

Submittal Report

Financial Project:	438262-1-52-01	Submittal Type:	OTHER
Submittal Phase:	REVISED	Submittal Staff Type:	CONSULTANT
Received Date:	5/26/2026	Response Due Date:	7/10/2026
Grace Period:	0	District:	FIRST
Status:	OPEN	Create Date:	5/26/2026
Create User Id:	RD158JL	Last Update:	5/26/2026
		Last Update User Id:	RD158JL

Description:

PH IIR

This email shall serve as a transmittal letter for a Phase IIR plans review. Please provide Phase IIR comments for this project.
438262-1| SR 45 (US 41) TAMIAMI TRAIL FROM CONWAY BLVD TO MIDWAY BLVD. This project is located in Charlotte County.

The following component sets have been included in this Phase IIR submittal:

- **Roadway
- **Roadway - Verified Utilities
- **Roadway - Core Borings
- **Signing and Pavement Marking
- **Signalization Plans
- **Lighting Plans
- **Structures Plans

The following documentation has been included with the submittal:

- **Estimated Quantities
- **TMP Form 240
- **Summary of Pay Items
- **Utility Conflict Matrix
- **Project Edit Report
- **Stormwater Management Report
- **CADD Zip File

Plans and supporting documents can be found in the ERC under the Documents tab or on the local server at the following location:

S:\Project Management\ERP\43826215201\PhaseII-Rev

PSEE link:

<https://projectsuite.dot.state.fl.us/Pages/Project/Project.aspx?item=438262&itemSeg=1>

Threads:

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Amy Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Casey Schley	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
CHRIS CARPENTER	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Chris Coughlin	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	23

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
19	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 9 / Typical Sections	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
a) Unclear how the areas identified as "Sod (1' Min)" are to be graded. Per FDM 913.2.1 (17), recommend providing proposed grading for all roadside slopes.			
b) Back of Sidewalk Profiles contain information for both a Proposed Ditch & Proposed County Ditch. Recommend clarifying which location(s) are consistent with which ditches on Typical Sections.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
a) The sod section in question is part of the "Flat (1:6 MAX.)" section. The leaderline will be moved to point to the center of the segment for clarity.			
b) A label will be added to the Typical Section to indicate the ditch profile.			
Chris Coughlin	6/30/2026	1	
Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
20	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 10 / Typical Sections	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
Index 330-001 of the Standard Plans outlines guidelines for material types & thicknesses for paved connections, both driveways & roadways. Please clarify how the proposed driveway reconstruction design was established, as it calls for the heavier of the two Base Groups in addition to 3" of structural asphalt, twice that required.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
The proposed Driveway Reconstruction utilized a pavement design that was used on another project in the area. We will revise the pavement design to remove the 1.5" of friction course on the driveways so it aligns with Index 330-001.			
Chris Coughlin	6/30/2026	1	
Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
21	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 11 / Typical Sections	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
a) When curb & gutter is proposed in locations is does not exist, please clarify how it is to be stabilized.			
b) Please clarify where Pavement Widening is proposed.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
a) Per discussion at the initial MOT and Constructability meeting, the proposed curb and gutter does not require stabilization since it is located in areas that appear to be previously stabilized. Generally, curb and gutter is being replaced where the existing shoulder pavement is being and/or existing curb and gutter is being removed and being reset.			
b) Pavement Widening is utilized between sta. 244+77 and 245+06. This will remain a separate pavement design due to the reduction in driveway pavement design and the pattern/legend will be updated. Additionally pavement widening is being added at locations along the sidestreets where existing pipes are being removed and new pipes are being installed.			
Chris Coughlin	6/30/2026	1	
Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
22	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 16 / General Notes	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
Note 13: Please clarify how the contractor is to be compensated for this effort.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	

This General Note is included per the Standard Plans Instructions (SPI) for Index 536-002 which states this is in accordance with Specification 562 which states

"562-4 Basis of Payment.

No direct payment will be made for galvanizing compound coating of welded surfaces or for field repair of damaged galvanized surfaces. Include the cost to perform these operations, in the Contract price for the item which includes the member being so treated."

Chris Coughlin 6/30/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
24	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 18 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1		
a) Please clarify how the proposed compound radius (100' & 200') was established. What Design Vehicle was utilized? Was an AutoTurn analysis performed?				
b) Unpaved shoulder construction is not depicted on Typical Sections. Is the intent for stabilization to be placed up to the finished grade, at 0.06, & sodded? Please review & clarify. Recommend detailing.				
Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1		
a) The 100' radius is replacing existing curb and gutter along a similar radius. The 200' radius was developed tangent to the 100' radius and connects to the existing mainline edge of pavement. The minimum pavement width between the splitter island and outside curb is being maintained between the existing condition and proposed condition.				
b) The area with asphalt removal, regrading and sod will not require stabilization as this is an area that appears to be previously stabilized. Typical Section Details will be added to show the regrading intent with slopes.				
Chris Coughlin	7/13/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
25	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 19 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1		
Please clarify intent of reducing the sidewalk width to 6' while traversing around the existing light pole near Sta. 211+75, RT. Even with a kink in the geometry, can a constant 8' width not be maintained?				
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1		
This approach was discussed and approved by FDOT in order to not require light pole replacement at this location. With the required tie down slopes, it is not possible to install 8' sidewalk at this location.				
Chris Coughlin	6/30/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
26	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 20 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1		
CR-E curb ramps are called for in the directional islands at Galway Ln. Is intent for curb ramps to be installed, ramping pedestrians up & immediately back down, or is intent for depressed, at-grade pedestrian refuges within the directional islands? Please review & clarify.				
Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1		
Please note that there are details for this area on the Special Details sheet. The detail sheet provides information about the slope intent. The detail shows 0.02 slope up and down to provide positive drainage and prevent ponding in the curb ramp areas.				
Chris Coughlin	7/13/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
27	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 21 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1		
General Notes sheet indicates Charlotte County has agreed to maintain sidewalk beyond FDOT R/W, within County R/W limits. Please clarify who will be responsible for maintaining elements that are not sidewalk located beyond FDOT R/W, within County R/W.				

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

We are coordinating with Aileen Keating (FDOT Local Program Coordinator) to determine if the proposed MES' within the County R/W need to be added to the maintenance agreement.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
28	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 26 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

a) Please clarify the intent of the 12' long, 2'-wide shoulders proposed at all turnout locations abutting flush paved shoulders. Paved shoulders already exist.

b) The proposed curb return radii vary significantly across the returns of the two turnouts. Please review & clarify intent. Additionally, suggest identifying locations where radii begin/end.

c) Per Index 330-001 of the Standard Plans, private driveways are to have a minimum unpaved shoulder width of 5' Please review. Can Structure S-204 be located beyond this footprint?

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

a) Because the mainline is not being milled and resurfaced, the driveway reconstruction was designed for constructability providing enough space for compaction. The area extends to the limit of the theoretical radius point.

b) Driveway reconstruction was designed to meet the FDM to the extent feasible otherwise to match the current driveway footprint and to tie into the existing asphalt at the R/W. The missing station/offset location will be added.

c) Structure S-204 is replacing an existing DBI in place to maintain existing drainage patterns. This ditch bottom inlet is almost flush with the adjacent pavement.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
29	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 28 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

Consider labeling Proposed County Ditch linework.

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

At locations where a ditch centerline definition is required including in the proposed county ditch, labels will be added.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
30	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 29 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

a) General Notes sheet discusses removal of cement-sand riprap when proposed sand-cement riprap bags are to be installed. Please clarify intent of the existing erosion control measures in the return of Elkcam Blvd, within the footprint of the proposed sidewalk alignment.

b) Back of Sidewalk Profile indicates there is a Proposed County Ditch from Sta. 265+76 to Sta. 267+85 & from Sta. 271+74 to Sta. 273+49. Consider depicting & labeling.

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

a) A detail will be added to indicate the locations where existing rubble riprap will be removed and reinstalled.

b) In locations where a ditch centerline definition is required, labels will be added.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
31	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 31 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

- a) Provided the driveway is being reconstructed, locating a DBI within the limits of the newly constructed turnout necessary? Can it not be located outside the limits of the turnout, or eliminated?
- b) The proposed alignment for the South Florida Skin Center appears as though it could impact circulation. Has the proposed turnout alignment been coordinated with the property owner?
- c) Parking spaces will be impacted for the Absolute Blinds driveway. Has this been coordinated with the property owner?

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

- a) Structure S-319 is replacing an existing DBI in place to maintain existing drainage patterns.
- b) The driveway near Sta. 278 for the Doctors Plaza is designed to maintain the current circulation pattern while also providing access to existing parking spaces near the right of way. A meeting was held with Kevin Ingle to confirm the design. We also met with the owner and driveway modification letters have been sent. The coordination with the property owner is still ongoing.
- c) The driveway near Sta. 280 for Absolute Blinds is designed to maintain access to the existing parking spaces near the right of way. Parking within the FDOT right of way is not permitted. A meeting was held with Kevin Ingle to confirm the design. We also met with the owner and driveway modification letters have been sent. The coordination with the property owner is still ongoing.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
32	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 33 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
	Provided driveways are being reconstructed, please clarify why conventional geometry is not being established. It appears several unnecessary deflections / kinks could be eliminated. See similar circumstances throughout.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1	
	The driveways are being reconstructed to provide an ADA crossing for the proposed sidewalk. Driveway reconstruction was designed to minimize kinks where possible, to match the current driveway footprint, and match the existing asphalt limits at and beyond the right of way.			
	Chris Coughlin	7/13/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
33	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 34 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
	Please clarify width of pedestrian refuge between the two turnouts, near Sta. 294+40, RT. Station / Offset labels indicate it may be less than the 8' sidewalk width. Provided there is no curb face to protect it, are there concerns with regard to off-tracking over the pedestrian refuge?			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1	
	The sidewalk width provided meets the 6-ft requirement at back of curb. The design maintains the two driveways and more clearly delineates the edge of the driveway. The existing business types, size of the parking, and parking lot geometry indicates large vehicles are not anticipated. Minimal off-tracking is anticipated.			
	Chris Coughlin	7/13/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
34	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 39 / Back of Sidewalk Profile	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
	Per FDM 222.2.1.3, sidewalk grades are not to exceed 5%. Acknowledged note indicates actual slope differs. However, please confirm grade does not exceed criteria on the approach to the Easy Street intersection.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1	
	The profile approaching Easy Street will be reviewed to confirm the grade does not exceed criteria.			
	Chris Coughlin	7/13/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
35	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 40 / Back of Sidewalk Profile	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
	Please confirm the back of sidewalk grade is constant near Sta. 211+90, where the sidewalk kinks around an existing light pole & narrows in width.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
	The Back of Sidewalk profile will be updated to include PI points at all points around the light pole.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/30/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
36	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 46 / Back of Sidewalk Profile	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
	Please confirm the PI at Sta. 246+20 is necessary. It appears as though there may be an opportunity to eliminate it, flattening the steeper of the two grades.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1	
	The profile will be reviewed at this location to confirm if the PI is necessary.			
	Chris Coughlin	7/13/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
37	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 59 / Special Profiles	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
	Is intent for the driveways being reconstructed to be crowned down the centerline? Please clarify. If not, may consider providing grading details ensuring ponding does not occur when low points are within turnouts.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1	
	The intent for all reconstructed driveways is to be crowned down the center. Each driveway has been modeled and the special profiles developed using this approach.			
	Chris Coughlin	7/13/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
38	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 77 / Special Details	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	
	Special Gutter Profile Detail: Please clarify how Type F Curb & Gutter with Special Gutter Profile is to be paid for. The Basis of Estimates has established a Pay Item for this that is not included in the Estimated Quantities Report; 520-1-12. Please review.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
	Pay item 520-1-12 will be added to the EQR for special gutter profile locations.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/30/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
39	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 279 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

Please clarify how lane closure restrictions were established. Was a Lane Closure Analysis performed? Lane Closure Worksheet calculations are to be provided with the submittal in accordance with the District 1 Maintenance of Traffic Review Policy. Please provide.

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

The Lane Closure Analysis was completed and the restrictions were reviewed at the MOT and Constructability meeting. The lane closure analysis was submitted to you on June 30, 2026.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
40	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 288 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

How long are crosswalk closures permitted? Was consideration given to providing the contractor with duration limitations?

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

The following note has been utilized and approved by the District and will be added to the plans:
Restrict pedestrian curb ramp and sidewalk improvements to four consecutive days per corner of pedestrian improvements. Restrict pedestrian intersection improvements to one intersection at a time.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
42	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR / Page 1 - Signature Page	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

F.A.C. Rule 61G15-23.004 was updated to lift restrictions placed on Digital Signature requirements. Please review Figure 902.2.1 & revise Signing & Sealing language accordingly.

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

The EQR cover page will be updated.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
43	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	6/17/2026	1	

Attached is the marked-up plan set for your reference.

Please feel free to contact me if you want to discuss any of the comments.
Chris Coughlin, P.E.
Florida Department of Transportation D1
Chris.Coughlin@dot.state.fl.us
(Cell) 813-447-9207

Matthew Gibbs 7/8/2026 1

Thank you for your review.

Chris Coughlin 7/13/2026 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Forestt	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
1	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Contamination Technical Memorandum	CONTAMINATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Christopher Forestt	5/26/2026	1		
This comment does not require a written response from the Designers other than acknowledgement. Please review the attached Contamination Technical Memorandum, which explains there is potential contamination and hazardous material involvement. Thank you. Again, the Designers need only to acknowledge this comment.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1		
Thank your for your review and providing the Contamination memo.				
Christopher Forestt	6/30/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
DAVID DOWLING	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	8
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
11	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		172	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1		
What is the 0.06% label for?				
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1		
The label will be updated for the revised sidewalk design at 208+50.				
DAVID DOWLING	6/29/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
12	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		177	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1		
Cross section 213+50, is the sidewalk slope arrow correct?				
Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1		
Yes the slope arrow was confirmed to be correct at Sta. 213+50.				
DAVID DOWLING	6/29/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
13	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		185	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1	
	Are the sidewalk slope arrows correct?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
	Yes the slope arrows were confirmed to be correct.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/29/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
14	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		186	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1	
	Are the sidewalk slope arrows correct?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
	Yes the slope arrows were confirmed to be correct.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/29/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
15	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		226	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1	
	Are the sidewalk slope arrows correct?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
	The slope arrows will be corrected at Sta. 262+00 and 262+50.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/29/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
16	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		225	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1	
	Is the sidewalk slope arrow correct for Sta 261+50?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
	The slope arrows will be corrected at Sta. 261+50.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/29/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
17	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		257	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1	
	Is the sidewalk slope arrow correct Sta 293+50?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/29/2026	1	
	The slope arrows will be corrected at Sta. 293+50.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/29/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
18	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		29 and 30	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	6/17/2026	1	
	Is the existing sidewalk to remain in good condition and does it meet ADA compliance?			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1	
	The existing sidewalk location was previously field reviewed. There are two locations of cracked/ broken sidewalk which is shown in the plans for replacement. The remaining sidewalk was found to be in good condition. The slopes were confirmed with survey information and are ADA compliant.			
	DAVID DOWLING	7/8/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Deborah Barnhill	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Garfield Howell	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	2

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
23	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	6/17/2026	1	
	Previous signing comments have been addressed. Traffic design has no additional comment.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/30/2026	1	
	Thank you for your review.			
	Garfield Howell	7/1/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
44	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	6/17/2026	1	
	Per previous phase 2 lighting response, lighting maybe provided at intersections. Therefore, an updated lighting analysis would be required			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1	
	Art Tester with VIBE will be sending this to you directly.			
	Garfield Howell	7/15/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jacques Louis	IN-HOUSE PROJECT MANAGER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
JASON NEWTON	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeanna Dean	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
JEFF KEYSER	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey James	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jhamaul Hanner	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jimmy Vilce	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
JODY MANSELL	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kristin Caruso	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Laura Herrero	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
MARY KATE ROBERTS	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
41	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CULTURAL RESOURCES,ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
MARY KATE ROBERTS	6/17/2026	1		
Phase II Revised plans (dated May 2026) were compared to Phase II plans (dated March 2026). There are no substantial changes to the scope of work. Based on a desktop review, there are known cultural resource concerns with this project. We recommend a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS), including field survey, be prepared and submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for review. The Environmental Management Office (EMO) will coordinate the production of this document soon and with SHPO prior to the completion of the environmental certification. The SHPO will have 30 days to respond once the document is submitted.				
Matthew Gibbs	7/8/2026	1		
Agree, thank you for your review.				
MARY KATE ROBERTS	7/15/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Matthew Gibbs	CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER	7/10/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Meghan Croft	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Michelle Barker	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	8
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
2	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR - page 34	ESTIMATES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1		
This pay item (0530 1 100) requires coordination with the State Drainage Office per BOE. Has this been completed?				
Matthew Gibbs	6/17/2026	1		
Per coordination with FDOT District 1 Drainage we are changing the pay item for the proposed riprap and will continue to coordinate with them and any State Drainage as necessary for approvals.				
Michelle Barker	6/18/2026	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
3	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR - page 64	ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1	
	Transport has a total quantity of 688 for pay item 0630 2 11. Please verify.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/16/2026	1	
	The Transport typo will be corrected to 668 for the Signalization quantity for pay item 630-2-11. Please note there are additional quantities for this pay item under the Lighting component as well. Both quantities will be verified to match between the EQR and Transport.			
	Michelle Barker	6/17/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
4	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		EQR - page 70	ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1	
	These pay items for signs should be broken out per location per BOE 8.2.1.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/16/2026	1	
	The Summary of Signing and Pavement Marking will be updated to include the sign locations.			
	Michelle Barker	6/17/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
5	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Key Sheet	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1	
	UTV sheets has 4 sheets. Please verify.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/16/2026	1	
	Correct, the UTV sheets will be updated on the roadway key sheet and the sheet numbers corrected on the UTV sheets.			
	Michelle Barker	6/17/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
6	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Key sheet	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1	
	Statement for structure plans is missing on key sheet. See FDM Exhibit 910-1.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/16/2026	1	
	The Standard Plans note for Bridge Construction will be added.			
	Michelle Barker	6/17/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
7	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Key Sheet	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1	
	We should have Guide Sign worksheets in this plan set for the proposed signs and for multi-post signs, include the number of posts needed and the column size and length per FDM 940.5.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/16/2026	1	
	We are not proposing new sign panels for the multi-post signs so the worksheets were not used. The pay item 700-2-500 (Multi-column ground sign assembly, relocate) is the only multi-post item for this project. We have provided post information and column size on the Signing and Pavement Marking Plan sheets (S-11, S-13, S-19, S-22).			
	Michelle Barker	6/17/2026	1	

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
8	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet L-5	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1	
	These pay items (639 3 11, 641 2 11) are not listed in Transport. Please verify.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/17/2026	1	
	These pay items will be added to TRNSPORT.			
	Michelle Barker	6/18/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
9	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Key Sheet	STRUCTURES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Michelle Barker	6/3/2026	1	
	Map, beginning and ending MP's, North arrow, and FAC rule is missing. Please see FDM Exhibit 302-3.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/17/2026	1	
	The keysheet will be updated to address these items.			
	Michelle Barker	6/18/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nikki Gilmer	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Patrick Bateman	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Rebecca Johnson	REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
10	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Rebecca Johnson	6/9/2026	1	
	Phase 52 Construction Cost is \$11,038,388.13 PDC based on Transport quantities. See attached file.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/16/2026	1	
	Thank you for providing this information.			
	Rebecca Johnson	6/16/2026	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
ROBERT FAKHRI	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Rushil Kasetty	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ryan Molloy	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Steven Nolan	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Todd Boehmer	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wayne Shelton	LEAD REVIEWER	6/19/2026	ACTIVE	0*