

Submittal Report

Financial Project:	438262-1-52-01	Submittal Type:	PLANS
Submittal Phase:	PHASE II	Submittal Staff Type:	CONSULTANT
Received Date:	4/23/2025	Response Due Date:	6/19/2025
Grace Period:	0	District:	FIRST
Status:	CLOSED	Create Date:	4/23/2025
Create User Id:	RD158JJ	Last Update:	4/23/2025
		Last Update User Id:	RD158JJ

Description:

Phase II Plans

This email shall serve as a transmittal letter for a Phase II plans review. Please provide Phase II comments for this project. This project is located in Charlotte County.

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

- **Roadway
- **Signing and Pavement Marking
- **Signalization
- **Structures

The following documentation has been included with the submittal:

- **LRE Markup
- **Environmental Determination Worksheet
- **KMZ File
- **Lighting Design Analysis Report
- **CADD Zip File
- **Drainage Report
- **Estimated Quantities Report
- **Lane CLOSure Analysis
- **Pavement Coring Memorandum
- **Bridge Hydraulic Report
- **Bridge Development Report
- **Geotech Report
- **SRCC Worksheet

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

ERP: S:\Project Management\ERP\4382625201\Phase II

PSEE link:

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

Threads:

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
ABRA HORNE	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Agnimitra Sengupta	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
AMANDA TYNER	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Amy Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Belinda Thomas	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Bessie Reina	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Blake Stallworth	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Brent Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Brett Berube	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	6
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
41	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Brett Berube	5/9/2025	1		
	Bats were observed roosting within Bridge No. 010045 during a field review conducted on May 7, 2025. Per this submittal, it appears that no work will be performed to the existing bridge, but rather a new pedestrian bridge will be constructed at this crossing. Please note, should any work occur to the existing bridge structure at this location, a bat exclusion will likely be required. Please inform the Environmental Management Office as soon as practicable should work to the existing bridge structure be required.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
	Thank you for the review. We do not expect any work on the existing bridge structure.			
Brett Berube	6/11/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
42	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			WETLANDS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Brett Berube	5/9/2025	1		
	Based on this submittal, it appears that the project may result in impacts to wetlands and/or other surface waters. When available, please provide the acreage impacts to wetlands and/or other surface waters (including shading impacts).			
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
	We are working to develop these acreage impacts including the shading impacts and will include these as part of our permit package.			
Brett Berube	6/11/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
43	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			THREATENED/ENDANGERED SPECIES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Brett Berube	5/9/2025	1		
	The project occurs over designated critical habitat for the smalltooth sawfish and West Indian manatee and over waters accessible to the Gulf sturgeon and swimming sea turtles. Please include the special provisions for swimming sea turtles (SP0070104-6), the smalltooth sawfish (SP0070104-5), Gulf sturgeon (SP0070104-7), and West Indian manatee (SP0070104-4) in the project specifications package. The project may require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or National Marine Fisheries Service as part of the Section 404 permitting process. Please provide details regarding any in-water work (such as temporary work platforms, vessels, pile driving, etc) required for the project.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1		
	We will include the mentioned special provisions in the Specs package. We will coordinate with our structures subconsultant regarding in-water work and notes in the plans regarding construction from embankment.			
Brett Berube	6/11/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
44	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Brett Berube	5/9/2025	1	
	The project occurs over waters designated as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). In particular, it was noted that mangroves occur at the proposed new bridge crossing. Work in this location may require coordination with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and a detail of impacts to EFH. When available, please provide details of any volumetric impacts (dredge and/or fill totals) to project wetlands and/or other surface waters, along with any clearing and grubbing acreages that would include mangroves.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	We are adding the mangrove linework to the plans and will provide impact areas for dredge and fill, wetland, other surface water, and mangrove impacts.			
	Brett Berube	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
45	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Brett Berube	5/9/2025	1	
	A previously documented eagle nest occurs adjacent to the project limits located at approximately 26.983668, -82.102825. However, based on coordination with Artemis staff this nest was inhabited by osprey as of their review last year. During our review conducted on May 7, 2025, it was confirmed that the nest is still an active osprey nest. As of this submittal, the project is not anticipated to impact this nest and no considerations are required for eagles at this time.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Thank you for your review and confirmation of the Eagles Nest status.			
	Brett Berube	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
46	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Brett Berube	5/9/2025	1	
	As noted in my other comments, a natural resources field review was conducted on May 7, 2025. We will provide a Natural Resources Technical Memorandum detailing this review, as well as our conclusions and determinations for listed species involvement. It is anticipated that this document will be used to support the project permitting effort. Given the detail required for that coordination, the technical memorandum can not be finalized until the information requested in my previous comments is provided. Please send me (bberube@rkk.com) the requested information when available and copy Kristin Caruso (kristin.caruso@dot.state.fl.us) for timely completion of the memo.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	We will send the requested information to bberube@rkk.com and copy kristin.caruso@dot.state.fl.us. We anticipate sending this information prior to the June 26 meeting with Nicole.			
	Brett Berube	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Casey Schley	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Cassie Lee	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
CHARLES L. PETERS	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Charles Manganaro	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	27

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
120	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	

Sheet 9 – the pavement design for driveway reconstruction should be showing optional base group 3 (b12.5 asphalt base only) to expedite the construction of each driveway.

Matthew Gibbs 6/9/2025 1

Type B-12.5 Only will be added to the driveway base material for reconstruction.

Charles Manganaro 6/10/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
121	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 17 - Proposed detectible warning surfaces should be installed utilizing the cast in place method and should be red to match existing warning surfaces not being replaced.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	Per Specification 527 "Methods used to form detectable warnings in wet concrete will not be permitted." For this reason we would prefer not include cast in place method for DWS. We will add a color to be used on the detectable warning surfaces to match the others along the corridor.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
122	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 18 – plan is showing to remove the existing flume along the north radius of Easy Street. Where is the flow of water to go once this flume is removed?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	Flumes do not currently exist at Easy Street. There are currently existing sidewalk landings that are being replaced with proposed sidewalk as part of this project. The drainage patterns at this intersection are being maintained with flush shoulder on the NE corner and curb and gutter on the NW corner of the intersection.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
123	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Add a note that the sod should match the surrounding sod species when abutting adjacent properties with established turf.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	A note will be added to the General Notes regarding the sod species.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
124	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 17 – it is recommended to remove existing concrete sidewalk along Conway and repour to the proposed 8' wide sidewalk in the location of the flume it is recommended to place a flume inlet. Avoid realignment of sidewalk requiring MES and pipe work, removal of existing palm trees. This will improve the existing walkway and provide for a better detectible surface along Old Tamiami Trail and eliminate the conflict with the trees.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	The current alignment was selected in order to minimize tree and utility impacts, connect to the Conway Blvd intersection within FDOT ROW and maintain an offset from the flush shoulder roadway of Tamiami Trail. If changed, there would be impacts to the larger existing trees, the utility poles and guy wires, a large utility pull box, a bench, and the drainage. For this reason we prefer to keep the sidewalk alignment as it is currently shown. Charlotte County has reviewed and concurred with the proposed sidewalk footprint.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
125	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 17 – will existing palm trees in conflict with proposed sidewalk be relocated?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	These palm trees do not appear to be part of any landscaping. For this reason the intent is to remove the palm trees.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
126	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 17 – plan design should show the removal and replacement of existing concrete sidewalk overlay on the bridge sidewalk over the Fordham Waterway This sidewalk is a 2-inch-thick cap of concrete on top of existing bridge which has spalled areas and very cracked and requires work if not replaced.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We are coordinating with the County on this to confirm repair or replacement.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
127	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 18 – adjustment of existing pull boxes on the NE corner of Easy Street.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	New signal pull boxes will be provided in lieu of re-using existing pull boxes when installing new conduits. The new pull boxes will allow adjustment.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
128	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 21 – is it possible to run the alignment of the sidewalk from approximate station 222+06 to go along Tamiami Trail to meet up with the existing sidewalk along this roadway in lieu of showing the alignment toward.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	The proposed sidewalk alignment has been coordinated extensively with Charlotte County who has concurred with the proposed sidewalk footprint. The proposed sidewalk alignment also aligns with the sidewalk at the right turn lane location near Sta. 228+00. For these reasons we would prefer to maintain the current alignment at this location. Connection to the existing sidewalk along Tamiami Trail is provided at Sta. 227+20.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
129	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	General comment – plan is not showing at locations of flume inlets the sidewalk with bricks to dissipate the energy per standards to be included in the cost of the flume inlet or the installation of handrail at these locations.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	

Bricks to dissipate energy and handrails will be added, and both items will be included in the updated summary of quantities.

Charles Manganaro 6/10/2025 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
130	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 32 – plan sheet is showing 2 different legend for drives a shaded gray for concrete removal and a cross hatch for driveway reconstruction. Is this correct?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Type B-12.5 Only will be added to the driveway base material for reconstruction.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
131	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	General comment – roadway cross section shows existing drainage structures and pipe extending above the earth fill or in conflict with proposed sidewalk. Please clarify if these drafted correctly or plan should be noting the pipe and structures to be removed.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will review existing and proposed drainage features to ensure they are below grade. ORD does display drainage nodes above ground at times even though the structure is below grade. Additionally if the cross section is at an MES the pipe will appear above ground, but it is the MES portion of the pipe that is being displayed.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
132	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 185 note 2 first paragraph 3rd sentence should be deleted. This note provides times shown for one- and two-lane closures. These restrictions require the Contractor should be maintaining two lanes at all times in both directions except when the Contractor can close two lanes.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	The lane closure restrictions were reviewed at the MOT and Constructability meeting. The following are the updated lane closure restrictions that were recommended based upon this meeting: One lane closure permitted between 7:00pm and 6:30am Two lane closure permitted between 8:30pm and 6:30am These closure times allow the contractor to mill and resurface the center lane of the intersection which will require closure of the adjacent travel lane or second lane.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
133	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 185 a note should be added to restrict the contractor to complete the removal and reconstruction of a driveway is the same day's operation.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	We have included a quantity for the pay item 102-3, Commercial Material for Temporary Driveway Maintenance for the locations of driveway reconstruction to be used in the event the driveway work extends beyond one work period. Some of the driveways are larger and connected to adjacent driveways. For this reason we would prefer not to restrict the contractor to the same day work for driveway removal and reconstruction.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
134	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Sheet 186 note 2 regarding maintenance of a 4' bike lane- can a temporary sign be used to indicate for bicyclists to share the driving lane during lane closures.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Because the existing paved shoulder has existing marked keyholes, we prefer to maintain the bike facilities at all times. Due to the posted speed of 45mph, the shared lane markings are not permitted.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
135	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Maintenance of pedestrian movements - add a note to the plans that only one corner of an intersection/side street should be worked at any time to ensure a movement even if there was no existing walkway on the corners.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	The detailed MOT plans for this project were reviewed with the Department at the MOT and Constructability meeting. Our MOT plans include maintaining access to existing sidewalk features throughout the intersection throughout construction. For this reason we would prefer not to include a note of this nature.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
136	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Plan sheet 67 – BFOC in conflict with SN-1 also very close and maybe impacted by the excavation operation for structures SN-02 and SN-03.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	All utility information is based upon standard cover height. Now that the Phase II plans have been reviewed we are ordering additional Vvh information and will add this information into the plans to confirm utility conflicts. The utility conflicts will be updated in the Utility Conflict Matrix accordingly. All conflicts will be cleared during the utility coordination phase.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
137	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Plan sheet 70 – WM in conflict with SN-10 and SN-11is in conflict BOFC.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	All utility information is based upon standard cover height. Now that the Phase II plans have been reviewed we are ordering additional Vvh information and will add this information into the plans to confirm utility conflicts. The utility conflicts will be updated in the Utility Conflict Matrix accordingly.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
138	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Add a note drive piling should only be done during daytime.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	

A note that pile driving should only be done during the daytime will be added.

Charles Manganaro 6/9/2025 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
139	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	USCG letter on March 11, 2025, notes 5 and 6 should be included in the plans.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Notes 5 and 6 from the USCG letter from March 11, 2025 will be added to the plans.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
140	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Signalization plans – plan is showing existing pull boxes to remain although in some cases new conduit is being installed. This will require removal of the pull box which may be damaged during this work effort. New pull boxes should be shown in this case. Also make sure removal of existing concrete and new sidewalk is shown in areas of signalization work.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	New pull boxes will be provided in lieu of re-using existing pull boxes when installing new conduits. We will coordinate with Roadway to ensure all necessary sidewalk/concrete is included.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
141	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Signalization Plans – has the designer of record verified that new signal cabling can be installed in the existing conduits. This will require the removal of the existing signal cable. Are there existing cables operating on more than one device. Also, the existing cabling must be removed and newly installed in the same operation and made functional. Considerations of increasing Traffic Control Officer hours should be made if the controller must be turned off while Contractor is working on the signalization system.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Per the MOT and Constructability meeting new conduits and pull boxes will be used due to historic construction issues with reusing existing conduit and pull boxes.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
142	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ARCHITECTURE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Summary of quantities shows pay item 711-11-160 although this is not reflected on the plan set.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	The item 711-11-160 will be removed.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
143	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Summary of quantities is missing pay items for bicyclist symbol and arrow.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	The pay items for Preformed White Message or Symbol (711-14-160) and Preformed White Arrow (711-14-170) will be added.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
144	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Structure plans do not show details for rubble riprap installation. Quantities should be reviewed, either the select bedding or the tonnage of rubble rip rap is in error.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Will review/update quantities as we develop the riprap details for next submittal.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
145	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Summary of quantities for pay item 630-2-16 is shown a 768 lf this equals 3 conduits, Plans show 3 conduits per parapet wall or 1536 lf of conduit. This would also increase the number of junction boxes pay item 635-3-13 to 4 ea total.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Quantities will be reviewed and updated for the next submittal.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
146	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Charles Manganaro	5/21/2025	1	
	Summary of quantities for MOT devices – summary shows number of days exceeding the total number of 270 days estimated. The total of all phases combined should be 270 days.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	The Phase I construction for the pedestrian bridge will continue through the duration of the project so the duration is the full project length. We will revise the phases for clarity.			
	Charles Manganaro	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
CHRIS CARPENTER	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Chris Coughlin	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	29

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
70	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 1 / Key Sheet	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
PSEE indicates ALL Phase 52 funding for this project is federal. Per FDM 910.2.1, FEDERAL FUNDS should be displayed on the Key Sheet, below the FPID, when Federal Funds are involved. Please coordinate with your FDOT Project Manager to confirm it should be added to the Key Sheet.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
"Federal Funds" will be added to the Key Sheets.			
Chris Coughlin	6/9/2025	1	
Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
71	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 2A / Notes to Reviewer	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
Per FDM 914.4, Notes to Reviewer are to be located on the General Notes sheet. Please review.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
Future submittals will include "Notes to Reviewer" on the General Notes sheet, as necessary.			
Chris Coughlin	6/9/2025	1	
Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

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

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
a) Per FDM 913.2.1 (6), please define limits of all proposed sod/turf.			
b) Typical indicates proposed roadside grading slopes towards the shoulder. Please review & clarify intent. Consider identifying proposed grading, as well.			
c) Per FDM 913.2.1 (5), please identify the limits of Clearing & Grubbing. See all Typical.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
a) The proposed sod limits will be added to Typical Section 1.			
b) The grading will be revised to better represent the cross sections and proposed grading.			
c) The clearing and grubbing limits will be added to the Typical Sections.			
Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

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

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
a) 1:2 slopes are often subject to wear from the elements. Were permanent erosion control measures reviewed, or considered?			
b) Asterisk appears to indicate 1:2 slopes are permitted beyond the Clear Zone limit. However, Clear Zone limit is not defined. Please review. See all Typical.			
c) Per Section 2.4.4 of the FDOT Drainage Manual, the minimum ditch bottom width is 5'. This is to accommodate maintenance and MES's. Please review. See all Typical.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	

- a) The 1:2 slopes were required to place back as much ditch capacity as possible after impacts from the proposed sidewalk. Currently the ditches do have locations with 1:2 slopes that are sodded. We would prefer to maintain the sod for the ditches to promote as much pervious area as possible.
- b) We will add the clear zone limits to the Typical Sections.
- c) We maximized the ditch bottom widths where ROW would allow. We will review the cross sections and model in the immediate areas next to MES' to confirm we have sufficient ditch width to accommodate the existing or proposed MES'.

Chris Coughlin 6/12/2025 1

Consider investigating the potential need for permanent erosion control measures for 1:2 slopes.

Response Accepted & Comment Closed.

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
74	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 9 / Typical Sections	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1		
a) FDM 913.3 specifically states Posted Speed is not to be shown on Typical Sections. Consider removing. See all Typical.				
b) Per FDM 913.3 (6), the Context Classification is to be provided in the Traffic Data field. Please review. See all Typical.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
The Typical Sections will be updated to remove the Posted Speed and the Context Classification will be added.				
Chris Coughlin	6/9/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
75	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 11 / Typical Sections	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1		
a) Please clarify how proposed Type F Curb & Gutter is to be stabilized.				
b) Typical Section No. 1 calls for Traffic B Friction Course, while Typical Section No. 3 calls for Traffic C Friction Course. Please clarify intent of calling for different asphalt mixes.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
Per discussions at the MOT and Constructability meeting, the proposed curb and gutter does not require stabilization since it is located adjacent to proposed asphalt and in areas that appear to be previously stabilized.				
The traffic groups will be updated to Traffic C for both Typical Sections 1 and 3.				
Chris Coughlin	6/11/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
76	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 17 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1		
Detail 1 shows transition from proposed curb ramp to the existing sidewalk to the North. The transition is not depicted in Roadway Plan. Please review. Is the transition to be constructed of 4" or 6" concrete? Consider defining.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
Detail 1 is a larger image of the proposed work on the roadway plan CR-C MOD to clarify the intent of the ramp slopes. The plan shows the area as 6" concrete.				
Chris Coughlin	6/11/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
77	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 18 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1		

a) Proposed milling tapers to 0' around the return. Please review to confirm this is obtainable provided constraints presented by construction equipment.

b) Asphalt removal & sodding is called for. Will this now serve as the unpaved shoulder? Will stabilization need to be called for? How is it to be regraded? Please review.

Matthew Gibbs 6/11/2025 1

a) We will revise the taper to 0' location to a 2' minimum to accommodate construction equipment.

b) This area is the removal of an acceleration lane. The existing paved shoulder will remain in place. The regrading will tie into the proposed sidewalk and is modeled in the 3D model.

Chris Coughlin 6/12/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
78	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 20 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 5/21/2025 1

Consider reviewing recessed pedestrian refuges within directional concrete islands to ensure sufficient grading is provided, avoiding ponding & sediment buildup.

Matthew Gibbs 6/9/2025 1

The Roadway Plan sheet notes "See Galway Lane Detail on Special Detail Sheet." The special detail provides curb ramp details for the traffic islands and shows a required slope to avoid any drainage issues.

Chris Coughlin 6/11/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
79	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 22 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 5/21/2025 1

Please clarify why the proposed curb & gutter terminates within the existing pavement & curb return radius, as opposed to abutting it. See others with a similar circumstance.

Matthew Gibbs 6/9/2025 1

The limits of the proposed curb and gutter along the right turn lanes will be reviewed at all terminations and driveways to determine the appropriate limits.

Chris Coughlin 6/11/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
80	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 23 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 5/21/2025 1

The proposed curb return geometry introduces a kink into the return alignment. Please review. Consider creating a uniform return.

Matthew Gibbs 6/9/2025 1

The existing curb ramps at Harbor Blvd. are proposed to remain. The sidewalk connection near 234+30 was required to avoid the existing mast arm foundation while providing the required sidewalk width. The sharper angle was required to avoid impacts to the existing drainage ditch.

Chris Coughlin 6/11/2025 1

It would appear curb line geometry could be revised to be a single radius. Consider revising.

Response Accepted & Comment Closed.

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
81	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 25 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 5/21/2025 1

Concrete removal is called for beyond the limits of the proposed curb & gutter return. This will create a void in between the existing pavement & new curb return. Is widening proposed to fill the void? Please review.

Matthew Gibbs 6/11/2025 1

Pavement widening will be added to this location to ensure there is not a void.

Chris Coughlin 6/12/2025 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
82	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 28 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Per FDM 222.2, curb ramps should be in line with the crossing. Please review. Being that new curb ramps & pedestrian refuges are being proposed, consider aligning as such.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	The alignment of the sidewalk and curb ramp will be reviewed to determine if the alignment can be revised.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
83	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 32 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Please confirm the proposed driveway removal was coordinated with Access Management & the property owner.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	A meeting was previously held with FDOT Access Management to discuss driveway removals. Now that we have Phase II plans reviewed we are going to follow up with Access Management and complete the driveway coordination process with the property owners as necessary.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
84	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 33 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Consider sawcutting new radii, establishing a full-width pedestrian refuge between the two driveways near Sta. 291+90, RT.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will review the driveways at Sta. 291+90 Rt and provide as much of a pedestrian refuge as possible.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
85	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 34 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Please ensure sufficient information (Station/Offset labels, radii, etc) are provided to construct the geometry in the NW return of West Tarpon Blvd.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	On this sheet is Detail 3 which provides additional station and offset information for construction of the geometry in the NW corner.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
86	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 36 / Roadway Plan	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Consider sawcutting to create smooth driveway geometry near Sta. 305+80, RT, as done in other locations.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	At Sta. 305+80 Rt we will review the driveway radius and sawcut where possible to smooth out the radius.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
87	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 38 / Back of Sidewalk Profile	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	a) Is the intent for PI locations to be defined on the Roadway Plan, with Station/Offset labels? Please review, as some appear to be flagged, while others are not.			
	b) Are PI's within 10' - 15' of one another necessary? Can these be consolidated to a single PI?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	a) The PI's in the profile correspond to change in direction in the plan view. We will review to confirm the plan view change in direction have corresponding PI's.			
	b) The PI's within 10-15' are necessary as they correspond to change in direction in the plan view and/or begin and end points of the proposed sidewalk.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
88	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 49 / Back of Sidewalk Profile	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Per FDM 222.2.1.3, sidewalk grades are not to exceed 5%. Please review vertical geometry near Sta. 265+70.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	At this location there is an asterisk next to the slope. The asterisk is a note on the sheet that reads "ACTUAL SLOPE DIFFERS WHERE SIDEWALK NOT PARALLEL TO BASELINE. SEE ROADWAY PLAN SHEETS FOR SIDEWALK LENGTH." At this location the slope has been confirmed to be less than 5%.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
89	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 55 / Back of Sidewalk Profile	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Are there concerns that a sidewalk grade of 0.0% will result in ponding, sediment buildup, & overgrown sod between the turnouts near Sta. 300+10, RT? Please review.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	The sidewalk still has a cross slope, so if the longitudinal slope is flat the sidewalk will still drain.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
90	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 59 / Special Details	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Topographic features are difficult to view & decipher. Consider darkening for clarity of intent.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will darken the topo features on sheet 59 for clarity.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
91	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 71 / Cross Sections	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Provided a model is not being delivered as part of this project, consider indicating Begin & End Earthwork stations as they pertain to the earthwork being quantified.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will add begin and end earthwork stations to the cross sections.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
93	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 75 / Cross Sections	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Sta. 206+50: Proposed sidewalk appears it will trap off-site runoff at several locations throughout. Please review & clarify intent. Have proposed measures been put into place to address this?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	We will review the proposed sidewalk at this location to confirm positive drainage and revise as necessary.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
94	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 77 / Cross Sections	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Sta. 208+50: Roadside slope & ditch bottom line work appears missing. Please review. See other cross sections, as well.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	In the model this linework is showing up. We will correct the linework to ensure it appears on the sheets.			
	Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
96	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 79 / Cross Sections	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1	
	Sta. 210+50: Ditch bottom width appears inconsistently identified. Consider providing on all for consistency.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	

We will correct the bottom width callout at Sta. 210+50.

Chris Coughlin 6/12/2025 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
98	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 159 / Cross Sections	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1		
Sta. 290+50: Several features, both existing & proposed, extend above the existing or proposed ground surface at this location & beyond. Please review.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1		
At this location the pipe is starting to daylight at the opening and that is why it is showing up as partially out of the ground. We will review the model and existing features at this location to confirm they are correct.				
Chris Coughlin	6/12/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
101	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 185 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1		
a) TTC General Notes - Note 2: Two Lane Closure restrictions do not permit a 10-hour work window. Please review. A Design Variation may be appropriate if the restrictions cannot be extended to meet this requirement.				
b) Advanced Warning Layout: Index 102-600 of the Standard Plans requires 500' work zone sign spacing for arterials & collectors with a work zone speed of 45 MPH or greater. Please review.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
a) Per discussions at the MOT and Constructability meeting the lane closures will be revised to the following: One lane closure permitted between 7:00pm and 6:30am Two lane closure permitted between 8:30pm and 6:30am				
b) The Advanced Warning Sign layout meets the 500' spacing as the Speeding Fines Doubled sign is not a warning sign.				
Chris Coughlin	6/11/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
102	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 188 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	1		
Per FDM 240.2.1.9, pedestrian access ways are to be maintained, or replicated, to the greatest extent practical. Unclear how pedestrian connectivity is being maintained. It appears pedestrians are being directed into active work zones. Please review & clarify intent. See others, as well.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
The TTC plan will be updated to clarify the smaller work zone areas for pedestrian features work while maintaining peds with additional PLCDs and signs.				
Chris Coughlin	6/11/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
103	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	5/21/2025	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 6/9/2025 1

Thank you for your review.

Chris Coughlin 6/11/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Forestt	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
1	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Contamination Technical Memorandum	CONTAMINATION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Christopher Forestt	4/23/2025	1	

This comment does not require a written response from the Designers other than acknowledgement.

There are potential contamination-related impacts to construction of this project. Specifically, there is subsurface work for minor drainage work along the corridor and pedestrian signal directional bores. Also, improvements near the bridge structures may involve hazardous materials. These locations, and potentially others, warrant further review as the design plans progress.

At the Phase-IIR Design Plans ERC Submittal, the Environmental Management Office (EMO) will provide a Contamination Memorandum evaluating these sites of concern to determine if Level-II testing is warranted. Performing the review at the Phase-IIR design phase helps to ensure any requisite sampling is performed in the correct areas and that the resulting data is timely for use during any requisite Level-III construction support that may result from the ensuing corridor investigation.

Current PSEE Dates: PRODUCTION 4/17/26, PLANS-TO-TALLAHASSEE 6/2/26, & LETTING 7/29/26

The District Contamination Impact Coordinator (DCIC) will direct the Contamination Assessment & Remediation (CAR) Contractor to perform any necessary Level-II investigation.

If impacts are detected, the EMO will provide a final Contamination Marking at the Phase-IV ERC Plans Submittal detailing any necessary plan markings or notes.

If contamination-related plan notes or markings are needed, the DCIC will instruct the CAR Contractor to coordinate with the eventual Road & Bridge Contractor and Project Engineer to provide appropriate Level-III construction support.

Thank you.

Again, this comment does not require a written response from the Designers.

Matthew Gibbs 6/9/2025 1

Thank you for your review and comment.

Christopher Forestt 6/9/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Morin	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Clifton Johnson	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Daniel Buidens	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Darryl Richard	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
David Adams	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name		Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
DAVID DOWLING		LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	34
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
4	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-4	SIGNING AND MARKING	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	Are the R10-15aR signs necessary at a signalized intersection without a right turn slip lane?	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/18/2025	1		
	The R10-15a signs were installed at signalized intersections with a dedicated turn lane or free-flow channelized turn lane per TEM 2.44.3. They are installed at the near right corner of the signalized intersection per MUTCD 2B.59. We will coordinate with FDOT to confirm the desired intersection signing related to pedestrians and pedestrian crossings.				
	DAVID DOWLING	6/18/2025	1	Response Accepted & Comment Closed	
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
5	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-5 to S-24	SIGNING AND MARKING	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	Identify potential conflicts with utilities.	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
	We are preparing for the Phase IIR submittal and will be updating the utility conflict matrix for this submittal. This will identify the conflicts with the latest design.				
	DAVID DOWLING	6/10/2025	1	Response Accepted & Comment Closed	
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
6	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-5 to S-24	SIGNING AND MARKING	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	Are existing signs to be relocated in good condition and meet reflectivity standards?	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/18/2025	1		
	A field review will be completed to confirm the condition of the existing signs.				
	DAVID DOWLING	6/18/2025	1	Response Accepted & Comment Closed	
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
7	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-13	SIGNING AND MARKING	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	Does the sign lettering size for the guide sign meet current standards?	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/18/2025	1		
	A field review will be completed to confirm the letter size on the existing multi-post signs.				
	DAVID DOWLING	6/18/2025	1	Response Accepted & Comment Closed	
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
8	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-15	SIGNING AND MARKING	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	Should a R10-15aR sign be added?	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/18/2025	1		

As the Elkam Blvd. intersection is an unsignalized intersection, we prefer to not install an R10-15 sign per the MUTCD and TEM.

DAVID DOWLING 6/18/2025 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
9	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-17	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Are the R10-15aR signs necessary at a signalized intersection without a right turn slip lane?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/18/2025	1	
	The R10-15a signs were installed at signalized intersections with a dedicated turn lane or free-flow channelized turn lane per TEM 2.44.3. The proposed R10-15a signs will be removed where no right turn lanes exist at Port Charlotte Blvd.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/18/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
10	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-21	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Are the R10-15aR signs necessary at a signalized intersection without a right turn slip lane?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/18/2025	1	
	The R10-15a signs were installed at signalized intersections with a dedicated turn lane or free-flow channelized turn lane per TEM 2.44.3. The proposed R10-15a signs will be removed where no right turn lanes exist at Tarpon Blvd.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/18/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
11	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-24	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Are the R10-15aR signs necessary at a signalized intersection without a right turn slip lane?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/18/2025	1	
	The R10-15a signs were installed at signalized intersections with a dedicated turn lane or free-flow channelized turn lane per TEM 2.44.3. They are installed at the near right corner of the signalized intersection per MUTCD 2B.59. We will coordinate with FDOT to confirm the desired intersection signing related to pedestrians and pedestrian crossings.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/18/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
12	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		16	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Provide email addresses for UAO contacts.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Email addresses for UAO contacts will be provided.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
13	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		9	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	

Grading between the EOP and sidewalk is shown draining towards the road?

Is this area intended to have sod?

Matthew Gibbs 6/10/2025 1

The typical section will be updated to represent the cross sections better. The sidewalk slope and location has taken drainage into account to ensure we are not trapping water and we maintain the existing flow patterns.

DAVID DOWLING 6/12/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
14	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		10	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	

Is drainage flowing outside the r/w where the sidewalk is sloped towards the r/w, please clarify?

Matthew Gibbs 6/10/2025 1

The typical section will be updated to represent the cross sections better. The sidewalk slope and location has taken drainage into account to ensure we are not trapping water and we maintain the existing flow patterns.

DAVID DOWLING 6/12/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
15	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		67 to 70	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	

Label the fill slopes.

Identify and label Vvh utilities.

Matthew Gibbs 6/11/2025 1

Slopes will be labeled on the Drainage Structures sheets.

We are preparing the SUE request and updating the plans for the Phase IIR submittal. We will add the Vvh information to the Drainage Structures.

DAVID DOWLING 6/12/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
16	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		39	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	

Reduce the 5.462% grade to under 5%.

Matthew Gibbs 6/10/2025 1

The actual slope at this location is less than 5%. The slope callout includes an asterisk that refers to the note on the page "**ACTUAL SLOPE DIFFERS WHERE SIDEWALK NOT PARALLEL TO BASELINE. SEE ROADWAY PLAN SHEETS FOR SIDEWALK LENGTH."

DAVID DOWLING 6/12/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
17	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		46	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	

Is it possible to reduce the 4.966% grade?

Matthew Gibbs 6/10/2025 1

The proposed sidewalk profile is as close to the existing ground as possible to minimize drainage impacts and tie in issues. For this reason we would prefer to maintain the existing profile slope at this location which is less than 5%.

DAVID DOWLING 6/12/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
18	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		49	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Reduce the 7.962% grade to under 5%.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	
	The actual slope at this location is less than 5%. We will add an asterisk to the slope callout for -7.962% that refers to the note on the page "*ACTUAL SLOPE DIFFERS WHERE SIDEWALK NOT PARALLEL TO BASELINE. SEE ROADWAY PLAN SHEETS FOR SIDEWALK LENGTH."			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
19	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		66	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	For Special Gutter Profile Detail-			
	provide a slope arrow for the sidewalk.			
	can a 2-foot level sod area be used behind the sidewalk?			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	A slope arrow will be added for the sidewalk. Due to ROW constraints 1' behind the sidewalk was typically what could be accommodated.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
20	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		66	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	For the Modified Driveway Detail, clarify the intent of listing 2 slopes graded towards the curb.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	The second slope label will be removed.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
21	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		17-37	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Label all existing drainage pipes.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Existing drainage pipes will be labeled if they don't already have labels.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
22	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		17	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Label concrete collar.			
	Confirm ADA compliance for existing walkway over the Fordham Waterway.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	

The concrete collar will be labeled.

We are reviewing and coordinating the Fordham Waterway concrete removal and reinstallation to better accommodate the proposed sidewalk and meet ADA.

DAVID DOWLING 6/12/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
23	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		18	ROADWAY
		Created By	Created On	Version
		DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1
		Label concrete collar.		
		Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1
		The concrete collar will be labeled.		
		DAVID DOWLING	6/10/2025	1
		Response Accepted & Comment Closed		

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
25	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		20	ROADWAY
		Created By	Created On	Version
		DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1
		What is the intent of the jog in the sidewalk alignment around station 219+41 to station 220+30?		
		Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1
		At this location the grass and landscaping is well maintained. The jog in sidewalk is to go around the existing landscaping elements and trees.		
		DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1
		Response Accepted & Comment Closed		

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
26	COMMENT RESOLVED		21	ROADWAY
		Created By	Created On	Version
		DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1
		Where rub rail is being added to the existing guardrail, does the existing guardrail meet current standards?		
		Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1
		The scope of this project includes adding sidewalk, for this reason we did not evaluate the existing guardrail. We retrofitted the guardrail to accommodate the proposed sidewalk.		
		DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1
		Confirm with District 1 that since the existing guardrail is being modified, the guardrail does not need to be evaluated for replacement to meet current standards.		
		Jacques Louis	7/7/2025	1
		We spoke with the District Roadway Design Engineer, Sergio Figueroa, and he informed us that if the existing guardrail meets the FDM requirements of Section 215.7.2 then it can remain. We reviewed the existing guardrail which was installed in 2015 and it meets this criteria. Therefore, we would prefer to maintain the existing guardrail and install the rub rail only.		

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
27	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		22	ROADWAY
		Created By	Created On	Version
		DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1
		Label concrete collar.		
		Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1
		The concrete collar will be labeled.		
		DAVID DOWLING	6/10/2025	1
		Response Accepted & Comment Closed		

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
30	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		24	ACCESS MANAGEMENT
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Label rectangular symbol at station 241+00 right.			
	Confirm grading will fit in this area off the back of sidewalk.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will label the existing drainage pipe and the grading near Sta. 241+00 will be reviewed to verify no impacts to the existing drainage feature occur.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
31	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		27	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Add detail for ped / bike railing.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will add the begin and end stationing of the pedestrian railing. The railing will also be added to the proposed model so it shows up in the cross sections. Other information needed for railing construction is located in the Standard Plans.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
32	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		29-30	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Confirm ADA compliance for existing sidewalk to remain.			
	Label concrete collar.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will confirm ADA compliance for existing sidewalk to remain. The concrete collar will be labeled.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
33	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		37	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Label concrete collar.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	The concrete collar will be labeled.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
34	COMMENT RESOLVED		71-183	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Since there are multiple changes to the slope of the sidewalk throughout the project, consider adding slope arrows for the sidewalk for clarity.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/10/2025	1	

We reviewed the sidewalk grades in this area and are trying to match existing ground as much as possible. For this reason we would prefer to leave the proposed sidewalk slopes as they currently are which is less than 5%.

DAVID DOWLING 6/12/2025 1

Understood. For clarity add slope arrows for the sidewalk on the cross sections.

Jacques Louis 7/7/2025 1

Slope arrows will be added to the sidewalk in the cross sections.

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
35	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		77	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Missing proposed line work.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	The linework is showing up in the file, but not in the sheet. We will update to ensure it prints correctly.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
36	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		78	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Missing proposed line work.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	The linework is showing up in the file, but not in the sheet. We will update to ensure it prints correctly.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
37	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		128	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Show and label ped / bike railing at station 259+50.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will add the handrail to the model and label it in the cross sections.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
38	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		129	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Clarify fill slopes at station 260+50.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will remove the extra slope line at Sta. 260+50.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
39	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		92 to 94	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Appears existing ground is not current from station 223+50 to station 225+50.			
	Show and label ped / bike railing.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	We will have the surveyor update the existing groundline by the headwall in this location. It is not anticipated to impact our proposed sidewalk geometry.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
40	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	DAVID DOWLING	5/6/2025	1	
	Deduct curb and gutter quantities for closed flume inlets.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	Curb and gutter quantities will be removed at the closed flume inlets.			
	DAVID DOWLING	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Deborah Barnhill	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Earl Taylor	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
56	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Earl Taylor	5/15/2025	1	
	Is the island nose at 245+34 getting new C&G? its not called out in the plans.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	On this sheet it references to see the "Special Details". On the Special Details sheet the new curb and gutter is called out.			
	Earl Taylor	6/12/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Edward Stevens	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Elizabeth Sofsky	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Eric Reese	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Garfield Howell	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	20

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
92	COMMENT RESOLVED			LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	

Please consider adding light poles to improve lighting distribution levels evenly throughout the intersections whereby increasing vertical and horizontal (Horizontal 0, Vertical 0) levels to meet the retrofit standard average foot candle levels.

Matthew Gibbs 6/9/2025 1

Proposed lighting for Easy Street and Tarpon Boulevard was removed from the projects scope. The existing conditions were analyzed and included in the LDAR to document the current lighting conditions to assist the Department in determining if proposed lighting should be added in the future. The existing lighting was designed for corridor lighting, and the analysis focused on intersection lighting.

Jacques Louis 7/21/2025 1

We are working on adding intersections lighting within the project limits.

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
95	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNALIZATION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	Please confirm, the existing directional bore path between proposed pedestrian assemblies and the existing controller cabinet contain spare conduit run.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Per discussions at the MOT and Constructability meeting new conduit and pull boxes will be proposed.			
	Garfield Howell	6/11/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
99	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-4 Please consider replacing existing R6-3 sign assembly with W11-2/ W16-7p sign assembly.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	The Divided Highway sign will be removed per our meeting 7/9/25. The Pedestrian Warning sign and arrow sign (W11-2/W16-7p) will be installed.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
100	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-4 Please consider replacing and relocating the proposed R10-15a sign assembly with the W11-2/W16-9p sign assembly 100 feet in advance of slip lane crosswalk			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	The R10-15a sign will be removed per our meeting 7/9/25. At this location along Conway Blvd, the Pedestrian Warning sign and Ahead sign (W11-2/W16-9p) is unable to be installed due to the Tamiami Trail frontage road located approximately 50-ft from the Pedestrian Warning sign.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
104	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-5 Please consider providing the W11-2/W16-9p sign assembly in advance at station 205+80			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	A Pedestrian Warning sign and Ahead sign (W11-2/W16-9p) will be installed near 205+80.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
105	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-5 Please consider relocating existing yield sign assembly			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	The existing yield sign near sta. 206+90 on sheet S-5 will be relocated.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
106	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-5 Please consider replacing proposed R10-15a with W11-2/ W16-7p sign assemble, placed adjacent to existing pedestrian crosswalk since slip lane is outside the intersection on Easy Street.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	The R10-15a sign will be removed per our meeting 7/9/25. The Pedestrian Warning sign and arrow sign (W11-2/W16-7p) will be installed.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
107	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-5 Please consider providing the W11-2/W16-9p sign assembly 100 feet in advance on Easy Street.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	At this location along Easy Street, the Pedestrian Warning sign and Ahead sign (W11-2/W16-9p) is unable to be installed due to the Tamiami Trail frontage road located approximately 60-ft from the Pedestrian Warning sign.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
108	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-7 Please consider replacing the W11-2/ W16-7p sign assemble, placed adjacent to proposed pedestrian crosswalk.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	A Pedestrian Warning sign and arrow sign (W11-2/W16-7p) will be installed along the slip right turn lane at the crosswalk near 217+40.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
109	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-7 Please consider providing the W11-2/W16-9p sign assembly in advance at station 216+00			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	A Pedestrian Warning sign and Ahead sign (W11-2/W16-9p) will be installed near 216+00.			

Garfield Howell 7/10/2025 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
110	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-7 Please consider relocating the proposed R5-1 sign assembly to station 216+80			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	The proposed Do Not Enter sign (R5-1) will be moved to 216+80.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
111	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-7 Please relocate existing yield sign assembly from shoulder to median for left turning traffic			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	We will install a Yield Sign within the median for the directional median opening left turning movement from SR 45 to Galway Lane. The existing yield sign will be relocated for the channelized right turn lane near 217+72.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
112	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-7 Please consider replacing the W11-2/ W16-7p sign assemble, placed adjacent to proposed pedestrian crosswalk on Galway Lane.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	A Pedestrian Warning sign and arrow sign (W11-2/W16-7p) will be installed along the slip right turn lane at the crosswalk near 218+50.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
113	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-7 Please consider providing the W11-2/W16-9p sign assembly in advance on Galway Lane.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	At this location along Galway Lane, the Pedestrian Warning sign and Ahead sign (W11-2/W16-9p) is unable to be installed due to the Tamiami Trail frontage road located approximately 55-ft from the Pedestrian Warning sign.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
114	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-11 Please consider adding the R3-5 and R6-1 signs to the proposed R1-1 sign assembly			

Matthew Gibbs 7/9/2025 1

The One Way and Right Only signs (R3-5R and R6-1R) will be added to the Stop sign for the driveway near sta. 238.

Garfield Howell 7/10/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
115	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-13			
	Please consider adding the R3-5 and R6-1 signs to the relocated R1-1 sign assembly			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	The One Way and Right Only signs (R3-5R and R6-1R) will be added to the Stop sign for the driveway near sta. 249.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
116	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	Please consistence maintain the ladder design for each leg within each signalized intersection work is being proposed			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	For consistency, we will add Special Emphasis on all existing marked crosswalk legs of the signalized intersections: Conway Blvd., Easy Street, Harbor Blvd., Olean Blvd., Port Charlotte Blvd/ Tamiami Trail, and Tarpon Blvd.			
	In areas where we are not milling and resurfacing and there are existing Standard Crosswalk markings, we will remove the existing 12" White and replace with new Thermoplastic Special Emphasis Crosswalk markings (12" White and 24" White bars).			
	In areas where we are not milling and resurfacing and there are existing Special Emphasis Crosswalk markings, they will remain.			
	In areas with milling and resurfacing at the signalized intersections, we will install new Special Emphasis markings.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
117	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-15			
	Please consider replacing the W11-2/ W16-7p sign assemble, placed adjacent to proposed pedestrian crosswalk.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	A Pedestrian Warning sign and arrow sign (W11-2/W16-7p) will be installed along the slip right turn lane at the crosswalk near 264+50.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
118	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-15			
	Please consider providing the W11-2/W16-9p sign assembly in advance			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	A Pedestrian Warning sign and Ahead sign (W11-2/W16-9p) will be installed near 263+50.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
119	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	5/21/2025	1	
	S-16 Please consider replacing the W11-2/ W16-7p sign assemble, placed adjacent to proposed pedestrian crosswalk.			
	Matthew Gibbs	7/9/2025	1	
	A Pedestrian Warning sign and arrow sign (W11-2/W16-7p) will be installed along the slip right turn lane at the crosswalk near 265+60.			
	Garfield Howell	7/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
GENA BATMAN	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
3	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ESTIMATES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	GENA BATMAN	4/25/2025	1	
	Phase 52 Construction Cost is \$5,172,572.44 PDC based on LRE markups. See attached file.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	All LRE quantity markups from the Phase II submittal were incorporated. Thank you for providing the latest LRE.			
	GENA BATMAN	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Gregory Bohde	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Gregory Bowne	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Harley Davidson	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Heather Johnson	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
J.J. Wren	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
2	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			RAILROAD
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	J.J. Wren	4/23/2025	1	
	A No Rail Coordination Needed certification has been issued. The certification has been uploaded to PSEE and I have requested the appropriate schedule adjustments be made to reflect No Rail Coordination Needed. Thank you.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Thank you for providing the No Rail Coordination Needed certification.			
	J.J. Wren	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jacques Louis	IN-HOUSE PROJECT MANAGER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jason Mobsby	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
JASON NEWTON	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeanna Dean	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
JEFF KEYSER	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey James	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jesten Abraham	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jhamaul Hanner	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jimmy Vilce	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
JODY MANSELL	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
John Kubicki	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Joseph Harper	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kaitlin Phillips	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Karina Della Sera	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Katharine Causey	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kayla Sapp	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Keith Robbins	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
KENNETH YINGER	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	5

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
47	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		BHRS	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	5/14/2025	1	

BHRS:

a. The R/W extents in the BHRS do not appear to be correct downstream (west) of the bridges where the limits of survey is labeled as the R/W Line. There are also lines that appear to be offsite from the R/W line upstream of the bridge that don't appear to be contour lines that should be labeled.

b. Please provide the Bridge Number, when available.

c. The scour profile along the cross section does not appear to follow the elevations shown in the Hydraulic Design Data.

d. In the profile view please dimension and label the overall bridge length and the width of each span and approach (FDOT Design Manual §906.3).

e. The Begin Approach Slab is shown ten feet back of the end bent in the profile view. The End of the Approach Slab is shown at the End Bridge in the profile view and should be located ten feet ahead.

- a. The R/W and R/W labels will be updated to reflect the correct linework.
- b. The Bridge Number will be added when available.
- c. The scour profile elevation will be updated to match the elevations shown in the Design Data.
- d. The overall bridge length and width of each span will be added to the profile view.
- e. The end approach slab will be extended 10 feet in the profile view.

KENNETH YINGER 6/16/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
48	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		BHR	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	5/14/2025	1	
	BHR:			
	a. Please provide documentation of coordination with the Coast Guard and Corps of Engineers. b. The downstream pedestrian Bridge Hydraulics Memorandum provided in Appendix B includes a BIR. Please remove the BIR from the appendix of that report. The BIR is confidential and exempt from public inspection pursuant to § 119.071(3)(a) & (b), FS.			
	Matthew Gibbs	5/27/2025	1	
	a. The Coast Guard documentation will be added to the Appendix. b. The BIR will be removed from the downstream pedestrian Bridge Hydraulics Memo in Appendix B.			
	KENNETH YINGER	6/16/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
49	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		SRCC	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	5/14/2025	1	
	SRCC:			
	a. Please provide Forms 251A and 251B b. Sediment barriers are not typically installed perpendicular to the conveyance ditches, or along the R/W where slopes are positive and offsite water discharges to the FDOT. Please consider placing silt fence downstream of earth disturbance activities associated with the sidewalk grading and construction. See the State of Florida Erosion and Sediment Control, page 140. c. The sediment barriers shown in Sheet 1 and Sheet 2 could largely be deleted. Sediment barrier from STA 208+50 to STA 217+50 near the R/W line should be provided. d. The sediment barrier (in front of the guardrail) between the roadway and the proposed work from STA 223 to STA 225 should not be necessary. Sediment barrier from STA 220 to STA 224, and STA 226 to STA 233 should be placed near the R/W. e. Sediment barrier behind the sidewalk, as shown from STA 233+50 to 237+60 would reduce sediment discharging to the swale and should remain. Sediment barrier from STA 238 to STA 251 should be placed near the R/W, etc. f. The sediment barrier shown across Morningstar Waterway should be removed. In general, sediment barriers should be placed parallel to the channels and at the water's edge of the embankment. In this case, place floating turbidity barriers parallel to and encircle abutments and encircle proposed piers.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	
	a) Form 251A and 251B will be provided. b) The location of sediment barriers will be revised per the manual for Erosion and Sediment Control as noted. c) The location of the sediment barrier will be reviewed and revised to be downstream/below the disturbed areas and removed from the ditches. d) The sediment barrier will be revised within the vicinity of the Elkam Waterway. e) The location of the sediment barrier will be reviewed and revised to be downstream/below the disturbed areas or along the project boundary and will be removed from the ditches. f) The sediment barrier will be revised and floating turbidity barriers will be added.			
	KENNETH YINGER	6/16/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
50	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Report	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	5/14/2025	1	
	Drainage Report:			
	a. If V-bottom ditches are used, the front and back slopes shall be 1:6 or flatter. Locations where this cannot be met should be tabulated, justified, and approved by the Department. b. Please tabulate locations where the minimum 5-ft bottom ditch width cannot be achieved, look at alternatives to provide justification for the deviations and obtain concurrence from the District Drainage Engineer. c. The ditch calculations should follow the Drainage Manual § 2.4.1 Table 2.2, where the Mannings n value is 0.06 to 0.042. d. The FDOT Zone 8 IDF curves should not be utilized in the ditch design calculations. Please use the NOAA Atlas 14 Rainfall Data (per the 2025 FDOT Drainage Manual). e. The Storm Sewer Calculations and tabulations in Appendix 5 should follow the FDOT Drainage Manual and the FDOT Drainage Design Guide.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1	

- a. Additional calculations will be provided at V-bottom ditch sections. The majority of the existing ditch sections lack adequate capacity. The existing ditches have been modified to maximize capacity where impacted and meet FDOT standards for capacity, conveyance, and freeboard.
- b. Additional tabulations will be included. Further coordination with the District Drainage Engineer will be included in the resubmittal.
- c. Acknowledged. The calculations will be modified.
- d. Acknowledged. The calculations will be modified.
- e. Acknowledged. The calculations will be modified.

KENNETH YINGER 6/16/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
51	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
KENNETH YINGER	5/14/2025	1		

Roadway Plans:

- a. There are many existing sidedrain pipes with no end treatments. Please review your scope and discuss with the FDOT PM whether providing safety measures at these locations with MES is warranted.
- b. The legend shown on Sheet 26 does not match the plan view intent at STA 251+60, Rt and STA 252+50, Rt. The driveways at the Wendys are shown cross hatched for a 6" concrete sidewalk and probably should be driveway reconstruction. Please clarify.
- c. Please provide the gutter grade at the closed flume inlet STA 251+25, Rt.
- d. Sheet 67, Drainage Structures, SN-1, SN-2, SN-3, etc. shows two Type C inlets in the drainage cross sections (and plan view) over the two proposed dual 14" x 23" pipes. This is contrary to the call-out for one DBI Type C, J-Bottom, 4'x7' box. The call-out should be consistent with what is shown in the plans.
- e. Please reconsider the proposed call-out for SN-1, SN-2, SN-3, etc. A Type C J-bottom structure would probably not work for this application. A J-bottom would encompass the pipes, but the Type C inlet riser and top slab would likely not fit vertically at most of these locations. Please determine whether a Type H DBI will accommodate the two pipes.
- f. Please review pipe to structure connections with the Drainage Design Guide § 6.4.4. Table 6.4-4 and Table 6.4-5.
- g. Sheet 68, Drainage Structures, SN-7, please check pipe cover using Appendix C of the FDOT Drainage Manual here and at other locations (such as STA 222+50, STA 231+50, STA 253+50, etc.).
- h. The Drainage Structure SN-5 shows the proposed pipe within the cone of a Type 8 MH. Pipes cannot be placed within the MH cone. Please review whether a Type 7 MH will work and review the pipe clearances using the Drainage Design Guide and the FDOT Standard Plans.
- i. The cross sections at STA 206+50 show that the proposed sidewalk is above the existing ground and will block offsite water. Please review here and other locations and consider lowering the sidewalk to existing ground.
- j. The cross section at STA 208+50 is not finished. Please tie in the proposed slopes using the approved front slope and back slope from the approved project Typical Sections at this location and others. Please review whether there are instances where additional pipe and DBIs may need to be incorporated within some areas to accommodate the onsite and offsite stormwater.
- k. Please complete the proposed drainage concept design, such as at STA 253+00, where the existing pipe is not shown connected to the proposed DBI, STA 274+50 where the top of the MH is 3-ft above the bottom of the ditch with no connection, STA 289+00, STA 291+50, STA 292+00, STA 292+50, etc.
- l. Throughout the plans, please delete the random artifacts within the draft drawings. See cross sections at STA 269+00, STA 283+50, STA 285+00, STA 298+00, STA 300+00, STA 303+00, etc.

Matthew Gibbs 6/11/2025 1

- a) We will follow up with the FDOT PM regarding adding MES' to the pipes that do not have existing end treatments.
- b) We will update these driveways to driveway reconstruction and update the legend to match.
- c) The gutter grade information will be added for the flume at Sta. 251+25 Rt.
- d) The plans will be updated to show one inlet instead of two at these drainage structure cross sections.
- e) We will review if a Type H DBI vs. a Type C inlet is needed at this location.
- f) We will review the pipe to structure connections per the Drainage Design Guide.
- g) We will review pipe cover height for structure SN-7.
- h) We will review the pipe invert to confirm if a Type 7 MH is needed at this location.
- i) At this particular cross section the sidewalk is slightly higher than grade, but the water will travel south to Sta.205+50 and then travel over the sidewalk. We will review this cross section to see if we can lower the proposed sidewalk elevation.
- j) The linework shows up correctly in the file but did not print. We will update to ensure it shows up in the PDF of the plans.
- k) These are existing drainage features that are showing up incorrectly. They will be updated to show up correctly.
- l. These existing features will be turned off so they don't print in the PDF.

KENNETH YINGER 6/16/2025 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kevin Ingle	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name		Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kisan Patel		LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	3
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
67	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			DRAINAGE,GEOTECH/MATERIALS,ROADWAY	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	Kisan Patel	5/21/2025	1	Borings are needed for the sidewalk, ditches, pipe runs, and drainage structures. Please coordinate with Arehna and copy me in the email. They will need the plans and KMZ file.	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1		
	We will coordinate with Arehna regarding Geotech borings for the specified elements.				
	Kisan Patel	7/10/2025	1	Response Accepted & Comment Closed	
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
68	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			DRAINAGE,GEOTECH/MATERIALS,ROADWAY,SIGNALIZATION,STRUCTURES	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	Kisan Patel	5/21/2025	1	In the next submittal, please make sure the geotech information is included in the plans.	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1		
	The Geotech information will be included with the next submittal.				
	Kisan Patel	7/10/2025	1	Response Accepted & Comment Closed	
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories	
69	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			GEOTECH/MATERIALS,STRUCTURES	
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
	Kisan Patel	5/21/2025	1	Sheet B1-08: Spec 455 has major changes. Please make sure the plans do not conflict with the latest specifications. You can coordinate with the Geotech Engineer. For example: min. tip can no longer have the "per spec 455-5" note.	
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
	We will coordinate with the geotech engineer to update notes and pile data table for Phase III submittal. We will determine min. tip based on lateral analysis.				
	Kisan Patel	7/10/2025	1	Response Accepted & Comment Closed	
Name		Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kristin Caruso		LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name		Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kyle Purvis		LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name		Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Lawrence Zagardo		LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name		Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Mark Every		LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name		Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Mark Peronto		LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Mark Roberts	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	3
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
24	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Signalization Plans	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Mark Roberts	5/6/2025	1		
Your project is within the limits of the Charlotte County Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS). Charlotte County operates and maintains the ATMS infrastructure for FDOT as part of the Traffic Signal Maintenance and Compensation Agreement.				
Any impacts to the ATMS infrastructure should be addressed within this design project. I have attached the as-built plans to this comment for your information. Please show and label the existing ATMS infrastructure in the plans. Please contact Jody Mansell of Charlotte County at Jody.Mansell@charlottecountyfl.gov for verification of this information and to determine if they have additional infrastructure within the area.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
Thank you. We've confirmed the existing ATMS infrastructure is located on the west side of US 41 and impacts are not anticipated.				
Mark Roberts	6/13/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
28	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Signalization Plans	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Mark Roberts	5/6/2025	1		
Please ensure pay item 633-3 is added to the Project's Estimated Quantities Report.				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
Pay item 633-6 will be included in the Project's EQ Report.				
Mark Roberts	6/13/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
29	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Signalization Plans	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Mark Roberts	5/6/2025	1		
Per FDM Section 923.2, please coordinate with the roadway designer to ensure the existing Charlotte County ATMS infrastructure is shown and labeled on the Utility Adjustment sheets				
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
We will coordinate with the roadway designer to ensure the existing ATMS infrastructure is shown and labeled on the Utility Adjustment sheets.				
Mark Roberts	6/13/2025	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
MARLENA GORE	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Marlene Hebert	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Marshall Douberley	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Martin Smith	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Matthew A. Miller	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Matthew Gibbs	CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER	6/19/2025	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Matthew Litteral	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
97	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CULTURAL RESOURCES,ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Matthew Litteral	5/21/2025	1		
	Based on a desktop review, there are known cultural resource concerns with this project. There are unrecorded historic resources within the projects Historic Area of Potential Effects (APE). 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 District Environmental Management Office (DEMO) will coordinate the production of this document and with SHPO prior to the completion of the environmental certification. We will review future submittals to confirm that this determination remains valid.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/11/2025	1		
	Thank you for your review. Please provide the CRAS to us once it is completed.			
Matthew Litteral	6/12/2025	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Megan Arp	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Melissa Slater	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Melody Joyner	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Michael Rima	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
66	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			MAINTENANCE
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Michael Rima	5/19/2025	1		
	For any new, qualifying bridges, culverts, overhead signs, and traffic signal mast arms being constructed, please submit a request for structure number assignment and an initial inspection request to either Douglas Torres or Michael Rima with the DSMO before the start of construction.			
Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1		
	Noted. Will submit structures number request form.			
Michael Rima	6/16/2025	1		
	Thank you.			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
MICHAEL SHERRON	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
MICHAEL VAUGHN	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nathan Poole	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Neal Turner	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nicole Monies	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nikki Gilmer	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
PAMELA BARR	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Patrick Bateman	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Paul Keller	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Paul Simmons	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
RAVI KAMARAJUGADDA	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
RENJAN JOSEPH	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
ROBERT FAKHRI	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Robert Forand	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	4
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
52	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		B1-01	STRUCTURES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Robert Forand	5/14/2025	1	
	Show the tie-in dimension to the PGL.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Agree, dimension will be adjusted to show tie-in to PGL.			
	Robert Forand	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
53	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		B1-02	STRUCTURES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Robert Forand	5/14/2025	1	
	Call out the low member elevation on the Elevation view.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Noted. Will include low member elevation.			
	Robert Forand	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
54	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		B1-09, B1-10	STRUCTURES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Robert Forand	5/14/2025	1	
	Call out dimensions to the centerline of bearings.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Dimensions will be included from front face of backwall to centerline of bearings and piles.			
	Robert Forand	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
55	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		B1-09, B1-10, B1-13	STRUCTURES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Robert Forand	5/14/2025	1	
	The Section A-A cut should be located at the pile to be consistent with the detail shown.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Correct. Section A-A will be adjusted for next submittal.			
	Robert Forand	6/10/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Robert Harris	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
RUTA VARDYS	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ryan Molloy	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Samantha Ervin	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Scott Ellis	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Scott Presson	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Sergio Figueroa	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Shiva Moonian	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Steven Davis	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Stu Myers	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Tanya Merkle	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Tia Norman	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	9
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
57	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	Based on review of the PH II plans and documentation, it was determined that environmental permits will be required. A modification to ERP #43009761.001 from SWFWMD and a Nationwide Permit from USACE are anticipated for this project. It is our understanding that the consultant will be applying for permits on this project. Please provide a copy of your permit application to review prior to submitting to the agencies. Please provide the Department with the revised Phase II plans for review prior to submittal for permits.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	We had a SWFWMD pre-app meeting on April 4, 2024 and have a meeting on June 26 with Nicole Monies to discuss the USACE permit package for this project. Once the permit packages are finalized we will submit for the Departments review. We will also submit the revised Phase II plans for review prior to permit submittal.			
	Tia Norman	6/9/2025	1	

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
58	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	Due to the proximity of Morningstar Canal to USACE Civil Works projects (Charlotte Harbor, project ID 6980), please note that coordination may be required with USACE's Section 408 which requires additional review time. Please coordinate with the Environmental Permits Coordinator (Nicole Monies, Nicole.Monies@dot.state.fl.us) to determine the need for Section 408 review.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	We currently have a meeting scheduled with Nicole Monies for June 26 to discuss the USACE permit package for this project.			
	Tia Norman	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
59	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	As part of the ERP application package, please include Form 251-A ERP Permit Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Narrative for FDOT Projects.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	We will complete form 251-A ERP narrative for FDOT projects.			
	Tia Norman	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
60	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	It appears that the project will exceed the 1.0-acre threshold for erodible surfaces, therefore a NPDES Permit will be required. Thank you for including the Stormwater Runoff Control Concept (SRCC) with this submittal.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Thank you for your review.			
	Tia Norman	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
61	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	On all current and future projects, the Permits Department is requesting the roadway plans that are to be submitted for permits (i.e. Ph. II or Ph. IIR), be digitally signed and sealed by all of the necessary Engineers of Record.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	Agree, we will sign and seal future submittals required for permits.			
	Tia Norman	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
62	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	Morningstar Canal is a navigable waterway. It is understood that coordination with the USCG has already been completed and a letter was received from Omar Beceiro (Bridge Management Specialist) stating that a USCG permit will not be required.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	

That is correct, a letter from the USCG was received stating this on March 11 , 2025.

Tia Norman 6/9/2025 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
63	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	The wetland lines, including other surface waters (i.e., ditches) and canals, will need to be shown on the plan-profile sheets & cross sections along with the unique wetland/surface water names. Please use unique symbology for these lines so they can be easily identified.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/12/2025	1	
	The wetland lines are on the plans and will be labeled. The other surface waters (ditches that run parallel to SR 45) will be labeled on the plans with a hatching and callout. In the cross sections vertical lines outlining the wetlands and/or other surface waters will be shown and labeled.			
	Tia Norman	6/16/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
64	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	On the SRCC worksheet, please reverse the wetland line symbology so that the grass hatchings are facing into the wetland/surface water.			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	The wetland symbology will be revised as requested.			
	Tia Norman	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
65	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Tia Norman	5/15/2025	1	
	Please coordinate with Nicole Monies (nicole.monies@dot.state.fl.us) to place this project on the SWFWMD pre-app meeting agenda. Be ready to discuss at the pre-app the following information (as it applies to your project): a. An oral summary of proposed work b. Drainage calculations - net new impervious c. Floodplain compensation d. Existing permit(s) e. Construction plans or a representation of proposed work f. Wetland/surface water impacts g. Ditch impacts			
	Matthew Gibbs	6/9/2025	1	
	A permit pre-application meeting was previously held for this project on April 4, 2024.			
	Tia Norman	6/9/2025	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Timmy Meeks	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Todd Boehmer	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
VIVIANNE PENA RODRIGUEZ	REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Walter Breuggeman	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments

Wayne Gaither	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wayne Shelton	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wendy Sands	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wilfredo Alfonzo	LEAD REVIEWER	5/21/2025	ACTIVE	0