

Submittal Report

Financial Project: 417540-6-52-01 Submittal Type: PLANS
Submittal Phase: PHASE II Submittal Staff Type: CONSULTANT
Received Date: 6/6/2024 Response Due Date: 8/2/2024
Grace Period: 0 District: FIRST
Status: CLOSED Create Date: 6/6/2024
Create User Id: KNAKNCI Last Update: 8/20/2024
Last Update User Id: KNAKNCI

Description:

Submittal of PHII Plans Review.
*6/21 Update - Drainage Report added

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 Collier County.

The following documentation has been included with the submittal:

- (1) Roadway Plans
- (1-1) Roadway Plans (Coreborings)
- (2) S&PM Plans
- (3) Cross-Sections
- (4) Driveway Sections
- (5) Lighting Plans
- (6) Lighting Tech Memo
- (7) Design Criteria
- (8) Pavement Design
- (9) Roadway Soil Survey
- (10) Typical Section Package
- (11) ICE Analysis
- (12) ICE Stage 1
- (13) ICE Stage 2
- (14) Roundabout Docs
- (15) TMP
- (16) EDW
- (17) KMZ (Existing)
- (18) KMZ (Proposed)
- (19) LRE
- (20) EQR
- (21) Drainage Report* (Added 6/21)

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

ERP: \\dotsd1cadd\ERP\41754065201\PhaseII

Threads:

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
ABRA HORNE	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Agnimitra Sengupta	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Alan Eldridge	LEAD DESIGNER	8/2/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Amjed Altamimi	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Amy Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Anthony Brown	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Bessie Reina	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Blake Stallworth	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Brent Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Chris Coughlin	LEAD REVIEWER	7/16/2024	ACTIVE	13

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
70	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 11 / Typical Section (1)	ROADWAY

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

Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

Per FDM 222.2.1, for flush shoulder roadways, at the limits of the full width shoulder is the least desirable location to place a sidewalk. Please review, as there appears to be ample R/W to accommodate a more desirable location. See others Typicals, as well.

Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

Sidewalk was placed to minimize impacts to the existing surface waters and conveyance systems and provided at the same location relative to the shoulder as the existing sidewalk. The New Market roundabout is being re-designed to remove the bypass lanes and shift the center location which will likely result in the roadway improvements south of the roundabout to be significantly shortened. We will review the sidewalk placement with the roundabout updates and see if we can move the sidewalk further from the shoulder.

Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
----------------	----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
71	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 14 / Typical Section (4)	ROADWAY

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

Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

a) Clear Zone is defined & dimensioned on the main Typicals on most SR 29 Typical Sections. However, there are a couple it is not defined on, in addition to any of the drop-down details. Consider defining & dimensioning for all for consistency.

b) Per 224.4 of the FDM, a standard width of 12' should be used for Shared Use Paths. Acknowledged 10' is permitted where there is limited R/W. Can the standard 12'-width not be accommodated within the 200' R/W? See all.

Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

a) Clear Zone dimensions will be added to the remaining main Typicals and drop-down details.

b) The 12' width cannot be accommodated within the 200' R/W. The proposed roadway is elevated to meet the SHW base clearance and stormwater pond design high waters. The current design closely follows the existing R/W at the limits of construction.

Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
----------------	----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
72	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 15 / Typical Section (5)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	Per Table 210.3.1 of the FDM, the minimum median width for a C2 flush shoulder facility with a 55 MPH Design Speed is 40'. Please review. See all Typical sections w/ C2 facilities & a 55 MPH Design Speed.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/18/2024	1	
	The typical section is considered high speed suburban (curbed median) per FDM 210.5.1 and Table 210.3.1 and is consistent with FPID 417540-5.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/19/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
73	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 16 / Typical Section (6)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	Drop-Down Detail: 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 clarify why the ditch bottom width is reduced to 4'.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
	The ditch width is restricted due to additional ditch height to aid in conveyance. The ditch profile in this location is opposite of the roadway profile, and the plan location is restricted by the existing right of way. The four-foot minimum ditch width will be coordinated with the District Drainage Engineer as stated in FDM 215.2.7.1.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
74	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 18 / Typical Section (8)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	a) Per FDM 913.2.1 (7), full shoulder widths are to be dimensioned Typical Sections. Please review. The full SB shoulder width is not dimensioned on this Typical. Also, please clarify why stabilization extends to the miscellaneous asphalt on this Typical, while it does not on other Typical sections with a similar circumstance.			
	b) Per FDM 913.2.1 (6), please define limits of proposed sod on SB shoulder.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
	a) The full 10' SB shoulder width will be dimensioned and the stabilization will be terminated at 10' SB shoulder edge.			
	b) Sod text will be added under the 6.5' dimension.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
75	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 19 / Typical Section (9)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	Consider sodding SB unpaved shoulder, provided it is within Clearing & Grubbing limits & will likely be disturbed by proposed construction on either side. At a minimum, if shoulder grading is not proposed, Shoulder Treatment should be considered adjacent to milling & resurfacing.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
	Sod will be added to the SB unpaved shoulder.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
76	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 23 / Typical Section Details (2)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	a) Typically, Type E Curb & Gutter is utilized for boarding & alighting areas. Please clarify Type F Curb & Gutter is called for. See Right Lane Bus Bay, as well.			
	b) Provided SR 29 has flush shoulders, minimum gutter grade is not required along the mainline. Was the profile of the curbed bus bay reviewed? It may result in ponding, particularly with the winged transition terminals. See Right Lane Bus Bay, as well.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
	a) Type F C&G is proposed based on the FDOT Transit Facilities Guidelines, sheet 8 of 41, Section D-D, for closed bus bay layouts on a rural/shoulder with asphalt pavement.			
	b) Spot elevations will be added to the details to ensure that runoff is not trapped in the curb and gutter.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
77	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 46 / Roadway Plan (5)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	Per FDM 210.3.2.2 (3), approach noses of traffic separators are to be offset a minimum of 2' from the approach through lanes. Please review. See all.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
	The nose of median islands will be offset a minimum of 2' from the approach through lanes.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
79	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (2)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	Consider providing an additional END ROADWORK sign in the median along SR 82.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
	An additional End Road Work sign will be added in the median.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
80	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (11)	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1	
	Consider providing geometry/curve radii as done on other Details.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1	
	The curve radii will be added as provided on other details.			
	Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
81	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 177 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (16)	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1		
	Keyholes are provided during the TCP in other locations. Heritage Blvd only appears to accommodate cyclists on paved shoulders. Was providing a temporary keyhole considered? See other locations. Was intent to provide keyholes where they exist? Please clarify intent.			
Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1		
	The intent is to provide keyholes where they are present in the existing condition.			
Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
82	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 196 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan (35)	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	1		
	Please clarify how the proposed 370' radius was established. See other Phases with sharper radii for the New Market Road connection.			
Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1		
	The intent is to provide larger radii where possible to accommodate larger vehicles, given the narrowed lane widths. Radii for this approach in Phases IA, IB, and IIA are between 360'-400'. The Phase III approach is more restrictive as it is bound by the final geometry of the roundabout.			
Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
83	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Chris Coughlin	7/16/2024	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			
Ken Muzyk	7/31/2024	1		
	Acknowledged, thank you for the markup, and your review.			
Chris Coughlin	8/6/2024	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
CHRISTINE ARNOLD	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	8

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
11	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1		
	Mid Block Camera at the Roundabout for safety and wellness			
Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1		
	The CCTV on the existing signal pole in the SW corner of the intersection will be removed along with the signal. Relocating the CCTV will be coordinated with Collier County.			
CHRISTINE ARNOLD	8/1/2024	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
12	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1	
	We have underground facilities within the scope of work. They will need to coordinate with us during construction. Also review the pull boxes for elevation adjustments that are to be made.			
	Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1	
	We will coordinate with Collier County to locate and call out existing infrastructure that will need to be adjusted and add a note to the plans with contact information to coordinate during construction.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	8/1/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
13	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 4 Roadway Plans	TRAFFIC OPERATIONS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1	
	This intersection needs to be redesigned to permit left turns from Old SR 29 to the New SR 29.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The intersection that you appear to be referring to is known as the "bypass" intersection and is being designed by the EOR for FPID 417540-5 and defer to their response.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	7/23/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
14	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 44 Roadway Plans	TRAFFIC OPERATIONS
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1	
	I don't think the a NB right turn lane is needed the volume is very low. Please check your volumes.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The current roundabout lanes (from the approved PD&E) are being reviewed and we recently held a meeting and determined that the NB to EB and WB to NB bypass/right turn lanes are being removed.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
15	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-5, 2096+38	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1	
	Prefer to keep existing stop sign with street name sign. Can add "Only" to existing post. We use 2.5"x2.5" galvanized metal square tubular sign post.			
	Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1	
	There were no street name signs on this stop sign during our field review. Due to the age and condition of this sign it will be shown to be removed and replaced with a sign panel and post meeting current FDOT standards. Street name signs will be kept separate from stop sign assemblies.			
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	8/2/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
16	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-6, 2100	SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1	
	sign with 3 right arrows: Updated MUTCD uses "one way" sign instead.			

Tucker Ammerman 8/1/2024 1

The R6-4A signs will remain. The signs used are per FDM Exhibit 213-5, and match the existing roundabout at SR 29 and SR 82, and the other proposed roundabouts at SR 29 Bypass and CR 846.

CHRISTINE ARNOLD 8/2/2024 1

please check again, the FDM has not been upgraded yet to the MUTCD 11th addition (2023) but it will, you will need to use the one way sign.

Tucker Ammerman 8/2/2024 1

Thank you for the information. However, the FDOT has not officially adopted the 11th Edition of the MUTCD, December 2023. The signs will remain as shown to meet the current FDM. We will make sure to update and match when the MUTCD is adopted and FDM is updated.

CHRISTINE ARNOLD 8/2/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
17	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-31	SIGNING AND MARKING

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1	

For work in Collier County right of way, all sign related work to be coordinated with Felix Burgos, 239-253-3160, to maintain integrity of our Sign asset database. Contractor to follow Traffic Operations Signing and Pavement Markings Special Provision details which indicate using a 2.5" x 2.5" galvanized metal square tubular sign post.

Tucker Ammerman 8/1/2024 1

This request will be coordinated with the FDOT PM. As this project is funded by the FDOT, and all signs are located within FDOT right of way, any proposed signs will need to meet current FDOT Standards.

CHRISTINE ARNOLD 8/1/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
18	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		S-6	SIGNING AND MARKING

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
CHRISTINE ARNOLD	6/25/2024	1	

top right corner: add the road name

Tucker Ammerman 8/1/2024 1

Local road name (New Market Rd) sign will be added to the East Collier 29A standalone signs.

CHRISTINE ARNOLD 8/1/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Forestt	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
1	COMMENT AGREED WITH		Contamination Memorandum	CONTAMINATION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Christopher Forestt	6/6/2024	1	

This comment does NOT require a written response from the Designers.

There is a Level-I Contamination Screening Evaluation Report (CSER) submitted for the corridor addressing the Pond / Stormwater Management Features (SMFs). The CSER assigned several potential contamination sites with HIGH and MEDIUM risk ratings; meaning these locations may create impacts to construction.

The Environmental Management Office (EMO) will utilize the CSER, along with information collected from contamination-related geographic information system (GIS) registries and regulatory documentation, during review of future developing design plans.

It is important to note that the FDOT Utilities Group is coordinating with Calumet and their assessment contractor, ERM, regarding the potential presence of a former bulk oil pipeline within the Project Limits. If in conflict, the EMO will coordinate testing any areas of concern and providing oversight during pipeline removal.

Sites of concern will be identified in a Contamination Memorandum. The FDOT District One Contamination Assessment & Remediation (CAR) Contractor will test suspect locations. The CAR Contractor will present their investigation results in a Level-II Impact to Construction Assessment. Finding from that report will be summarized in Contamination Memorandums with FINAL plan markings and language to both the Design Team and Contractors.

The initial memorandum and subsequent environmental testing will be presented at a later phase of design, likely Phase-IIR, Phase-III, or Phase-IIIR, to ensure the contamination information is timely and sufficient to plan for any necessary Level-III construction support.

The Project Manager, Christopher Speese agreed with this approach based on the Project's current status and 3/25/27 Letting Date in PSEE.

The Design Team should continue to coordinate with the EMO regarding the timing of this matter as input regarding the Project's timing and contamination information needs will be appreciated.

Thank you.

Tammy Kreisle	7/10/2024	1
---------------	-----------	---

Comment Agreed & Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Speese	IN-HOUSE PROJECT MANAGER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Clifton Johnson	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Daisy Mattice-Cline	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Daniel Buidens	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Darryl Richard	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
DAVE HAY	REVIEWER	8/2/2024	ACTIVE	7

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
3	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 11	ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
DAVE HAY	6/12/2024	1		

The Shoulder Pavement calls for OBG-01(Asphalt Base) and the Shared Use Path also calls for OBG-01 with no specified material. The cost of these two operations are extremely different and should the percentage of there areas change either the DOT or the Contractor is going to be finically hurt. OBG-01 with asphalt is four inches thick. OBG-02 with asphalt is also four inches thick so the suggestion is that the shoulder pavement be OBG-02(Asphalt Base).

Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1
-----------	-----------	---

We will revise the shoulder pavement to OBG-02(Asphalt Base) as suggested.

DAVE HAY 7/18/2024 1
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
4	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheets 16 - 18	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVE HAY	6/12/2024	1	

The Friction Course for the shoulder pavement on these three Typical Sections do not note the 3/4" thickness for the F.C.-5.

Ken Muzyk 7/12/2024 1

We will add the FC-5 friction course thickness (3/4") to the description.

DAVE HAY 7/18/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
5	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 18	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVE HAY	6/12/2024	1	

The second lift of structural asphalt for the widening calls for 2.50" and the shoulder thickness shows 2". This violates Specification 334-1.3.3 Para. 2 which calls for the upper lift of the roadway to be pulled in the same pass and thickness as the shoulder.

Ken Muzyk 7/12/2024 1

We will increase the Type SP E thickness on the shoulder pavement from 2 to 2.5".

DAVE HAY 7/18/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
6	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 61	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVE HAY	6/12/2024	1	

At station 2221+66.29 Left is a callout for a 20' wide turnout. It scales 12' and by the stations given for it's intersection with the Shared Use Path it should be 12'.

Ken Muzyk 7/12/2024 1

We will revise the turnout width label to 12'.

DAVE HAY 7/18/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
7	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 68	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVE HAY	6/12/2024	1	

No sidewalk is shown on the right side yet Sheet 44 has a 6' sidewalk at the Match-Line. Is that where it is to end?

Ken Muzyk 7/12/2024 1

The new sidewalk is planned to end where the connection to the existing sidewalk occurs. We will remove part of the cross hatching and add labels on sheet 44.

DAVE HAY 7/18/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
8	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet 214	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVE HAY	6/12/2024	1	

No callout for the 12" WM Proposed running parallel to the roadway on the west side.

Ken Muzyk 7/12/2024 1

The 12" WM is an early markup that was provided by the utility and will be resolved for the Phase IIR submittal.

DAVE HAY 7/18/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
84	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet L-7	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
DAVE HAY	8/2/2024	1	

The conduit from Load Center A across the Roadway to Light Pole 11 only shows 2 # 6 plus 1 #6 ground. There are two circuits (A-1 and A-3) so should it not be 4 #6 conductors plus 1 #6 ground?

John Ramon 8/2/2024 1

Agreed, this call out will be updated to show 5 conductors. Also, the load center callout will be updated to show 9 conductors to account for all 4 branches.

DAVE HAY 8/6/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Desiree Davis	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Earl Taylor	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Edward Stevens	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Elias Bowne	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
2	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Permanent Count Station	OTHER

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Elias Bowne	6/11/2024	1	

There is a Telemetered Traffic Monitoring Station on 03080000 (SR 29) at 26.47924, -81.43456, or MP 42.386. Please contact James Whitely in CO for installation plans & specifications. (850-414-4350)

Tucker Ammerman 8/1/2024 1

We will contact James Whitely and include plans to replace the existing TTMS 03080000.

Elias Bowne 8/5/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Elizabeth Sofsky	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	3

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
43	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			TRANSIT

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Elizabeth Sofsky	7/8/2024	1	

Roadway Plans, Sheet 23 – Is there any concern for water pooling between the 2% shared use path and the adjacent concrete sidewalk sloping towards to the shared use path? Please review Section A-A of the Closed Bus Bay typical section detail and revise as necessary.

Ken Muzyk 7/12/2024 1

We will show a 2% cross slope on the sidewalk connecting the bus stop to the shared use path.

Elizabeth Sofsky 7/16/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
44	COMMENT RESOLVED			TRANSIT
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Elizabeth Sofsky	7/8/2024	1	
	Roadway Plans, Sheet 45 – During a Coordination Meeting with Collier Area Transit on April 25, 2024, locating the southbound transit stop closer to the roundabout to promote pedestrian crossings at marked crosswalks was considered. Is this option still being explored?			
	Tammy Kreisle	7/12/2024	1	
	We located the bus stops where they were requested in the Phase I review comments. We are in the process of revising the roundabout design and will see if it is possible to locate them further south.			
	Christopher Speese	4/23/2026	1	
	During a Transit Coordination Meeting on April 14, 2026, FDOT and Collier Area Transit (CAT) reviewed the proposed southbound transit stop and associated bus bay near Heritage Blvd. The FSU College of Medicine previously raised safety concerns regarding the bus bay being located approximately 900 feet from the nearest pedestrian crossing, which could encourage unsafe mid block crossings. After discussion, CAT agreed that the bus bay should not be included in the 417540 6 project at this time. CAT requested that the design files be provided so the facility may be considered for construction in a future phase when development and pedestrian infrastructure support it. FDOT and the design team concurred with removing the bus bay from the current project scope.			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
45	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING,TRANSIT
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Elizabeth Sofsky	7/8/2024	1	
	Signing and Pavement Marking Plans, Sheet S-8 – Please show where the proposed transit stop signs will be placed for the new transit stops near STA 2110+60 RT/LT.			
	Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1	
	Proposed transit stop sign locations will be shown to be installed by others at the Bus Stops. A contact will be coordinated and added to the General Notes Sheet.			
	Elizabeth Sofsky	8/2/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Eric Reese	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Garfield Howell	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	5

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
53	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	7/8/2024	1	
	Please confirm the proposed W2-6 with W13-1P sign assembly is provided for each approach leg into the roundabout			
	Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1	
	The proposed W2-6 and W13-1P signs are proposed on all legs of the roundabout and spaced as recommended in FDM Exhibit 213-5.			
	Garfield Howell	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
54	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	7/8/2024	1	
	S-6 Please consider the directional arrow orientation is not the same for each paired approach			
	Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1	
	The directional arrow signs on the RRFB will be split out into their respective sides for clarity.			
	Garfield Howell	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
55	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	7/8/2024	1	
	S-7 Please consider adding RPMs to each 6" solid white centerline entering or leaving proposed roundabout.			
	Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1	
	RPMs at 20' spacing will be added to each 6" solid white line entering and leaving the roundabout.			
	Garfield Howell	8/6/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
57	COMMENT RESOLVED			LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	7/8/2024	1	
	Please confirm lighting will be provided if traffic is permitted to enter roundabout during any of the proposed construction phases.			
	John Ramon	7/29/2024	1	
	The existing poles affected by the reconstruction are shown to be replaced with new light poles; however, new poles cannot be installed until new shoulders and slopes are constructed. Temporary lighting is not included in the scope, and per FDM 240.2.2.15, "temporary highway lighting is not required where it is necessary to remove existing lighting before new lighting is placed in service."			
	Christopher Speese	8/16/2024	1	
	Temp. Lighting will be added to the project per an upcoming SA			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
67	COMMENT RESOLVED			LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Garfield Howell	7/8/2024	1	
	Please consider increasing the lighting levels for new construction/ reconstruction to consistently meet the standard requirement.			
	John Ramon	7/29/2024	1	
	The proposed lighting design meets the required minimum criteria according to FDM 231.2.1 for both vertical and horizontal illuminance.			
	Christopher Speese	8/16/2024	1	
	Temp. Lighting will be added to the project per an upcoming SA			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
GENA BATMAN	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Gregory Bowne	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Harley Davidson	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments

J.J. Wren	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
James McGinnis	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jason Mobsby	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeanna Dean	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey James	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jennifer Gaona	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	INACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jimmy Vilce	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
John Kubicki	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
John Ramon	LEAD DESIGNER	8/2/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Karina Della Sera	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Katharine Causey	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kayla Sapp	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Keith Robbins	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ken Muzyk	LEAD DESIGNER	8/2/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
KENNETH YINGER	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	13

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
50	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	

Sheets 3-8 Drainage Map:
a. Please identify SMF outfall locations and provide flow arrows where the SMF water will go offsite. For instance, the outfall from Pond 605A drains to the west side of SR 29, but it is not clear where the stormwater will go from there.
b. Please identify where the project cross drains will outfall. For instance, CD3 appears to go to a closed wetland basin to the left. Please identify the basin pop-off or outfall for this cross drain. The outfall for CD4 is not identified. It appears that CD5 will drain south, but it is not clear as the flow arrow south may only be for an offsite Ag facility. CD2 is later shown in the plans [Sheet 47] to be removed, but the drainage map shows flow arrows approaching and leaving the cross drain.
c. Please identify basin pop-off locations and elevations, e.g.: STA 2130, LT

Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
---------------	----------	---	--

a. The SMF outfalls will be identified and flow arrows will depict where the SMF discharges will go offsite.
b. The cross drain outfalls will be identified and flow arrows will dipt where the discharges will go offsite. Additionally, for CD3 the basin pop-off elevation and location will be labeled on the maps.
c. All basin pop-off locations and elevations will will labeled on the maps.

KENNETH YINGER	8/8/2024	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	7/8/2024	1	
	Sheets 42-43: Label P-100A and P-100B in Roadway Plan sheets if they will not be shown on Drainage Structures sheets.			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	P-100A and P-100B will be labeled on the Roadway Plan sheets.			
	KENNETH YINGER	8/8/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
52	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	
	Sheet 45			
	a. Potential ponding at bus bay at 2111+00LT. Ensure positive drainage.			
	b. Consider the need for terminal inlets at 2104+40 LT/RT or erosion mitigation due to concentrated flows along the curb.			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	a. The bus bays will be graded to provide positive conveyance for the runoff.			
	b. We will review the drainage area anticipated at these locations and consider adding terminal inlets if the runoff is anticipated to create erosion.			
	KENNETH YINGER	8/8/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
56	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	
	Drainage Structures / Drainage Data Table:			
	a. [Sheet 129] P-106 appears larger than MES height of S-106A.			
	b. [Sheet 130] Gaps in finished grade on Drainage Structures (3), check all profiles.			
	c. [Sheet 131] Are grates needed on S-114, S-704 and S-705? Perpendicular to road and not standard on CD MES. Please review. Also, consider the use of endwalls instead of MES' for S-704 and S-705.			
	d. [Sheet 142] Extra text on S-705A profile, please revise.			
	e. [Sheet 146] Group 5 (all elliptical) material should be ERCP instead of RCP.			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	a. P-106 is drawn to scale. The rectangular cell to represent the MES at S-106A will be adjusted to match the correct pipe size.			
	b. The gaps in the finished grade are due to locations where the ORD model for the finished surface is incomplete. We will review these areas to verify the finished surface is continuously depicted above the profile.			
	c. S-114 will be modified with a design change and will no longer be a MES. the grates will be removed from S-704 and S-705 since they are standard CD MES and perpendicular to the roadway.			
	d. The duplicate and overlapping text on the S-705A profile will be removed.			
	e. The Group 5 material will be changed to "ERCP".			
	KENNETH YINGER	8/8/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
58	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	
	Stormwater Facility:			
	a. [Sheet 149] Review missing radius labels needed for construction of SMF 602B. Large radius on west side, and inside radius near S-201.			
	b. [Sheet 149] P-200 through P-203 appear to be skewed at approximately 40 degrees, exceeding the 17 degree maximum for 24" equivalent pipes per Table 6.4-3 of the Drainage Design Guide. Please review.			
	c. [Sheet 155] Differentiate SWF 605A Control El. contour as a dashed line, similar to FDM Exhibit 917-1.			
	d. [Sheet 161] Update "S-206" labels on this sheet to match table and plan view "S-205".			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	a. On the Pond 602B detail, the large west side radius will be added as well as the inside radius near S-201.			
	b. We will review the skewed pipe design for consistency with the Drainage Design Guide and will consider modifying the design to provide a straighter path for the pipes conveying discharge from the control structures.			
	c. The control elevation contour will be changed to be a dashed line.			
	d. The S-206" labels will be revised to "S-205" to match the plan view and structure data table.			

KENNETH YINGER 8/8/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
59	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	

Drainage Structures

- a. There are multiple upside-down alignment tangent labels on Drainage Structures (3). Please revise and look for other occurrences.
- b. It appears that the profile shows the HGL/EGL linework on Drainage Structures (8). Please review and check for other occurrences.
- c. Per FDM 916.2.2, assign pipe numbers that correlate with the structure at the hydraulically upper end of pipe. Please revise pipe numbers (i.e. P-100A, P-100B, P-505, P-508, etc.)
- d. Multiple existing ground lines appear on some profiles, consider reviewing. (S-500A, S-500B, S-510)

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

- a. The upside down alignment tangent labels will be removed and replaced with a note that states "See Project Layout Roundabout Sheets for Roundabout BL CONST. and Curve Data Information".
- b. We will review the profile to verify only the existing ground and proposed surface lines are depicted and not the HGL and EGL lines.
- c. We will review all of the pipe numbers and make modifications to ensure that the naming convention correlates with the structure at the hydraulically upper end of the pipe.
- d. We will review the existing ground profile lines to ensure that only one line representing the surveyed existing ground profile is depicted.

KENNETH YINGER 8/8/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
60	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	

Drainage Structures Data:

- a. Use consistent decimal precision for Baseline Stations and Baseline Offsets.
- b. S-109 should have a negative offset, as the standard station/offset reference point is LT of the referenced baseline. Please revise.
- c. Offsets of S-500B, S-500C, S-509, S-600 differ from storm tabs. Please revise.
- d. Station of S-510, S-600 in Data Table differs from storm tabs. Please revise.
- e. Please review all Stations/Offsets/Structure Elevations/Pipe Elevations between the data tables and Stormwater Facility outlet structure tables. There is conflicting information for S-123, S-200, S-304, S-505, S-700.
- f. P-504 size and elevations conflict with Stormwater Facility sheets and ICPR drop structure link. Please Review
- g. Consider specifying modified structures and J-Bottoms in the Structures Data.
- h. Provide notes to "See SMF Details" in Drainage Structures Data tables.

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

- a. Consistent decimal precision will be utilized for the baseline station and offset labels on the Drainage Structures Data sheets.
- b. We will review the offset dimension for S-109 and verify that it is labelled correctly prior to the next submittal.
- c. We will review the offset dimensions for S-500B, S-500C, S-509, and S-600 to ensure consistency between the Drainage Structure Data tables and the storm tab calculations.
- d. We will review the station of S-510 and S-600 to ensure consistency between the Drainage Structure Data tables and the storm tab calculations.
- e. All pond control structure data will be reviewed for consistency between the Drainage Structure Data tables and the SWF Outlet Structure tables.
- f. P-504 will be reviewed to ensure consistency with the ICPR4 drop structure data input.
- g. Modified structures and J-Bottoms will with specified in the Drainage Structure Data tables.
- h. A note to "See SMF Details" will be provided on the Drainage Structure Data sheets.

KENNETH YINGER 8/8/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
61	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	

Cross Sections:

Multiple locations impacting existing ditches where offsite area is coming to the project. Is water being trapped? Consider need for R/W and proposed ditches to ensure positive drainage. (2106+00 to 2120+00 LT, 2163+00 to 2221+00 LT, 2160+00 to 2231+00 RT)

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

These areas have been reviewed and water is not trapped but conveys along the back of the tie-down slope to the existing outfall locations to match the existing drainage patterns. The ICPR modeling has analyzed each of these offsite areas listed utilizing stage/area to demonstrate that the post stage in each node is less than or equal to the pre stage. Additional mainline right of way is not required.

KENNETH YINGER 8/8/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
62	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Report	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	
	Documentation – Drainage Design Criteria:			
	a. Please address in the report whether or not there are any special drainage basins that may require extraordinary attenuation.			
	b. Please address in the report whether or not there are any basins that may require extraordinary treatment. (Specially address the OFW criteria as mentioned in the SFWMD meeting minutes and how the OFW issue will be handled.)			
	c. Please address any additional coordination and/or criteria with Collier County/BCB for FPC impacts.			
	d. Earlier coordination with SFWMD in 2020 led to some extraordinary requests from the WMD for the corridor. Please indicate in the documentation if any of these requests were incorporated in the drainage design, and indicate whether there has been any coordination with the Lake Trafford Management team.			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	a. The report will be updated to state there are no special drainage basins requiring extraordinary attenuation.			
	b. The report will be updated to state that no basins will require extraordinary treatment and no basins outfall to an OFW and OFW criteria is not required to be attained.			
	c. There is currently no additional coordination with Collier County or BCB to document. If additional coordination is conducted as the design phase progresses documentation of meetings or discussions will be added to the report.			
	d. The "extraordinary" WMD requests and coordination with the Lake Trafford Management Team were with respect to a stormwater design that utilized a regional pond at the downstream end of the outfall canal prior to discharge to Lake Trafford. As the design phase progressed, restrictions were placed on the design team to move forward with design and the Phase II plans submittal without coordinating with agencies, stakeholders, property owners, and local municipalities until LDCA was received for the PD&E phase. As a result, the regional pond idea was eliminated as a viable alternative for stormwater management and the "extraordinary" WMD requests and coordination with the Lake Trafford Management Team were not required for a traditional stormwater management design.			
	KENNETH YINGER	8/8/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
63	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Report	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	
	Documentation – 18. Erosion and Sediment Control:			
	a. It is stated that the storm drain outfalls into the SMFs will contain sediment sumps to reduce sedimentation of the SMF. The next sentence states that all inflow pipes to the SMFs require no special erosion control measures. The two statements seem to contradict each other. Please clarify.			
	b. If sediment sumps are constructed at SMF inflow points to reduce sedimentation of the ponds, further coordination with Maintenance may be necessary to ensure that a maintenance schedule includes inspection and cleanout of these sumps.			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	a. The sentence will be clarified to state that "all inflow pipes to the SMFs will not require special erosion control measures other than the sediment sumps."			
	b. Typically, the FDOT ponds are inspected on an 18 month cycle to identify any routine maintenance items or deficiencies. The 18 month inspection cycle should be sufficient to ensure that routine maintenance can be carried out on the sediment sumps, if needed, to keep the ponds in compliance for re-certification of the ERP with the WMD.			
	KENNETH YINGER	8/8/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
64	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Report	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	
	Documentation – Storm Tabs:			
	a. S-111 and S-112 pipes are below minimum velocity. Please review.			
	b. S-106A outfall system missing from storm tabs. Please review.			
	c. Is the area of S-114 accounted for at S-113? S-114 is not included in the storm tabs for the system. Please review.			
	d. Consider adding notes to Storm Tabs when the minimum 10-minute TC is not used for the basin. For example, S-500B, S-510 etc. appear to use a TC based on the upstream ditch flow path travel time, but it does not match the ditch calculations travel time.			
	e. Please review the TC calculation for S-600. The travel time in the ditch is 9.91 minutes; does it take 10 minutes to get to the upstream end of the ditch? For example, S-514 appears to have used only the travel time of the corresponding ditch calculation but did not add the minimum 10-minute initial TC. S-604 and S-610 are similar.			
	f. Review the HGL at S-610 (EI. 34.20). The Storm Tabs show a 38.69 HGL. However, the max stage at the ICPR model node 606-03 for the 10yr-24hr storm is 38.76. Please resolve.			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	

- a. The pipes at S-111 and S-112 will be reviewed and modified to provided the required cleansing velocity.
- b. A stormtab calculation for the S-106A outfall system will be provided in the Drainage Report with the next submittal.
- c. The SUP location on the east side of SR 29 is being modified and the ditch and inlet design at S-114 will change on future submittals. When the re-design is complete and the new calculations prepared we will verify that the drainage area for S-114 is included being conveyed to S-113.
- d. A description will be added to the "Note" column in the stormtab calculations for drainage structures that utilize a TC value from the ditch conveyance calculations. The TC values utilized in the stormtab calculations for S-500B and S-510 will be reviewed to verify they are using the appropriate TC value from the ditch conveyance calculations.
- e. The TC value for S-600 in the stormtab calculation will be reviewed to verify the correct value is being utilized. We will also review the TC values for S-514, S-604, and S-610 to verify the TC value utilized in the stormtab calculation is appropriately based on the ditch conveyance calculation.
- f. S-610 is being removed from the design to disconnect the L-29 Canal from Pond 606A. Instead of the DBI at S-610, the L-29 Canal will convey to the north via a new side drain under the Pond 606A access driveway. The onsite system will continue to convey to Pond606A through a closed pipe system but the SR 29 runoff will be collected by shoulder gutter inlets instead. In future submittals the stage elevation noted in the comment will not be calculated in the stormtab and only analyzed via the ICPR4 model.

KENNETH YINGER 8/8/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
65	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Report	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	

Documentation – Ditch Calculations:

- a. Does the Depth Allow column consider the freeboard of 0.5' or 1' needed depending on whether the section is in cut or fill, per Drainage Manual 2.4.5? Or does the Flow Depth column need to be at least 0.5' below the Depth Allow column? Recommend clarifying the template based on this.
- b. Ditches 601-06, 604-03A n value should be 0.042 based on the calculated Flow depth. Please revise.
- c. Ditch 604-03A Flow Depth exceeds Depth Allow. Please Review.
- d. Review n values for Ditch 605-01 to 605-04, 605-05B, 606-03, 606-04, 606-07, 606-09. Flow depths appear < 0.70' yet n value of 0.042 is used. If changing n to 0.060 results in flow depth > 0.70', no change needed.
- e. Ditch slope in Ditch 606-04 does not meet minimum slope in Drainage Manual 2.4.2. Please revise.

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

- a. The "Depth Allow" column is the physical depth from the ditch bottom to the low top of bank. The freeboard provided is the difference between the "Depth Allow" and "Flow Depth" columns. A "Freeboard" column will be added to the calculations to clarify this value.
- b. At ditch 601-06 the n value will be changed to 0.042. At ditch 604-03A a modification was made to the calculation and the ditch stage is now less than 0.7' and the n value will remain at 0.06.
- c. The flow depth at ditch 604-03A was not calculating correctly. The calculation has been corrected and the Flow Depth is now calculated as 0.67' and is contained within the Depth Allowable.
- d. When the n value is changed to 0.06 for these ditches the Flow Depth is calculated as >0.70'. Accordingly, the 0.042 n value currently utilized will remain in the calculation.
- e. Ditch 606-04 will be regraded to provide the minimum ditch slope required in the Drainage Manual.

KENNETH YINGER 8/8/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
66	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Report	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
KENNETH YINGER	7/8/2024	1	

Documentation – ICPR:

- a. Review max depth for P 602 drop structure link. Should it be 1.58 ft? For example, P 603/604B uses the elliptical pipe depth.
- b. P 606A drop structure link inverts appear to differ from data tables and Stormwater Facility sheet. Please review.
- c. P S-125A seems to correspond to S-123 control structure, however, the pipe invert appears to differ from Stormwater Facility sheet. Please review.
- d. S-205 Control Structure for Attenuation Pond does not appear in ICPR calcs.

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

- a. The max depth for the P602 drop structure link will be revised to 1.58 feet.
- b. We will review the P606A drop structure link inverts versus the plans and verify that they match prior to the next submittal.
- c. P S-125A is the control structure for Pond 601A. We will review the drop structure link inverts versus the plans and verify that they match prior to the next submittal.
- d. The input data for the S-205 control structure for the Attenuation Pond will be included in the Drainage Report with the next submittal.

KENNETH YINGER 8/8/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kimberly Warren	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	2
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
68	COMMENT AGREED WITH			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Kimberly Warren	7/8/2024	1		
Based upon a meeting on 7/8/24 between DEMO and the design consultant, it is noted that a stormwater attenuation area is located on the east side of SR 29 from approximately STA 2128 to STA 2136. This area was included in the CRAS Addendum, species survey area and CSER 500' buffer. No additional evaluation is required. However, it is noted that the attenuation area will need to be documented in a future re-evaluation.				
Tammy Kreisle	7/10/2024	1		
Thank you for your review and for the quick coordination to confirm that no additional evaluation is required.				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
69	COMMENT AGREED WITH			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Kimberly Warren	7/8/2024	1		
Any additional ROW not shown and cleared as part of the PD&E Preferred Alternative or changes to the typical section or access should be coordinated with DEMO as soon as possible. These changes may constitute a design change, which would require a re-evaluation.				
This may result in additional documentation and agency coordination, possibly impacting the project schedule.				
Tammy Kreisle	7/10/2024	1		
Comment Agreed & Closed				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kisan Patel	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kristin Caruso	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kyle Purvis	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Lawrence Zagardo	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Mark Peronto	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Mark Roberts	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Marlene Hebert	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Marshall Douberley	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Martin Smith	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Matthew A. Miller	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Megan Arp	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	4
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
46	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Megan Arp	7/8/2024	1		
This is an FYI comment and Does NOT require a response.				
This project is located in a mix of Xeric Habitat and wetlands. Some of this area has dry conditions naturally. It is difficult to establish sod without a topsoil layer. Topsoil adds a layer of organic material that holds water and nutrients on top of the quartzite soils giving the sod a barrier of moisture between it and the existing dry sandy soils. Although sod comes with a 2-plus inch base of rich organic soil (held together by its roots). This sod piece/roll laid directly on the hot, xeric quartzite sand will fry the roots from the bottom-up injuring or destroying the sods root system. Also, sun damage occurs to the top grassy portion of the sod too in this region since it is a xeric habitat lacking shade and naturally occurring moist (wetland) soils. Please consider including topsoil in these areas to ensure the success of sod establishment.				
Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1		
Thank you for your review.				
Megan Arp	7/15/2024	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
47	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Megan Arp	7/8/2024	1		
It appears that there is natural habitat/open space on this job. There is a possibility for protected species to be present in these pockets of open space. Will there be a Field Environmental Assessment performed to identify what is present of the job? This habitat is suitable for the Gopher Tortoise, Florida Panther, and Black Bear.				
Tammy Kreisle	7/10/2024	1		
We agree there is a potential for listed species to be encountered. Gopher tortoise burrows are known to be present. District One's listed species consultants will review the project prior to construction and perform relocations if necessary. Surveys or habitat assessments for other listed species including the Florida panther and Florida black bear have been conducted and the results were coordinated with the agencies. USFWS and FWC provided concurrence with the findings and proposed mitigation in the PD&E Study phase. Permit applications are being prepared for the project which details the design level of impacts and proposed mitigation. Additional coordination with USFWS and FWC will occur through the permit application review process to finalize any mitigation requirements.				
Megan Arp	7/15/2024	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
48	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Megan Arp	7/8/2024	1		
Will there be Geo-Tech testing in the ponds (for suitable material) to avoid long term turbid conditions after construction? Also, will the constructed ponds receive off-site water that may be compromised by activities on adjacent private properties?				
Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1		
Yes, deeper SPT borings to determine suitable pond material have been performed to confirm long term turbid conditions will not exist. The design of the storm water system primarily bypasses offsite runoff past the proposed ponds and directly to the outfall locations to minimize the effects of treating compromised offsite runoff in the FDOT ponds.				
Megan Arp	8/9/2024	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
49	COMMENT AGREED WITH		Ponds	CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Megan Arp	7/8/2024	1		
This is an FYI comment and does NOT require a response.				
If there is prolonged dewatering for the building of ponds (exceeding one year) extra permits may be required from the Water Management District.				
Tammy Kreisle	7/10/2024	1		
Noted.				

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Melissa Slater	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Michael Rima	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
MICHAEL SHERRON	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nathan Poole	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
10	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet S-3	SIGNALIZATION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Nathan Poole	6/20/2024	1	

Please include the following notes:

~ REQUEST UPDATED SIGNAL TIMINGS FROM FDOT TSM&O ENGINEER - ARTERIALS (863-519-2216) WHEN ALL LANES, STRIPING, SIGNALS AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ARE IN THEIR FINAL CONFIGURATION AND THE SIGNAL IS OPERATING AS DESIGNED. PROVIDE FDOT WITH ALL 'AS-BUILT' INFORMATION NECESSARY TO DEVELOP THE BASIC SIGNAL TIMING PARAMETERS AND ALLOW THREE (3) WEEKS FOLLOWING THE REQUEST FOR FDOT TO DEVELOP THE UPDATED TIMINGS. PROGRAM THE CONTROLLER PER THE TIMINGS PROVIDED BY FDOT.

~ AT THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT, PROVIDE AS-BUILT PLANS IN ELECTRONIC FORM (PDF) TO:

FDOT TRAFFIC OPERATIONS
 NEAL TURNER, P.E., TSM&O ENGINEER - ARTERIALS
 801 N. BROADWAY AVE
 P.O. BOX 1249
 BARTOW, FL 33830-1249
 EMAIL: NEAL.TURNER@DOT.STATE.FL.US
 PHONE: 863-519-2216

Tucker Ammerman	8/1/2024	1	
The existing signal at SR 29 and Westclox Street is being removed and replaced with a roundabout. There are no other signals within the project limits.			
Nathan Poole	8/8/2024	1	
The requested note is needed due to the RRFBs being included at the roundabout. TSM&O maintains the operations of the RRFBs. Please include the requested notes.			
Tammy Kreisle	8/12/2024	1	
This note will be added to the General Note Sheet.			
Nathan Poole	8/12/2024	1	
Thank you.			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nicole Monies	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nikki Gilmer	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Patrick Bateman	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Paul Simmons	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ramasamy Venkatesan	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	2

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
41	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			GEOTECH/MATERIALS

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Ramasamy Venkatesan	6/28/2024	1	

It appears though soil borings are shown in the cross section sheets. It appears soil stratum number are missing.

Ken Muzyk	7/15/2024	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

Soil borings are shown in the cross section sheets for information only. Soil stratum numbers are not required information on roadway cross sections per FDM 905.3. Please see the Roadway Soil Profiles contained in the Soil Survey document for soil stratum numbers.

Ramasamy Venkatesan	7/17/2024	1	
---------------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
42	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			GEOTECH/MATERIALS

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Ramasamy Venkatesan	6/28/2024	1	

Suggest including water table symbol be included in the soil boring shown in the cross section sheets.

Ken Muzyk	7/15/2024	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

Soil borings are shown in the cross section sheets for information only. Water table depths are not required information on roadway cross sections per FDM 905.3. Please see the Roadway Soil Profiles contained in the Soil Survey document for water table depths.

Ramasamy Venkatesan	7/17/2024	1	
---------------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
RENJAN JOSEPH	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Robert McCrumb	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
----------------	----------	----------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Ryan Molloy	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
-------------	---------------	----------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Samantha Ervin	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
----------------	---------------	----------	--------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Scott Ellis	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
-------------	---------------	----------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Scott Presson	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	21
---------------	----------	----------	--------	----

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
19	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 210	UTILITIES

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	

Approximate Station 2086+86, Utility Adjustment Sheet (1), Right roadway widening. How does widening occur without conflict to existing underground Comcast BTV utility? Provide SUE information for utilities at this location to verify no impact.

Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.

Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
---------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
20	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 211	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2094+00, Utility Adjustment Sheet (2), Right Roadway Widening. How does the 10' shoulder construction as per typical section occur without conflict to existing underground CenturyLink BT? The buried electric line that would be impacted is relocated to the West with lighting circuit A-1.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
21	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 211	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2095+22, Utility Adjustment Sheet (2), Right and Left roadway widening crosses existing underground Immokalee Water & Sewer District 8"WM. Provide Sue information at this location. If not at a sufficient depth, specify static compaction mode during widening as to not adversely impact existing underground WM utility.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
22	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 211	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2100+00 to 2101+20, Utility Adjustment Sheet (3). 8" Steel Underground GM crosses beneath proposed roundabout construction. Provide Sue information at this location. Recommend specifying static compaction mode during roundabout construction as to not adversely impact utility.			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
23	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 212	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2100+10, Utility Adjustment Sheet (3). Comment (3) 4" HDPE BE to be removed LCEC by others – header only points to one buried electric line. Is this comment applicable to the buried electric lines to the North and South. Or, are there (3)-qty HDPE lines in the conduit run?			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
24	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 214	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Utility Adjustment Sheet 214, Drainage Structures (5) Sheet 132. Approximate Station 2112+82.20" Casing for Proposed 12" WM beneath roadway. In direct conflict with structure S-117. How is this constructed?			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
25	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 214	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Approximate Station 2112+82.20 – 20" Casing for proposed 12" WM beneath roadway. In direct conflict with 8" Steel Teco Gas Main. How is this constructed?			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
26	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 219	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2150+00, Proposed 20" Casing Immokalee in direct conflict with 8" Teco Steel GM, at what elevation is this proposed utility to be constructed?			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
27	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 222	UTILITIES
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2170+00, Proposed 20" Casing Immokalee in direct conflict with 8" Teco Steel GM and Calumet GM, at what elevation is this proposed utility to be constructed?			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
28	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Lighting L-5	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Pole #1 – (45' Pole with Shaft foundation option for pole base). Per standards this is an 8 ft. deep foundation, typically precast. How is pole base installed at proposed location with no impacts/adjustment to existing Centurylink BFOT & BT underground utilities?			
	John Ramon	7/29/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/30/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
29	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Lighting L-5	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Pole #3 –(45' Pole with Shaft foundation option for pole base). Per standards this is an 8 ft. deep foundation. How is pole base installed at proposed location with no impacts/adjustments to existing 8" Teco Gas Main?			
	John Ramon	7/29/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/30/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
30	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Lighting L-8	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment for Robbie Harris - Pole #19 – (45" Pole with Shaft foundation option for pole base). Per standards this is an 8ft. deep foundation. How is pole base installed at proposed location with no impact/adjustment to existing BFOC?			
	John Ramon	7/29/2024	1	
	The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	7/30/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
31	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Lighting L-3	LIGHTING/ELECTRICAL
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Provide general note providing coordinating information with Collier County regarding Existing Light Poles to be removed.			
	John Ramon	7/29/2024	1	
	The general note will be added.			
	Scott Presson	7/30/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
32	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 9	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	

Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Provide updated Drainage Structure Data table that matches Drainage Map. The provided table reflects existing structure data from FPID: 430849-1-52-01. No way correlate information from 417540-6-52-01 is provided.

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

The Drainage structure Data table provided with the drainage map is to display and label the existing drainage structures with type, size, flow line elevations and flow arrows per the FDM 918. The table that provides the data for the structures proposed that correlate to 417540-6-52-01 are provided in the Drainage Structures Data sheets which are page numbers 143-145 in the plans.

Scott Presson 8/2/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
33	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 129	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	

Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - S104 to S106. (P-104) Is an 108' 18" pipe run. How will this pipe run be constructed? The 12" proposed Immokalee Water and Sewer District WM' work by Utility Highway Contractor is shown in conflict. Per pipe data table, only .4 (4-tenths) difference between upper start node and lower stop node of P-104.

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

We will coordinate with the designer of the 12" WM / UWHC to coordinate the proposed design and to avoid conflict.

Scott Presson 8/2/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
34	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 145	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	

Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Update Number of Barrels per pipe run for the provided Pipe Data chart.

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

The number of barrels per pipe run will be reviewed for consistency with the design.

Scott Presson 8/2/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
35	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 131	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	

Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Drainage Structures Sheet 131, Utility Adjustment Sheet 4, Pipe Run P-111 into proposed Structure S-112 is in direct conflict with 8" Steel Teco Gas Main. How is this pipe run constructed?

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

The Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE survey to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.

Scott Presson 8/2/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
36	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 49	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	

Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate station 2133+20, S205 to S206 is in direct conflict with 8" proposed Water and Sewer. How is this pipe run constructed?

Alan Eldridge 8/2/2024 1

The proposed storm sewer pipe does not appear to be in conflict with the proposed water line. We will coordinate with the designer of the 8" FM / UWHC to confirm if a vertical conflict exists and to avoid it.

Scott Presson 8/2/2024 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
37	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 55	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2175+00, S-500C, S-503, S-502 & S-504. Pipe run is in direct conflict with 12" WM and 8" FM from Immokalee Water and Sewer. How is this pipe run to be constructed?			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	We will coordinate with the designer of the 12" WM and 8" FM / UWHC to confirm if a vertical conflict exists and to avoid it.			
	Scott Presson	8/2/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
38	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 55	DRAINAGE
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Approximate Station 2180+00, S-510, S-509, S-508 Pipe run is in direct conflict with 8" Teco GM and 8" FM from Immokalee Water and Sewer. How is this pipe run to be constructed?			
	Alan Eldridge	8/2/2024	1	
	The proposed storm sewer pipe does not appear to be in conflict with the proposed water line. We will coordinate with the designer of the 8" FM / UWHC to confirm if a vertical conflict exists and to avoid it. Additionally, for the existing gas main, the Phase II plans include locates/designates from the initial SUE survey and green line markups provided by the utility companies. All utility conflict points will be identified after a meeting with the utility companies to identify which of their facilities will remain or be relocated. All utilities to remain will have additional SUE meeting to verify conflicts and those will be discussed with each utility at the Phase IIR utility meeting and resolved from there.			
	Scott Presson	8/2/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
39	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Roadway 44	ROADWAY
	Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
	Scott Presson	6/26/2024	1	
	Comment on behalf of Robbie Harris - Plan Sheet 44, add to the General Notes providing demolition instruction for "Welcome to Immokalee Brick Sign" located at approximate station 500+20. Does the city want to preserve signage?			
	Ken Muzyk	7/12/2024	1	
	We are coordinating with the City to resolve the sign disposition.			
	Scott Presson	7/15/2024	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Sergio Figueroa	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Shiva Moonian	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Stu Myers	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Tammy Kreisle	CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER	8/2/2024	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Todd Boehmer	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Tucker Ammerman	LEAD DESIGNER	8/2/2024	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
VIVIANNE PENA RODRIGUEZ	REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
40	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ACCESS MANAGEMENT
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
VIVIANNE PENA RODRIGUEZ	6/28/2024	1		
	Per meeting held on 06/27/2024, extend median concrete barrier on Sta. 2171 further South to prevent vehicles to make an illegal left turn when coming out from the UF facility.			
Tammy Kreisle	7/12/2024	1		
	We will review the design to see if the median can be modified to prohibit EB to NB left turns. A 30' median width with 4' offsets to the curb on both sides (required for high speed roadways (>=50 mph)) makes it a challenge to provide an overlap.			
VIVIANNE PENA RODRIGUEZ	7/15/2024	1		
	Please contact Walter Breuggeman if you have further questions about this request, as it was discussed with Christopher Speese during the meeting. Thank you!			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wayne Shelton	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wendy Sands	LEAD REVIEWER	7/8/2024	ACTIVE	0