for Central Ohio, please provide this information for review and the project's potential use.</p>	<p>Stone scuppers now being used.</p>